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**ADDENDA AND CORRIGENDA**

**VOLUME I**

- P. 56b, *ABD AL-CAZIZ, 1.4,* instead of 20 June read 26 June.

**P. 106b,** *ABU L-ARAB, add:* One of the works of Abu l'-Arab Muhammad b. Ahmad b. Tamīm b. Tamīm b. Tamīm al-Tamīnī (the thus the nasb) which has been preserved (in a unique Cambridge ms.) is his Kitāb al-Mīshān, a work in the tradition of the makātib books. It deals with a wide range of deaths in battle, by poisoning, persecution of al-Aids, sufferings of Ahmad b. Hanbal in the mihna [q.v.] of the early 3rd/9th century; see for an analysis of its contents, M. J. Kister, *The “Kitāb al-Mīshān”,* a book on Muslim mortuary rites, in *JSS, xx* (1975), 210-18. The complete work has now been edited by Yalā’ī Wahīb al-Qāddārī, Beirut 1403/1983.


**VOLUME II**


**P. 809b,** *FARRUKHAN,* l. 5 from bottom, instead of seventy years read thirteen years (90-103/709-21).

**VOLUME III**


**VOLUME IV**


**VOLUME V**

- P. 94b, *BAHMAN SHAH, AL-MALIK AL-AMDJAD,* 1.2, instead of Shāhānshāh read Turāngānshāh.

**P. 1007b,** *BARĀDUST,* l. 37, instead of 395/1005 read 1005/1597.

**P. 1300b,** *BULANDSHAHR,* l. 30, instead of 644/1246-665/1266 read 796-815/1394-1412.


**ADDENDA AND CORRIGENDA**

**VOLUME I**

- P. 56b, *‘ABD AL-CAZIZ, 1.4,* instead of 20 June read 26 June.

**VOLUME IV**

- P. 75b, *‘ABD AL-MADI D I, 1.39,* instead of 25 June read 26 June.

**P. 106b,** *ABU L-ARAB, add:* One of the works of Abu l'-Arab Muhammad b. Ahmad b. Tamīm b. Tamīm b. Tamīm al-Tamīnī (the thus the nasb) which has been preserved (in a unique Cambridge ms.) is his Kitāb al-Mīshān, a work in the tradition of the makātib books. It deals with a wide range of deaths in battle, by poisoning, persecution of al-Aids, sufferings of Ahmad b. Hanbal in the mihna [q.v.] of the early 3rd/9th century; see for an analysis of its contents, M. J. Kister, *The “Kitāb al-Mīshān”,* a book on Muslim mortuary rites, in *JSS, xx* (1975), 210-18. The complete work has now been edited by Yalā’ī Wahīb al-Qāddārī, Beirut 1403/1983.

**VOLUME II**


**P. 809b,** *FARRUKHAN,* l. 5 from bottom, instead of seventy years read thirteen years (90-103/709-21).

**VOLUME III**


**VOLUME IV**


**VOLUME V**

- P. 94b, *BAHMAN SHAH, AL-MALIK AL-AMDJAD,* 1.2, instead of Shāhānshāh read Turāngānshāh.

**P. 1007b,** *BARĀDUST,* l. 37, instead of 395/1005 read 1005/1597.

**P. 1300b,** *BULANDSHAHR,* l. 30, instead of 644/1246-665/1266 read 796-815/1394-1412.


**ADDENDA AND CORRIGENDA**

**VOLUME I**

- P. 56b, *‘ABD AL-CAZIZ, 1.4,* instead of 20 June read 26 June.

**VOLUME IV**

- P. 75b, *‘ABD AL-MADI D I, 1.39,* instead of 25 June read 26 June.

**P. 106b,** *ABU L-ARAB, add:* One of the works of Abu l'-Arab Muhammad b. Ahmad b. Tamīm b. Tamīm b. Tamīm al-Tamīnī (the thus the nasb) which has been preserved (in a unique Cambridge ms.) is his Kitāb al-Mīshān, a work in the tradition of the makātib books. It deals with a wide range of deaths in battle, by poisoning, persecution of al-Aids, sufferings of Ahmad b. Hanbal in the mihna [q.v.] of the early 3rd/9th century; see for an analysis of its contents, M. J. Kister, *The “Kitāb al-Mīshān”,* a book on Muslim mortuary rites, in *JSS, xx* (1975), 210-18. The complete work has now been edited by Yalā’ī Wahīb al-Qāddārī, Beirut 1403/1983.

**VOLUME II**


**P. 809b,** *FARRUKHAN,* l. 5 from bottom, instead of seventy years read thirteen years (90-103/709-21).

**VOLUME III**


**VOLUME IV**


**VOLUME V**

- P. 94b, *BAHMAN SHAH, AL-MALIK AL-AMDJAD,* 1.2, instead of Shāhānshāh read Turāngānshāh.

**P. 1007b,** *BARĀDUST,* l. 37, instead of 395/1005 read 1005/1597.

**P. 1300b,** *BULANDSHAHR,* l. 30, instead of 644/1246-665/1266 read 796-815/1394-1412.


**ADDENDA AND CORRIGENDA**

The islamisation of Khotan apparently took place already around 1000, at any rate before 1008, since the Chinese annals for the year 1009 report the arrival of a kuei-hu (¼ Turk) sent by the he-tian (¼ Khagan) of Yu-tien (¼ Khotan) with tribute to the Imperial Chinese court; the envoy had been travelling for a year (see M. Abel-Rémy, Histoire de la ville de Khotan tirée des annales de la Chine et traduite du chinois, Paris 1820, 86-7). The Muslim ruler at this time was the Karakhānīd Yūsūf Kāfīr Kān of Kāshghar (on whom see O. Pritsak, Die Karachaniden, in Id., xxi [1953-4], 30-39, repr. in Studies in medieval Eurasian history, London 1981, xvi, and telk-išahāns). The conflict between Khotan and Kāshghar must have started earlier, however, for in a letter written in Khotanese by King Viśā Sūra in 970, the ruler refers to “Our evil enemy the Tażhīk (Khot. Tarīkha) Tcūm-hyai-nã (Ts’un-hsiân?), who [is] there among the Tażhīks,” and in a letter in Chinese from the ruler of Shou (Tun-hsuan) to the king of Khotan, in the Pelliot collection, from around 975 we read “the prince of the west is leading Taśīdīq (Ta-shīh) troops to attack [your] great kingdom” (see Bayley, Saka documents, text vol., Corpus inscr. iranicarum, ii, V, London 1968, 58-61, li 50-1; Hamilton, Sur la chronologie, 48-9). Hamilton has suggested that the “evil enemy” may be Viśā Sūra’s brother, another son of Viśā Saṁbhava (in Chinese, Li Sheng-t’ien), two of whom are known to have borne the name Tcūm/Ts’un. Kumamoto, op. cit., 231, suggests that this ruler may have been a Karakhanīd. The last known king of Khotan was Viśā Dēbharma (still ruling in 988), whose name shows that he was not a Muslim. The definitive struggle over Khotan must therefore have taken place during the ensuing two decades. See also M. A. Stein, Ancient Khotan, 2 vols., Oxford 1907, repr. New York 1975, i, 180-1; W. Samolin, East Turkestan to the twelfth century, The Hague, etc. 1964, 80-2.


P. 1029b, AL-MADIJAWI, i. 4, instead of Algiers, read Constantine.


P. 1232a, AL-MAHDI: ii. 33-48. This passage was modified by the Editors without the author’s consent. The author’s original should be restored as follows:

This hadīth, whose first part is patterned upon the revolt of ‘Abd Allāh b. al-Zubayr, probably goes back to ‘Abd Allāh b. al-Hārīth b. Nawfāl b. al-Hārīth b. ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib, who appears in its isnad and claimed to have heard it from Umm Salama, widow of the Prophet. ‘Abd Allāh b. al-Hārīth was chosen by the people of Baṣra as their governor in 64/684 after the death of the caliph Yazid and the flight of his governor ‘Ubayd Allāh b. Ziyād. He then recognised Ibn al-Zubayr as the caliph and took the pledge of allegiance of the Baṣrāns for him. The hadīth was evidently proclaimed by him in this situation with the aim of stirring up support for the cause of Ibn al-Zubayr.

VOLUME VI


P. 334a, MA’AN, at end of bibliography add Abu ‘I-Wafa’ al-Urdjī, Maḍīn al-dhīābā bin ‘l-rīḍjāl al-mugharrafa bi-him Ḥalaṣ, MS B.M. Or. 3618.

P. 358a, AL-MANĀMA, i. 3, instead of side read site.

Add to Bibliography Mahdi Abdalla al-Tajri, Bahrain 1920-1945, Britain, the Shaikh and the administration, London 1987.

P. 374b, AL-MANĀZIL, i. 8, after Ibn Kutayba insert a comma.

l. 27, after names insert became.

No. 5 of the list, instead of ‘a22. Orions read ‘a21. 2 Orions. No. 9 of the list, instead of 8 read x.

P. 390a, No. 28 of the list, instead of al-hū read al-hūt.

l. 23, instead of 1800 read 1840.


P. 459b, MAPPILA, l. 37, instead of 1948 read 1498.

P. 460b, l. 10, instead of ist read its.

l. 30, instead of or read of.
XVI ADDENDA AND CORRIGENDA

P. 461a, l. 13 from below, instead of wiser read wider.
P. 462b, l. 17, instead of nor read not.
P. 463a, ll. 29-30 from below, instead of remaining read remains.
P. 464a, l. 16 from below, instead of wisely read widely.
Pp. 511 and 517, MAR‘ASHIS. Owing to an unfortunate oversight Table A has been included twice.
P. 641a, MĂSARDJAWAYH, l. 10, instead of πανδέκτης read Πανδέκτης.
  l. 24-25, instead of p. 20, l. 341 read p. 20, l. 341.
P. 736b, MASKĂT, add to author’s signature “shortened by the Editors”.
P. 764b, MASRAH, add at the end of the Bibliography: Modern Persian drama. Anthology, tr. G. Kapuscinski, Lan-

SUPPLEMENT
P. 127a, BĂRIZ, DJABAL, add: One should note the present-day settlement of Pāriz, in the northwestern
  part of the Djabal Bāriz, on the Ragsandjan-Sa‘īdābād (Sīrjān) road, which could possibly be the,
  classical Perškāne polis, town of the Parikanioi. See A. D. H. Bivar, A Persian fairyland, in Acta Iranica
  derives the legends and romances around the peris or fairies of Iran (Av. παρικός, MP pāriš, NP pāri)
  from indigenous Persian traditions connecting them with the Parikanioi, whose epigoni were suspect
  in Sāsānian times by Zoroastrian orthodoxy for their non-Zoroastrian local beliefs and customs, hence
  equated with demonic and supernatural beings.
P. 163b, ČĂČ—NĂMA. The last item in the Bibliography has been published in Y. Friedmann, ed., Islam
  in Asia, 1: South Asia, Jerusalem 1984, 23-27.
P. 395a, IBN NĂZIR AL—DJAYSH, add to Bibl.: The Tathkif is now available in the edition of R. Veselỳ,
  IFAO, Cairo 1987; see also on the author, D. S. Richards, The Tathqif of Ibn Nāzir al-Jaish: the identity
The judicial functions of the Prophet, which had been expressly attributed to him in the Kur'ān (IV, 65, 105; V, 42, 48-9; XXIV, 48, 51), were taken over after his death by the first caliphs, who administered the law in person in Medina. Already under 'Umar, the expansion of the Islamic empire necessitated the appointment of judges, originally for the expeditionary forces, then, in the natural course of events, also for the conquered territories; this institution of army judges (kādi‘l-djund) remained in being down to the Ottoman period as the kādi‘-askar [q.v.]. The source of jurisdiction in the Shari‘a is the caliph; the judges act as delegates of the authority by which they have been appointed, and are authorised to delegate their powers in turn to other persons. The appointment of a judge is made by contract consisting of offer and acceptance in the presence of at least two witnesses. The validity of the appointment does not depend upon the legality of the appointing authority; by this open-minded disposition, the Shari‘a has accommodated itself even in theory to the actual facts. On the other hand, the authorities are free to restrict the competence (wilāya) of the judge with regard to place, time and subject matter. In the early period, there used to be judges only in the big towns, and the judicial districts were accordingly large (the whole of Egypt, for instance); under the Ottomans this came to change, perhaps in consequence of the intense practical application of the Shari‘a in their territory. The restriction with regard to subject-matter was originally intended to divide labour and alleviate the burden of the chief judge, especially by erecting into independent offices some of his functions that were not purely judicial; in modern times, the restriction with regard to time and subject-matter is used in order to modify or eliminate the application of provisions of the Shari‘a without interfering directly with its material dispositions (see section 4. xiii. Reforms in the law applying in Shari‘a courts, below). Under the Umayyads, the judges were as a rule appointed by the governors; the 'Abbāsids made a point of assuming directly the exercise of this function of the sovereign; although they had to delegate it more than once to practically independent princes, they still tried to retain it, at least in form, even when their power was in full decay. The compromise between these tendencies, together with the large size, and even the accumulation in one person, of judicial districts brought about a complicated system of delegation to substitutes. The Fājmīds, the Umayyads in Spain and the Ottoman sultans likewise appointed their judges directly; the latter continued to exercise this privilege also in ceded territories such as Egypt, of which the chief kādi‘ was nominated in Istanbul until 1914. The kādi‘ could be deposed at any time by the authority which had appointed him; a change of the person in charge of this function very often caused a re-filling of all the judicial posts dependent on it. According to the theory of the fīsh, only a delegate, not an independent kādi‘, loses his office by the death or dismissal of the person who appointed him. Corresponding to this right of nomination is something like a right of supervision, which manifests itself in receiving complaints as well as in giving official directions. Another kind of higher instance was represented by the unanimous opinion of the learned men whom the judge ought to consult in cases of doubt; these could come to form a sort of unofficial court of appeal. A third kind of higher instance, the most important in practice, was control by the successor, which was often exercised with the utmost severity; every judgment of a kādi‘ could be annulled by any of his successors, a possibility which led to an endless duration of some law-suits. All this affords certain possibilities for the revision of judgments, which in theory is not provided for at all. In theory, the kādi‘ acts as a single judge; this did not prevent several judges, even if belonging to different juridical
judicial district, especially in the capitals. A judgment was often had (for the first time in Cairo in 525/1131) in Baghdad (under Harun al-Rashid); in the western caliphs and their political organs: viziers, governors, nazar al-mazdlim, etc., or by judges appointed expressly for this purpose. It retained certain general principles of the Shari'a, but based its judgments mainly upon equity and custom and applied an elastic and often summary procedure. This state of things was to some extent sanctioned by the Kur'anic injunction to obey those in authority. In the sphere of secular jurisdiction, the last and the present century brought the creation of courts on the European pattern, controlled by the government, and the introduction of modern codes. The final step was the reorganisation, again on European lines, of the juridical system in a number of Muslim countries, resulting in the introduction of courts of appeal and of benches consisting of more than one judge. All this derives from the power of the authorities to restrict the competence of the kādīs.

In the following, we shall briefly discuss the spheres and organisation of Shari'a justice in the Muslim countries, its material law and procedure, the reforms in the law applying in Shari'a courts and their application by the kādīs.

MAHKAMA

Islamic law, Edinburgh 1964, parts i-ii; Jeanette A. Wakin, The function of documents in Islamic law, Albany 1972; H. J. Liebesny, The law of the Near and Middle East, Albany 1975, chs. 1-2; Subhi Mahmassani, al-Azda al-tashkhtiya fi 'l-dawal al-arabiyya muddahh uwa-haidhurah, Beirut 1965, with bibliography of Arabic works. (J. Schacht*)

2. THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE

i. The earlier centuries

As the official seat of the kâdî [q.v.], the makkama was a fixed location within the bounds of a kâdî or hukûma, the jurisdiction area assigned to a kâdî. The number of makkamas in a particular jurisdiction area was determined and fixed by the sultan, and their locations could not be changed at the will of the sultan. The location of the makkama was usually chosen for its easy access to the commercial community, generally in the bazaar or somewhere within the precincts or near to the congregational mosque of the town. For instance, one of the makkamas of Istanbul was in the courtyard of the mosque of Divan Kû'affîn (see R. K. Bire, Turkish Hist. Soc. ms. Y4, f. 87b). When the population of a district grew or when new circumstances arose, the sultan could decide to divide the existing kâdî's jurisdiction into new ones. The location of the makkama was thus easily changed which made it possible for the sultan to give it to his favorites or to distribute it among his allies. The number of makkamas in a particular jurisdiction area could not be increased; the sultan could only divide the existing jurisdiction into smaller areas.

In the Ottoman Empire, makkamas usually had their own premises, at least in the 18th century, as appears from the court records. The exact number of makkamas in a jurisdiction varied according to the population. In Istanbul, for example, there were five makkamas scattered in the kâdî of Istanbul, and in 993/1585 the kâdî submitted a request for opening of new makkamas for the convenience of the population (A. Refik, Istanbul hayâtes, i, 30). In other kâdîs of greater Istanbul, namely Eyüp (Khâşylar), Galata (Pera) and Üskûdar, there were other makkamas. Bur- sa had seven makkamas at various parts of the city in the 11th/17th century.

The jurisdiction of a makkama and abuses of power. Within a kâdî's boundaries, an individual was free to choose which makkama to use. Some makkamas developed a specialty in a certain field; for instance, the makkama of Eyüp became the court specialising in cases of water rights (O. Nûrî, Mağâilla, i, 1221). In the period before Süleyman's reign, important cities had judges of both the Hanafî and Shâfi'i law schools. However, Süleyman ordered that all courts in the Ottoman dominions should be administered only according to the Hanafî rite (Abu 'l-Su'ûd, Ma'rûdî, in MTTM, i, 340-1). Despite this rule, Shâfi'i judges continued to function in the courts of Antakya and all the cities in the Arab provinces (see Ewliyâ Čelebi, Şehâbât-nâmeh, iii, 38). By a hûkm of 928/1522 (ms. Veliyuddîn 1969), the local beys were authorised to appoint kâdîs of the Shâfi'i school in the province of Diyarbakr. In Raqâb 981/October-November 1953 a firman confirmed that the kâdîs in the province of Tarabûls al-Qharî (Libya) could follow the Mâlikî school in their decisions (Mühmmîm defteri, xxiii, 153).

The kâdî or hukûma al-shâr of a court derived his authority directly from the sultan and was responsible only to him. A kâdî once dismissed by the sultan had no power to issue any document. In the Ottoman empire, the kâdî administered, not only the religious law but also the secular kânûn [q.v.], a practice peculiar to that régime. The hâkim had the power to impose jizya [q.v.] punishments and to imprison debtors. Local makkamas, however, had to refer to the Porte all cases concerning the military class, state interests and public security, as well as those involving more than a certain amount of money. Some cases concerning the foreigners covered by the capitulations were also to be referred to the dîvân-i hâmâyûn [see Mi'tâvâyât, ii]. The sultan could order a hâkim not to hear certain kinds of cases. The kâdî's decision was in principle final, and there was no provision for appeal in the Ottoman judicial system. However, if the interested party complained directly to the sultan of injustice in a decision, the imperial dîvân, while not capable of reversing it, could order according to the circumstances either a retrial by the same kâdî, a transfer of the case to a nearby hâkim's court, or the dispatch of the parties to the imperial dîvân for a new trial.

Governors were strictly forbidden to interfere in the courts' activities (for the sultan's strong reaction in such a case of interference, see Taqûkpurû-zîde, Şokâ'î al-nâ'âmanîyya, 216). In a fatwa, Abu 'l-Su'ûd equated such governors with infidels. If a governor-general caught a kâdî in a flagrantly illegal action, he could put an end to his activities, but he had to notify the sultan immediately, since a kâdî could only be tried in the imperial dîvân itself. The sultan could at any time decide to remove a kâdî from office. At the beginning, the term of a kâdî's office was unlimited. Later, in 1001/1598-9, it was limited to three years, with the possibility of two-year interim appointments. From the end of the 11th/17th century onwards, the regular term of office or mudâdat-i tarîyya became one year. Originally an outgrowth of the need to find appointments for the mulzims or qualified candidates awaiting their turn for a post, these frequent changings of office were seen to be the prime factor in the deterioration of the Ottoman judicial system and a cause of widespread corruption (such criticisms made in the political pamphlets are summed up by K. Rohrborn, Unter- suchungen zur Osmanischen Verwaltungsgeschichte, Berlin 1973).

Local populations had the right to complain to the sultan about their hâkimâ' activities and behaviour, this being a fundamental right enjoyed by the re'ûyâ against any agent of the sultan. General inspections were carried out from time to time to redress wrongs attributed to the kâdî (for punishments meted out after such an inspection, see Topkapi Palace Library, Revan, no. 1506; M. Cezar, Levendler, Istanbul 1965, document no. 1 in the appendix). In Ottoman history, popular discontent against abuses at the makkama was taken seriously by the sultans, and periodic reforms were carried out from the time of Bayezid I onwards. The principal subject of complaint was the collection of court fees, considered to be contrary to Islamic principles and actually denounced by the Ottoman muftis. The government tried to regulate the rates of these fees in various dates, as can be seen from the following table.

These fees constituted the principal source of income of the hâkimâ. They were prone to raise the rates or to force people to come to court unnecessarily for cases such as inheritance division or kûsmat-i mûrûd. Ewliyâ Čelebi gives as the normal amount the income from each kâdî, including the income from abuses. It was only in the period following the Tanzîmât [q.v.], when the kâdîs were assigned fixed salaries, that such fees were finally abolished. In addition to this basic source of abuse, the hâkimâ were inclined to increase the number of the makkamas in their jurisdiction in order to obtain extra revenues and then to farm them out to the na'bîs. This practice, forbidden under Süleyman I, was approved by the firman of Egypt of 931/1524-5, was included among the general abuses in the 'addât-nâmeh of 947/1540-1 (H. İnalçik, Addâlet-nâmeler, in Begeler, ii, 76) and in a firman of 958/1551

Table showing fees collected for certain types of cases for each of the agents officiating (in akcaj) (ND = no data)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of case</th>
<th>Kādī</th>
<th>Nā’tb</th>
<th>Kātib</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manumission of slaves (rūdāk)</td>
<td>30 1 1</td>
<td>20 6 1</td>
<td>20 4 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration of marriage (nikādāb)</td>
<td>20 together 5</td>
<td>ND ND ND</td>
<td>20 together 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inheritance (mirādāb)</td>
<td>20 ND ND</td>
<td>20 4 2</td>
<td>20 together 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(fees for every 1,000 ašār of the estate’s value)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notary service (kūdījī)</td>
<td>15 1 1</td>
<td>14 4 2</td>
<td>15 ND ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signature (imād’ī)</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration fee (sidjill-i kayd)</td>
<td>together 7</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letters to authorities (musāsala)</td>
<td></td>
<td>together 7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

the due for inheritance division was dramatically reduced from 2.5% to 1.5% (see Mucigdi majmū‘ī, British Museum Or. 9505, f. 65b).

Another widespread subject of complaint was imposition of ijmā‘ (for the existence of such a council from early Islamic times, see E. Tyan, Organisation judiciaire, 213-36). However, a mufti is rarely mentioned as sitting regularly in Ottoman mahkamas, though local muftis were often referred to for the issue of fatwas [q. v.] on particular cases. In addition, the study of mahkama records reveals that the judge summoned individuals with knowledge and expertise on specific matters to act as witnesses, or šuhud al-kāh in the court, and these were registered as such at the end of the court sijillāt. The use of šuhūd, an old Islamic practice [see šāhīd], was designed to check the kādī and to ensure that a decision was reached in the presence of an unbiased and expert body. There is no evidence that in the Ottoman Empire a permanent body was appointed by the kādī as professional witnesses, who existed as a kind of corporation in Egypt. For everyday cases, persons in the court or court officials could be employed as witnesses. We find that the šāhīr kast- Público regular presence at the court and was often included among the witnesses.

The personnel of a given mahkama changed in number according to its importance, with a minimum of a kātib and a muḥādir. In large mahkamas, the following additional officials were to be found: a nā’tb or nā’hīs, kātībs under a bash-kātīb, chief secretary, and a mahkama emīn, acting trustee. The kādī’s staff included in some places a mukāyid or recorder and a čukādir or messenger (see C. Ulucay, 18. asrda Manisa, docum. 27). Under a muḥādir-bashi (in other Islamic states, ṣāhid al-majdīji or dīšuq), there were muḥādirs and yasakā ’īs (Janissaries), who acted as the court police. The bash-kātīb could also function as nā’tb and the muḥādir-bashi as emīn or emīn. In some large mahkamas they were also found dānishmends, college graduates training to become kādīs. Nā’hīs were agents of the kādī appointed by him and authorised to give legal decisions on his behalf in a certain mahkama or on certain specific issues. Each mahkama was assigned to the control of a nā’hī. Nā’hīs, sometimes also called simply kādīs, were required to have the same qualifications as kādīs themselves. Although in principle a nā’hī was appointed by the kādī and exclusively responsible to him, the government imposed certain restrictions in order to prevent some common abuses. As early as Süleyman I’s time (926-74/1520-66), the system of farming out the office of nā’hī was officially abolished, and the practice of selecting nā’hīs from the local population was also prohibited (see Inalcı, Addineamüder, 76-7). Yet despite these measures, the farming-out of the office of nā’hī became a well-established practice, since in the 12th/18th century most of the important kādī posts in the provinces were administered by nā’hīs appointed by the great kādīs who remained resident in Istanbul, or by those who received their kādī as apatāl [q. v.]. Apparently the real concern in this period became how to maximise income deriving to a kādī from a jurisdiction area. Another category was the itinerant nā’hīs who carried out inspections within the jurisdiction, handing down decisions on various offences, and determining the nisāṭet sumu or fines. Besides these, there were nā’hīs appointed to deal with only a proportion of the cases or with cases involving certain expertises in a busy mahkama. Among these the kassam-ı baladı, in charge of division of inheritances belonging to the non-military classes [see kassam], may be mentioned. A separate nā’hī, the gağe nā’hī, was appointed to hear cases at night. An apak nā’hī, or wandering nā’hī, was in charge of enforcing prescriptions against religiously-forbidden things such as fraud by shop-keepers, drinking of wine, etc. In the mahkama of Istanbul, the most extensive in the empire (its record books, numbering several thousands, are preserved today in a special archive attached to the müftüler of Istanbul), there was a bāb nā’hī, or judge for hearing ordinary cases. Nā’hīs were also appointed by the kādī of Istanbul to oversee business at certain locations at the city’s principal market places such as the flour, honey, and butter warehouses, the candle works, the vegetable market, and others. They were authorised to hear cases and to issue decisions on disputes arising in these
particular locations. Ndîbs were also appointed to make investigations for a mahkama, the keshif ndîbi, and to decide disputes in connection with payment of 'awdrid taxes [q. v.], the 'awdrid nîbi. In the last quarter of the 10th/16th century, it is repeatedly stressed that, without prior decision by a hakim, no member of the military class could impose any punishment, even a small fine, on the re'sâya. The enforcement of decisions, however, was left entirely to the military. By accepting a bribe from the guilty party, they quite often omitted to enforce a hakim's decision. This anomaly in practice to a separate settlement of the case by the military. The mahkama could order detention of the criminal only as a precautionary measure.

The hakim based his decisions on sharî'î texts, kânûn-nâmés, daftars [q. v.], imperial hukms and fatâwaîs. In the 'adilet-nâmé of 1004/1595-6 (see İnalçık, Addîletnâmeler, 105), it is asserted that under Sûleymân I 'imperial kânûn-nâmés were codified and deposited in the mahkamas of kâdis in every city'. Alongside a great many unofficial copies of the general kânûn-nâmés used by the kâdis in their mahkamas, one official copy bearing the tughrâ [q. v.] of the sultan has survived to our day (Nationalbibliothek, Vienna, Cod. mixt. 870). Because regulations were constantly being amended by imperial hukms, the hakims were not required to follow a universally-applied official version. As to the sharî'î text to be used, the hakim was free to consult any reference books, on condition that they belonged to the Hanafi school. In 1107/1695-6 Muştafa Î ordered that only sharî'î texts be used in the mahkamas (O. Nüeri, Meğlileî, i, 568), but this seems to have lasted only a short period.

In principle, the Islamic judicial system does not recognise the institution of attorney (Tyan, Organisation judiciaire, 262). The system of legal representation by askâlîtîs, widely used in Islamic mahkamas, including those of the Ottoman empire (R. Jennings, The office of Vekil, in SI, xili [1975], 147-69), cannot be equated with attorneyship. Nevertheless, it appears already from 10th/16th century documents (see İnalçık, Addîletnâmeler, 99) that court suits of individuals were pursued by their private representatives in return for a fee, and these agents sometimes called daîrûdî vekîlîs formed a semi-professional group in Ottoman cities, although the government tried to eliminate them from the courts, objecting to their use of false witness and other tactics to subvert the course of justice.

Cases concerning public security or injustices inflicted upon the re'sâya by the local authorities, the so-called 'azâlîm [q. v.], cases, could be heard by the local kâdis' courts, by muftis or inspectors, or by the dîwânî courts set up by one of the vezîris while on tour in a province, or in the final resort, by the dîwân-i hümâyûn [q. v.] itself. The beylerbeyîs or governor-generals held their own dîwânîs to hear and decide on cases involving sipahîs and other timâr-holders in their provinces, and had the authority to inflict various disciplinary punishments, including dismissal. In their dîwânîs, the beylerbeyîs also heard complaints by the re'sâya of their provinces against timâr-holders, but in order to be able to take action, the case and investigation had to be referred to a topruk kâdisî, rural kâdisî, for a legal decision. In order to save the re'sâya from hardships, a sultanic decree forbade the timâr-holders from taking such cases to an urban kâdisî. Any non-disciplinary case involving a timâr-holder was to be referred to the mahkama of the local kâdisî and to be decided according to the şahrî'sa and the kânûn. The priority recognised by the beylerbeyîs for hearing cases involving people under his command was also recognised to all military

regiments in the Empire whose commanding officers had the responsibility to hold diwânîs and to give disciplinary punishments. The heads of the community organisations, too, such as the guilds and the Dhimmi minorities, were also authorised to decide cases involving their internal regulations and security. Apart from these cases, the mahkama was the sole place of resort for justice, and preserved this characteristic up until the 12th/18th century, when community courts began to usurp some of its authority (see Pan- tazopoulos, Church and law, 44-112).

The effects of imperial decline on the courts of the kâdis, Mahkamas became the target of strong criticism from the writers of the late 10th/16th century, and it was from this period that the character and functions of the mahkama began to change. Apart from its function as a law court, the mahkama served as a town meeting-place to which the city notables, representatives of the craft guilds, as well as imânûs representing the people of their respective districts, were invited periodically by the kâdis. Such meetings were usually convened by the kâdis for the purpose of explaining new orders issued by the sultan of concern to the public at large. Beginning in the 11th/17th century, however, these meetings became more frequent and assumed greater importance. The reason for this was that in that century the 'awdrid-i diwânîyya (extraordinary levies in the form of provisions, services or money) began to be collected on a regular basis, and distribution among the population of such impositions was decided in the town meetings held in the mahkama. Also, at these meetings the city's expenses were discussed and written down in budgets. As a consequence of this development, in their capacity as representatives of the local population, town notables began to assume leadership at such meetings, supplanting the kâdis' authority in various fields concerning community interests. (H. İnalçık)

The reform era (ca. 1789-1922)

As the preceding discussion makes clear, the Ottoman Empire traditionally relied mainly on the courts of the kâdis for performances of judicial functions, though it also attributed some measure of judicial functions to other institutions, such as the dîwânûns of the sultans and senior military-administrative officials, the heads of the non-Muslim subject communities, or the guilds. Ottoman authorities recognised law based on custom (tâdîr) or on the sultan's decree (kânûn), as well as the şahrî'sa, and expected those with judicial responsibilities, kâdis, as well as military-administrative officers (dhî'-farî), to apply both sharî'î and non-sharî'î law. The judicial functions of the kâdis' courts and the dîwânûns of the military-administrative authorities certainly differed in a variety of respects (Heyd, 252-b), but there was no formal distinction of şahrî'sa and mazâlîm jurisdiction. In effect, Ottoman policy was to avoid such distinction. Similarly, the remarkable development among the Ottomans of regulatory acts (kânûn, kânûn-nâmé [q. v.]) ancillary to the şahrî'sa—a development unmatched in other Islamic states—did not in principle signify neglect of the şahrî'sa. Rather, the emphasis on the kânûn, an ideal means for assertion of the sultan's authority, coexisted with a larger pattern of policy aimed at legitimating the state through appeal, in law as in other matters, to Islamic values. As expressed in legal and judicial systems, this larger policy provided the basis for Schacht's opinion that the Ottoman Empire was the şahrî'sa 'a development of actual efficiency ... it had ever possessed in a society of high material civilization since early 'Abbâsid
Yet the equilibrium between shari’a and känun, and that between tribunals of different types, did not remain constant in every period. For example, the känun went into decline after the 10th/16th century. One consequence of this appears to have been an increase in emphasis on the shari’a in certain respects (Heyd, 152-57; cf. Inalcık, KANUN, in EP, iv, 560, 561). Simultaneously, the decay in the provincial military-administrative hierarchy, and the alteration in local power-relationships, seem to have enlarged and altered the functions of the kadıs’ courts, as indicated at the end of the preceding section. Later, as the empire moved into its 19th century reform era, the balance between shari’a and non-shari’a legal systems shifted in the opposite direction. The main reason for this was that the regulatory powers of the sultans began, from the time of Selim III (1789-1807) onward, to find a new use as the chief means for the pro-mulgation of innovative reforms. As this occurred, a new body of law, and eventually a new system of courts, began to emerge. This time, the jurisdictions of the two types of courts did become differentiated, with the result that it now became quite exact, in a sense that had not obtained several centuries before, to refer to the kadıs’ courts as shari’a courts. The new legal and judicial systems continued to grow in scope, however, and the end result was the closing of the shari’a courts and the creation of an exclusively secular court system under the Turkish Republic.

Paradoxically, then, the same empire that had so impressed Schacht through its emphasis on the shari’a ultimately evolved in such a way as to prepare the legal and judicial foundations for the most secular Islamic state of the 20th century.

For the sake of continuity with the discussion of Ottoman tribunals of earlier periods, it will serve best, in considering the 19th century, to look first at the shari’a courts. The succeeding discussion of what became known as the nişâmiyê courts will then make clear where the primary emphasis of judicial reform lay.

Reform of the shari’a courts. After earlier, episodic attempts at reform of the judiciary, a serious effort to reform standards occurred during the reign of Selim III (Uzunçaşlar, Ilm., 255-60). During the 19th century, other such measures followed. Perhaps the first was a penal code applying to the kadıs’-askers, kadıs, and ná lbs, issued at the same time as another for civil officials, in 1254/1838 (Hıfız Velpel, Kanunlaştırma, 170-1). Within another three years, the first attempt to substitute salaries for compensation by fees had occurred, and seemingly also failed (Inalcık, Tanzimat’ın yüzyılannası, 626, 686). Subsequently, there were regulations defining conditions of service for shari’a judicial officials, of whom all judges except those in the greatest cities came ultimately to be designated as ná lbs, their judgments being termed niyâdeti (a change presumably reflecting the increasing tendency to use the term kadi to refer to an administrative district; Heidborn, 260 n. 177). By the 1870s, these regulations covered subjects such as appointment by examination, ranks, duration of terms of service, maintenance of systematic service records, and—once again—salaries. While some of these concepts, such as examinations and ranks, had long been known among the ‘ulema, others were new; and all together signify the evolution, here as in other branches of government service, of essentially modern patterns of personnel administration (Aristarchii, ii, 320-4; Young, 200-1; Heidborn, 260-6; Distr. i, 1, 315-24; ii, 721; Distr. ii, 352-61). There were also efforts to upgrade meshrede training; and in the second half of the 19th century, new schools were founded in Istanbul specifically for the training of ná lbs and kadıs (Ergin, Türkiye maaşı tercihi, i, 135-42; Distr. ii, 127-38; ix, 598-690). Regulations were issued to define the functions that could be performed in the various shari’a courts and the fees that were still to be collected (Aristarchii, ii, 324-38; Distr. i, 1, 301-14; Distr. iii, 95, v, 1). The process of legal reform and codification affected the shari’a courts, particularly through the Medjelle [q.v.], published between 1870 and 3176. Chiefly the work of Ahmed Djevdet Paşa [q.v.] and based on Hanafi fiqh, the law had civil law and procedure and was intended for application in both the religious and the secular (nişâmiyê) courts (R. H. Davison, Reform in the Ottoman empire, Princeton 1962, 253-5; Heidborn, 283-6, 387-97).

Under the Medjelle, for example, the appeal of decisions from provincial shari’a courts became a matter of system (arts. 1835-40; Young, i, 287-95; Distr. iv, 123; Distr. iii, 85-8, v, 728). Other acts regulated the division (kûnet) of estates in certain circumstances (Young, i, 294-302; Distr. i, 1, 289-97; Distr. iii, 88-95; vi, 394-96). As the secular courts developed, the types of cases that were to go before the shari’a courts were increasingly delimited (Young, i, 291-3; Distr. iii, 165-6; EP, iv, 560, 561).

The Young Turk era produced more radical changes, under the influence of Ziya Gökalp’s Western-inspired concept of religion, a number of major reforms, aimed at restricting the role of the Şeyhül-İslâm to iftâ, were carried out in 1917. One of these measures was the placing of the shari’a courts under the authority of the Minister of Justice (Distr. i, ix, 270-1). A new law on shari’a court procedure appeared in October 1917 (Distr. i, ix, 783-94), as did a new code of family law, including provisions for Christians and Jews as well as Muslims (Distr. ix, ix, 762-81; x, 52-57; Berkes, Secularism, 415-19). After World War I, responsibility over the shari’a courts was briefly returned to the Şeyhül-İslâm (Pakalin, Kadi, 125). But with the complete dismantling of the traditional religious establishment under the Turkish Republic, the shari’a courts were abolished in 1924 (B. Lewis, The emergence of modern Turkey, Oxford 1968, 265-74).

The nişâmiyê courts. The best way to understand the rise of the nişâmiyê courts is to begin by examining how the reassessment of the sultans’ discretionary legislative power stimulated a new development in the tradition of the dîwanî, which the Ottomans used both as consultative and as judicial bodies.

The decree-power of the sultan provided the essential legislative sanction for all the reformist initiatives, including the Gül-kâhne Decree of 1839, the Reform Decree of 1856, and the Constitution of 1876 (Inalcık, Pâdişah, in İa, ix, 495). Concluding with the promise that new laws would be framed to elaborate its egalitarian principles, the Gül-kâhne Decree (Hurewitz, i, 271; Distr. i, 6) was of particular significance. For it provided the impetus for a good tide of new legislation, much of it explicitly borrowed from Western models (Veldel, Kanunlaştırma, 175 ff.; Heidborn, 283-4, 320-54, 366-86, 416-41). The fact that the terms nişâm or nişâm-nâmé now often replaced kânun or kânun-nâmé as designations for the new laws, cannot obscure the continuity, at least as far as the underlying legislative authority is concerned, between the reformist legislation and the laws of earlier centuries. The terms were not necessarily synonymous; and the designation of major political
periods of the reform era in terms of nizām or its derivatives (Nizām-i Lüfet, Tanzyimāt [q.v.]) is symbolic of the new shift in the historic balance between kānūn and ğhārā’s (Findley, Bureaucratic reforms in the Ottoman empire, ch. 5). The practice of referring to the new courts created in this period as nizāmīyye courts signifies that they were responsible for trying cases under the new laws. While some of the conciliatory bodies most distinctive of the “classic” Ottoman governmental system—such as the imperial dīwān at the palace or the dīwān of the leading military-administrative functionaries in the provinces—had long since declined, the tradition of the dīwān or councils (meglis-ā), as they were more often termed during the reform era, responded to this legislative reassertion in two respects. On one hand, the Supreme Council of Judicial Ordinances (Meglis-i Wādī-yi Akhām-i ʿAldiyeye), a body which Mahmūd II created out of the dīwān of the Grand Vezīr in 1838 and which evolved into the Council of State (Shurd-yl-ʾUlūm-i Dārul, 1868), assumed the bulk of the work of preparing the new legislation for the sultan’s sanction (Shaw, Central legislative councils, 51-84). On the other hand, simultaneous efforts to create a new kind of local administrative apparatus led to the creation in 1840 of new local councils, referred to as Meglis-i Muḥāṣṣil-īn, Muḥāṣṣilīn Meglis-ī, or Memleket Meglis-ī. These were intended in part to supplant the role that the kādī’s courts had acquired in administrative affairs, though not of course their judicial functions in ğhārā’s cases. Both the local councils and the Supreme Council of Judicial Ordinances in Istanbul also served as judicial bodies in certain types of cases arising under the new legislation (Heidborn, 219). Including various of the local administrative officials, the kādī and muḥāṣṣil, the leaders of the local non-Muslim communities, and in directly elected representatives of the local notables, the local councils were found at various administrative levels: lütūr or sanjāk, kādāt (a term used increasingly in this period to refer to the administrative subdivision of the lütūr), and sometimes on a reduced scale in lower-level subdivisions as well (Ortaylı, Mahāli şarʾerler, 13 ff.; İnalick, Tanzyim in uygulanması, 626, 633-5, 664-5; idem, Application of the Tanzyimāt and its social effects, in Archivum Ottomanicum, v [1973], 100-1, 107-10; Kornrumpf, Territorialverwaltung, 44-57 passim).

The assignment of judicial functions to the local councils marked the first step toward creation of the nizāmīyye courts, which continued to reflect their origins in being collegial bodies. Decades were to pass before a distinct hierarchy of nizāmīyye courts emerged, and incidentally before they were officially referred to by the term mahkeme (in 1868 according to Heidborn, 226, n. 57). Even then, the local administrative councils and—except for a few years during the Young Turk period—the Supreme Council of Judicial Ordinances, later the Council of State, retained responsibility for administrative justice (Shaw, Central legislative councils, passim; Findley, Bureaucratic reforms, 174-6, 249-9, 508-9).

Between the creation of the councils just described (1838, 1840) and the first comprehensive attempt to regulate and systematise the system of nizāmīyye courts (1879), a number of steps had to be taken. The 1840s witnessed the development of a system of commercial courts, beginning with a single one in Istanbul, where cases between Ottoman subjects and non-Ottomans were tried before a panel of judges, also of mixed nationalities. The number of these was set first at six, then raised to eight at the kādāt level (Dstr.1, i, 175). Half-Muslim and half-non-Muslim, these were to be elected by the same procedure as the elected members of the local administrative council (meglis-i ʿidār) that became the successor, under the 1864 law, of the earlier memleket meglis-ī. Under the provincial administration law of 1864, the provincial commercial courts, created in 1860, were also effectively integrated into the nizāmīyye court system. Numerous features of the system of 1864 reflect its incipient state of development. These include reliance on ğhārā’s court judges, as well as the fact that the hierarchy of courts thus far had only two echelons. A similar significance no doubt attaches to the fact that these provisions appeared in a law dealing with provincial administration; but this pattern proved short-lived. The new Law on Provincial Administration, promulgated in January 1871, contained virtually nothing on the courts (Dstr.1, i, 625-51; Aristarchi, iii,
This fact reflects a new policy—separation of powers—introduced into Ottoman practice with a reform of the Supreme Council of Judicial Ordinances in 1868. The Supreme Council was then separated into two bodies, one intended to perform legislative, the other judicial, functions. The new legislative body was the Council of State (Şura-ı Divan). This continued, aside from the short-lived parliament, to function as the main legislative body. The highest level of nizâmiyye justice became the responsibility of what can probably best be envisaged as a High Court of Justice (actual title, Divân-ı Ahkâm-ı Adilîye). The organisation and functions of this body underwent redefinition a number of times over the next several years. The various appeals courts already in existence in Istanbul for criminal and commercial cases were gradually brought together under the new agency, and it became the nucleus from which a Ministry of Justice 'shortly emerged (Dstr.1, i, 32-42, 357-63; iii, 2-3; Aristarchi, ii, 42-55; v, 26-8; Heidborn, 225-6).

This creation of the ministry, like the promulgation of the Constitution of 1876, was essentially a response to the crises of the late 1870s and to the need which the Ottomans felt to demonstrate their ability to meet the challenges of all types of case, even without European interference. The constitution itself contained a few provisions on matters related to the courts, such as the independence of the judiciary, conditions of service in it, and judicial procedure. The constitution also asserted that the organisation and competence of the courts and the duties of the judges must be defined by law (Dstr.1, iv, 14-16; Aristarchi, v, 19-21). A series of acts published in 1878 in the wake of the Congress of Berlin (Heidborn, 228), attempted to meet these demands.

The acts of 1879 in fact established the Ministry of Justice and the nizâmiyye court system essentially as they were to remain until the Young Turk period. These acts included organic regulations for a Ministry of Justice and Religious Affairs (‘Adîîye ve Meşâbîh Nîzâmîyye Nâzîrlâviyesi) and as the double mission of which gave it jurisdiction over judicial and other affairs of the non-Muslim communities, as well as over the nizâmiyye courts (Dstr.1, iv, 125-31; Young, i, 159-60). There was also an organic law for the nizâmiyye courts. This included provisions not only on the organisation and competence of the tribunals, but also on the organisation of the judiciary and on the systems of public prosecutors (müddet-i yaz’ umumî) and judicial inspectors (Dstr.1, iv, 235-50; later amendments ibid., vi, 81; vii, 171-2, 1080-1; viii, 136-7, 665-6; cf. Young, i, 166-80; Heidborn, 231-48). Also among the acts of 1879 were laws on the system for execution of the judgments of the courts (Dstr.1, iv, 225-35; vi, 837; vii, 752-3; Young, i, 197-210; Heidborn, 248-9), on notaries (Dstr.1, iv, 338-44; 1065-8; Young, i, 193-7; Heidborn, 249-50), and on judicial fees (Dstr.1, iv, 319-37; v, 582-96; vi, 456; viii, 744-7; Young, i, 210-23). There were also codes of civil and criminal procedure (Dstr.1, iv, 131-224, 257-318; later modifications ibid., vi, 230-1; vii, 16-17, 31-3, 89-90, 114, 151, 1081; viii, 135-6, 751-2; cf. Young, vii, 171-300; Heidborn, 397-441). About the same time, efforts were made to found a law school to train judges and lawyers competent in the new legal system (Ergin, Maarif tarihi, ii, 582-92; iii, 890-918; Heidborn, 245-60). The system for investigating and carrying out preliminary investigation of major crimes (kabdhdt ve dhunhd) continued, aside from the short-lived parliament, to function as a court of cassation in cases involving minor offences and misdemeanours (kahhâvât ve gînha) and carry out preliminary investigation of major crimes (gînayet). It could also hear commercial cases, if there was no separate commercial court in the kâda’s. The kâda’s court was authorised to hear appeals from the courts of arbitration at lower levels. It was also empowered to judge in last resort in cases where the matter in question had a monetary value that fell within stated limits, as well as in minor criminal offences (kahhâvât).

In kâda’s that coincided with the centre of a higher-level administrative circumscription, the court of first instance took on additional attributes. In the ‘central’ kâda’s of a liwâ’ or sandjak, for example, the court of first instance was to have two sections for civil and criminal cases. These functioned separately as courts of first instance for that kâda and jointly to try major crimes (gînayet) or hear appeals from the other kâda’s of the liwâ’.

There was also provision for a commercial court of the liwâ’, which functioned similarly as a court of first instance for the central kâda’s and as a court of appeal for the other kâda’s of the liwâ’. The law of 1879 does not specifically mention the courts of first instance located in kâda’s that coincided with province capitals. By 1908, however, these reportedly existed, serving as courts of first instance for the kâda’s in which they were located and as an appeals instance for cases coming up from the liwâ’ courts. There was also provision for provincial commercial courts. These are reported to have existed in most provinces, though only occasionally in lower-echelon administrative centres (Heidborn, 234).

A tribunal expressly designated as an appeals court (isti’ naf mahkemesi) was supposed to be located in every province capital. This court was to have separate civil and criminal sections. These were empowered to hear appeals from the courts of first instance located at the centres of the various liwâ’s of the province, as well as from those in the kâda’s of the central liwâ’. The criminal section served the central liwâ’s of the province and although various acts of the reign of Abd al-Hamid make clear that official interest in them did continue (Dstr.1, vi, 1155-68; vii, 27-38; viii, 712-28, 747, 753). The triple-tiered system of regular courts was also not as fully developed as its nomenclature implied. The law of 1879 in fact began by stating that the courts were of two levels, first instance and appeal. There was only one court of cassation, located in Istanbul; and even the functions of the courts of first instance and appeal varied as much with the level of the administrative hierarchy at which they were found as with their ostensible placement in the judicial hierarchy.

As prescribed in 1879, however, there was to be a court of first instance in every kâda. In a normal kâda, the court of the first instance was empowered to hear civil and criminal cases, all types of case, from those in the kâda’s that coincided with province capitals. For Istanbul, the law of 1879 prescribed an

RODUCTION and appointment of judges, who were no longer to be elected, and prescribed the keeping of systematic personnel records on all judicial officials (Dstr.1, v, 1058-64; vi, 1307-8; 1476; Young, i, 182-4).

As defined in the organic regulations of 1879, the nizâmiyye court system was supposed to include courts of arbitration (sulh dâ ’treleri) in the villages and nâhîyes, as well as courts of first instance (hidîyet), appeal (isti’ naf), and cassation (t les), (Dstr.1, vii, 228-32) indicated that the courts of arbitration were never really set up, although various acts of the reign of Abd al-Hamid make clear that official interest in them did continue (Dstr.1, vi, 1155-68; vii, 27-38; viii, 712-28, 747, 753). The triple-tiered system of regular courts was also not as fully developed as its nomenclature implied. The law of 1879 in fact began by stating that the courts were of two levels, first instance and appeal. There was only one court of cassation, located in Istanbul; and even the functions of the courts of first instance and appeal varied as much with the level of the administrative hierarchy at which they were found as with their ostensible placement in the judicial hierarchy.
analogous organisation, allowing that the number of sections and staff members could be increased in case of need, as was in fact done (Destr. iv, 240). In addition, there was an important deviation from the provincial pattern in that the Istanbul commercial court acquired three sections, one hearing only cases between Ottoman subjects and foreigners, one only cases between Ottoman subjects, and one only maritime cases. The capital city also had an appeals court with civil, criminal, and commercial sections (Heidborn, 237). At the apex of the nizâmiyye court system, finally, stood the court of cassation (mahkeme-i temyiz), also in Istanbul. This, too, had three sections, the functions of which were gradually defined in acts of the 1880s and 1890s (Destr. iv, v, 853-4, 992; vi, 89-90; Young, i, 180-1; Heidborn, 237-8). The first section, that of petitions (sind 2'dâ fi dâ'îrs), received all appeals to the court. This section had power to decide directly in certain matters, such as conflicts of jurisdiction, reassignment of cases from one court to another, or the unacceptability of petitions on grounds of technical irregularity or lapse of the period set for cassation. The petitions section referred the cases it accepted to either the civil or the criminal section, which either rejected the appeal or overturned the lower court ruling on ground of judicial error. In major criminal cases (sulh hâkimleri), when the courts of arbitration (sulh ddîresi), provided for in the capitulations, effective from 1 October 1914, had important implications for the criminal cases often had considerable patterns of organisation and staffing created in 1879 for the nizâmiyye courts at the administrative levels of the kadi 2's, nâhibs, and villages to hear minor cases of various types (Destr. v, 322-48, 619, 775-7, 827, 869-75; vi, 156-7, 294-5, 342-3, 1353; vii, 561-2; Meyer, Rechtswesen, 138). The patterns of organisation and staffing created in 1879 for the nizâmiyye courts at the administrative levels of the kadi 2's, liwâ 2's, province (wilâyet), and in Istanbul were amended at several points, starting in August 1909 (Destr. ii, 165-6; iii, 180-1; iv, 217-18, 793-5, 866). The abolition of the capitulations, effective from 1 October 1914, had important implications for the courts system, since in fact it required the abandonment of all courts and judicial procedures specifically for the benefit of foreigners (Destr. vi, 1273, 1336, 1340; Meyer, Rechtswesen, 117-18, 135). The attack on the traditional religious institutions in 1917 was of comparable significance, since it resulted in the placement of the şer i的应用 courts under the Ministry of Justice and the creation of a section for şar i的应用 courts in the Cassation Court in Istanbul (Meyer, Rechtswesen, 139-41). Though briefly reversed during the armistice period, these changes in the status of the şar i的应用 courts brought Ottoman judicial systems to a point very near complete unification, which occurred with the establishment of the secular, national court system under the Ministry of Justice of the Turkish Republic. Bibliography:
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1940, 139-209; G. Young, Corps de droit ottoman: recueil des codes, lois, règlements, ordonnances et actes les plus importants du droit intérieur, et d'études sur le droit coutumier de l'Empire ottoman, 7 vols., Oxford 1905-6.

(H. INALCIK and C. V. FINDLEY)

3. IRAN

Under the ‘Abbasids, as Schacht pointed out, the office of kādi became permanently connected with the sacred law, but, as he went on to say, the kādis very soon lost control of the administration of criminal justice. Ostensibly to supplement the deficiencies of the tribunals of the kādis, the mazālim [q.v.] courts were set up for the redress of grievances, deriving from the administrative practice of the Sāsānid kings, were set up by the political authority and received theoretical recognition (The law, in Unity and variety in Muslim civilization, ed. G. von Grunebaum, Chicago 1955, 74-5).

Al-Māwardi [q.v.], recognising that the mazālim could not deal with issues that fell within the general framework of the law. In a significant statement he claimed that it was charged with the enforcement of decisions made by kādis not sufficiently strong to see that their judgments were carried out against defendants occupying high rank or powerful positions, and with the suppression of evil-doing and the enforcement of regulations within the jurisdiction of the muhātasib but beyond his power to apply (al-Ahkām al-sultāniyya, Cairo 1386/1966, 83). In his account of the origins of the mazālim court, he attributes its emergence to the lapse into kingship after the golden age of the Medinan caliphate. It was concerned with cases against officials, suits concerning injustice in the levy of taxation, complaints by those in receipt of stipends from official sources that these had not been paid or had been reduced, and claims for the restoration of property wrongfully seized. It was also charged with the investigation of matters which concerned aukfūf, the care of public worship and the due performance of religious practices in general. Whereas the kādi’s court was bound by strict rules of evidence, the mazālim court was subject to no such limits, although Al-Māwardi states that in the hearing and decision of disputes in general the rules of procedure which determined cases that came before the kādis and judges were to prevail (al-Ahkām al-sultāniyya, 77 ff. See also R. Levy, The social structure of Islam, Cambridge 1957, 348-9). One of the most important functions of the mazālim court was arbitration. In exercising this the head of the court, the nizir al-mazālim, was, according to al-Māwardi, not to go outside the limits of what was demanded by the law and his decrees were to be in keeping with the rules expounded by the kādis (al-Ahkām al-sultāniyya, 83). Al-Māwardi further lays down that kādis and jurists, to whom the nizir al-mazālim might have recourse in case of difficulty or doubt, were to be present when the mazālim court sat (ibid., 80). It was thus a channel through which sanction was given to ‘urfī practices.

The lawbooks lay down the qualities demanded of the kādi and the rules of procedure for his court. They also lay down the method of his appointment; but in this Sunnī theory differs from Shi‘ī. Until the Šafawīs imposed Imāmī Shi‘īism as the official religion of their empire, Persia was, apart from certain districts, predominantly Sunnī. The dominant rites were the Šāhī‘ī and the Ḥanafī and it was the rules concerning kadā‘ laid down in the lawbooks of these schools which, for the most part, prevailed (for these see especially Al-Muzaffar al-Abbāsī, al-Ahkām al-sultāniyya and idem, Ādāb al-kādi, ed. Muḥyī l-Ḥalāl al-Sirāhī, Baghdād 1391/1971). According to Sunni theory, it was essential that there should be a valid delegation of authority to the kādi in order that his decisions should, in turn, have validity. As long as the caliphs held political authority they had delegated authority to their kādis. When they ceased to exercise power it was accepted that the kādi should be appointed by the ruler. Al-Ghazālī, concerned for the legality of the life of the community, held that any kādi nominated by one holding power (ṣābi‘ shawakat) could give valid decisions (Wadījī, ii, 143, quoted by E. Tyan, Histoire d’organisation judiciaire, i, 258). Once instituted, the kādi was regarded, not as the personal representative of the one who had delegated authority to him, but as the deputy or nā‘ib of the caliph or the Prophet. With the weakening of the power of the caliph and his overthrow by the Mongols, it became the normal theory to regard the kādis as the deputies of the prophet. This reinforced their independent status (see further Tyan, i, 134-5, 147-8). The death of the imām (or that person who had delegated authority to the kādi) did not result in the revocation of the kādis’s appointment (thus reinforcing his theoretical independence). On the other hand, the death of the kādi resulted in the revocation of the appointment of his deputies. If the inhabitants of a town which had no kādi appointed one, this designation was null and void if there was an imām in existence. If there was no imām, the appointment was valid and his judgments were to be executed (al-Ahkām al-sultāniyya, 76). This again emphasizes the independent status of the kādi. But his independence was relative: when a new imām was appointed, his agreement was required for the kādi to continue to exercise his functions (ibid.). The fact that the law administered by the kādi was the shari‘a, to which, in theory, the ruler was subject and which was independent of his will, also contributed to the independence of the kādi (cf. Tyan, i, 149-50)—an independence which they continued to enjoy to a greater or lesser extent over the centuries. Two factors in particular, however, limited their independence. First, the ruler who had nominated them could also dismiss them, and secondly, they had to rely on the officials of the government for the enforcement of their judgments. The competence of the kādi might be general or restricted. In the former case, the kādi’s functions were to settle disputes either by arbitration within the limits of the shari‘a between the parties to the dispute or by enforcing, after proof, liabilities by judgment in favour of those entitled to them upon persons who disputed them; to exercise control over persons who had not charge of their property by reason of sadness, infancy or insolvent; to oversee aukfūf; to execute wills and testaments; to give widows and divorced women in marriage; to apply the legal penalties; to supervise public utilities in order to prevent encroachment upon roads and public spaces; to make the necessary investigations concerning legal witnesses; to judge between the powerful and the weak; observing equality between them; and to decide with equity cases between the khass and the ‘āmm. If he was invested with authority for some specific purpose, i.e. if his authority was restricted (khūsūs), he exercised his functions within those limits only (al-Ahkām al-sultāniyya, 70 ff.).

Whereas the Sunnis considered the ultimate source of the kādi’s authority to be the Prophet, the Shi‘a held this to be the imāms (see al-Kulaynī, Usūl al-kāfi, ch. on kadā‘). The Imāmī Shi‘a, perhaps because their imāms apart from ‘Ali b. Abī Tālib did not hold political power, were not concerned with the valid delegation of authority by the holders of power to their subordinate officials. They regarded all government
in the absence of the imam as unjust (dfi‘ir). In their discussions of kaddi they differentiate between the time when the imam is present and the ghaba, i.e. the period of occultation. However, they could not entirely escape the problem of cooperation with an unjust government, the validity of whose title to rule they did not recognise. They attempted to solve this problem by permitting a limited degree of cooperation with the adoption of takﬁya (q.v.), dissimulation of one’s belief in the event of danger.

Muhammad b. al-Hasan al-Tusi (d. 460/1067) sets out, in a somewhat equivocal fashion, the Imami Shi‘i doctrine concerning the application of the legal penalties and the exercise of the office of kadi as follows: ‘‘No one has the right to execute the legal penalties except the sultan of the time, who has been appointed by God most High [i.e. the imam], or that person whom the imam has appointed to apply the legal penalties. It is not permissible for anyone except those two to apply the legal penalties on any occasion. But permission has been given for the people to apply the legal penalties to their children, their own people and their slaves in the time when the true imams are not in control and tyrants have usurped power, provided that they do not fear that any harm will come to them from the tyrants and are safe from harm from them. If this is not the case, it is not permissible to apply the legal penalties. If an unjust sultan makes someone [who is an Imami Shi‘i] his deputy and appoints him to apply the legal penalties, it is for him to do so fully and completely, while believing that what he does at the command of the true sultan; and it is incumbent upon believers to cooperate with him and to strengthen him as long as he does not transgress what is right in that over which he is appointed and does not go beyond what is legal according to the Shi‘i of Islam. If he does, it is not permissible for him to do so while practising takﬁya, as long as the killing of anyone is not involved. In no circumstance is takﬁya to be practised in the case of killing anyone (al-Nihdya fi mudgarad al-fukh wa’l-fatawa, Beirut 1970, 300-1, Persian text, ed. Muhammad Bâkîr Sabzawâri, Tehran 1333/1954-6, 2 vols., i, 201-1).

Similarly, al-Tusi states that it is not permissible for anyone to give judgment between the people except that person to whom ‘‘the true sultan’’ has given permission (ibid., 301, Persian text, i, 201). He continues, ‘‘The true imams, upon them be peace, have cast [the mantle of judgment (hukumât) on the fukahâ of the Shi‘a during such time as they themselves are not in a position to exercise it in person’’ (ibid., Persian text, i, 201; the Arabic text omits the words a’mmma-i hak and reads ‘‘They have entrusted this (the function of judging) to the fukahâ of their shi‘a during such time as they are not able to exercise it in person’’, 301). This statement, which would appear to be one of the earliest occasions when it is stated that the fukahâ are in effect the successors or deputies of the imams in the giving of judgment, does not provide for any immediate source of authority for the fukahâ. The qualities required for the office of kadi (ibid., 266, 301) are wisdom and maturity, being learned in the Kurgan works, and that he should avoid sins and refrain from lust and have an intense concern for piety. Only someone endowed with these qualities was permitted to undertake the office and to judge between the people provided that there was no fear for his life, his people, his possessions or for any believers (al-Nihdya fi mudgarad al-fukh wa’l-fatawa, 301, Persian text, i, 226). It was permissible to take wages and subsistence from a just sultan (i.e. the imam) for the exercise of the office of kadi, but in the case of an unjust sultan it was only permissible in the event of necessity or fear. It was, however, better, in al-Tusi’s opinion, to refrain in all cases from taking wages for the office of kadi (ibid., Arabic text, 367, Persian text, i, 246).

‘‘If,’’ al-Tusi states, ‘‘anyone is able to carry out a judgment or a settlement (sulh) between people or to execute a decision between two litigants, as long as he does not fear harm for himself or for anyone of the faith and is safe from harm in so doing, he will receive recompense and reward. But if he fears any of these things, in no circumstances is it permissible for him to undertake these matters. If someone calls upon one of the fukahâ of the people of the truth (i.e. the Imami Shi‘a) to decide something between them (the Shi‘a), and that fukahâ does not agree to do so, preferring that it should be referred to a person who is charged with the matter on behalf of tyrants, he will have stepped outside the truth and committed sin. It is not permissible for a person who is charged with giving a decision between two litigants, or judgment between the people, to do so except in accordance with the truth; it is not permissible to give judgment according to the Sunni schools. If anyone undertakes judgment on behalf of unjust persons, let him strive to give judgments as demanded of him by the ghari‘a of the faith; but if he is constrained to give judgment according to the Sunni schools because he fears for himself, his people or believers or for their property, it is permissible for him to do so [while practising takﬁya], provided it does not involve the killing of anyone, because takﬁya is not to be adopted in the case of killing someone’’ (ibid., 301-2, Persian text, i, 201).

Concluding his discussion of the application of the legal penalties and the execution of judgment, al-Tusi succinctly explains in what circumstances a fakih might undertake these functions under an unjust ruler and how the fakih was to believe while doing so that he was, in fact, acting on behalf of the imam. He

‘‘Abd Allâh (Dja‘far al-Sâdîk) concerning two of our companions who are involved in a dispute over debt or inheritance and who seek judgment before a sultan or kaddi. Is this lawful (hâl?l)? Abû ‘Abd Allâh replied, ‘‘He who seeks judgment from a fakih (i.e. tyrants) and obtains judgment receives only a denomination, even if his claim is valid, because he has accepted the decision of fakih. God has commanded that (such a one) be considered an unbeliever (kâfir).’’ Umar b. Hanzala said, ‘‘What should they do?’’ Dja‘far al-Sâdîk replied, ‘‘Look to one of your number who relates our hadith, who considers our hâdîl and our hârin and who knows our shari‘a, and who is one of our jurists for I have made him a hakim over you. If he gives a decision in accordance with our judgment and (the litigant) does not accept it, then it is God’s judgment he has scorned and us he has rejected. One who rejects us rejects God and he is subject to the punishment due for polytheism (‘sâl hadd al-dalîl’).’’ (Furû‘ al-kâfî, i, 357-9). The qualities required for the office of kadi were wisdom and maturity, being learned in the Kur‘ân and the Sunna, and a knowledge of Arabic; it was also a condition that he who undertook this office should be devout and abstinent and much given to good works, and that he should avoid sins and refrain from lust and have an intense concern for piety. Only someone endowed with these qualities was permitted to undertake the office and to judge between the people provided that there was no fear for his life, his people, his possessions or for any believers (al-Nihdya fi mudgarad al-fukh wa’l-fatawa, 301, Persian text, i, 226). It was permissible to take wages and subsistence from a just sultan (i.e. the imam) for the exercise of the office of kadi, but in the case of an unjust sultan it was only permissible in the event of necessity or fear. It was, however, better, in al-Tusi’s opinion, to refrain in all cases from taking wages for the office of kadi (ibid., Arabic text, 367, Persian text, i, 246).

‘‘If,’’ al-Tusi states, ‘‘anyone is able to carry out a judgment or a settlement (sulh) between people or to execute a decision between two litigants, as long as he does not fear harm for himself or for anyone of the faith and is safe from harm in so doing, he will receive recompense and reward. But if he fears any of these things, in no circumstances is it permissible for him to undertake these matters. If someone calls upon one of the fukahâ of the people of the truth (i.e. the Imami Shi‘a) to decide something between them (the Shi‘a), and that fukahâ does not agree to do so, preferring that it should be referred to a person who is charged with the matter on behalf of tyrants, he will have stepped outside the truth and committed sin. It is not permissible for a person who is charged with giving a decision between two litigants, or judgment between the people, to do so except in accordance with the truth; it is not permissible to give judgment according to the Sunni schools. If anyone undertakes judgment on behalf of unjust persons, let him strive to give judgments as demanded of him by the ghari‘a of the faith; but if he is constrained to give judgment according to the Sunni schools because he fears for himself, his people or believers or for their property, it is permissible for him to do so [while practising takﬁya], provided it does not involve the killing of anyone, because takﬁya is not to be adopted in the case of killing someone’’ (ibid., 301-2, Persian text, i, 201).

Concluding his discussion of the application of the legal penalties and the execution of judgment, al-Tusi succinctly explains in what circumstances a fakih might undertake these functions under an unjust ruler and how the fakih was to believe while doing so that he was, in fact, acting on behalf of the imam. He
states, "If a fażīkh exercises authority (seṭlāyā) on behalf of a tyrant, let him think that in applying the penalties of the law and in giving judgment he is acting on behalf of the true imām and let him undertake (these duties) for the sake of the greater interest of the faith; and whenever he is empowered to execute punishment against a transgressor, let him do so, for verily this is one of the greatest (forms) of diṭāhā. If, however, someone does not know the conditions in which the penalties should be applied and cannot execute them [properly], it is not permissible, in any circumstances, for him to apply them—if he does he will be a sinner. But if he is compelled to do so, then it will not be anything against him. Let him endeavour to keep himself apart from things which are illegitimate (al-ākāff). It is not permissible for anyone to choose to execute oversight on behalf of tyrants unless he has (first) determined that he will not transgress what is obligatory and will only execute what is right and that he will allocate such things as sadakat and dārūmā and so on to their proper use. If he knows that will he will not be able to control these things, it is not permissible for him voluntarily to undertake such work, but if he is compelled to do so, it is permissible. Let him strive (to act) as we have said" (ibid., 302-3, Persian text, i, 201-2).

Al-Tūsī’s theory thus made it possible for Imām Shī'ī to accept the office of kādi from unjust rulers, whether Sunni or Shi'ī, although he did not provide for any immediate source of their authority. His theory was for the most part accepted by later jurists. Hasan b. Yusuf b. al-Muḥtaḥār al-Hilli (d. 726/1325), writing in the reign of Ağāy (703-16/1304-16), who was converted to Shī’ism, was a sinner and it was incumbent (kuddt al-djawr) on this, states with reference to the exercise of judicial functions: C. Schefer, Paris 1891, Persian text, 10). His main concern appears to have been to strengthen the authority of the ruler rather that to ensure that justice was done to the individual. He continues, “A few cases which are of greater importance shall be submitted to the kādi, but he makes a distinction between the exercise of office by a muḏājahād and one who was not muḏājahād. He permits a kādi to carry out the ta‘ṣīr punishments but states that the execution of the hadd punishments was the muḏājahād’s prerogative, and in carrying out a hadd punishment his inward intention (niyyāt) must be that he was carrying it out as the deputy, not of the temporal governors (hakkām), but of the imām. He also states that it was not permissible for the leader of the Muslims to appoint a kādi or muḏājahād except with the permission of a muḏājahād (Kashf al-ghidā, lith., pages unnumbered).
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functional authority of the kādi derived from the shari‘a (see further Lambton, Quis custodiet custodes, in SFa, 1956, 132-3).

A document issued by Sandjār’s diwān appointing Majd al-Dīn Muhammad kādi of Gulpāygaš states that the office of kādi and hākim was the greatest religious office (ṣughl) and the most delicate shari‘i charge (ʿamāl) (Muntadī al-Dīn Bāḍī al-Dişwānī, ‘Atabat al-kataba, ed. ‘Abdāb Iḵtāl, Tehran 1329/1950, 45). Nizām al-Mulk also recognises that the office of kādi was a delicate one “because they (the kādīs) were empowered over the lives and properties of the Musliṁs” (Ṣuyūṭī-nāma, 19). Cf. also al-Ghazālī’s letter to Fakhr al-Mulk b. Nizam al-Mulk, Faddā’il al-anām, ed. ‘Abdāb Iḵtāl, Tehran 1333/1954-5, 28). It was no doubt partly on this account that care was urged upon the kādīs in the drawing up of testimonies, title deeds and other documents (cf. the document issued by Sandjār’s diwān appointing ‘Imād al-Dīn Muḥammad b. ‘Abdāb as kādi of Nišāpūr, Ḍalā’il al-kubrawī, 27). They were, thus, in some measure government servants. Their function as such was probably to watch over the religious institution on behalf of the government in order to prevent the spread of unorthodox opinions (which were in the eyes of the government inevitably linked with sedition). Nizām al-Mulk also states that the kādīs were to be supported by other officials and their prestige guarded. In keeping with the Sunni principle, kull mudjtahid mustāṣir, he states that the judgments of kādīs, even if wrongfully given, were to be executed by other officials. The latter were, however, to report wrong judgments to the ruler so that he might dismiss and punish a kādi guilty of such. Anyone who behaved presumptuously and refused to appear at the kādi’s court when summoned was to be forced to do so, even if he was a great man (ibid.). In some cases, the diploma appointing a kādi stipulates that he was to judge according to a particular rite. Cases are, however, recorded of kādīs giving fatwās according to more than one rite.

In Nizām al-Mulk’s theory there is a certain ambiguity in the position of the kādi. On the one hand he was appointed by the ruler, but on the other he enjoyed a certain independence because of his relationship to the caliph. “The kādīs”, Nizām al-Mulk states, “are all the deputies (nāʿībān) of the king. It is incumbent upon the king to support them. They must be accorded full respect and dignity because they are the deputies of the caliph, whose mantle has devolved upon them” (ibid., 40-1). This statement is to be seen, perhaps, in the light of the theory that the caliph should be a mudjtahid and that the ruler, if he was not a mudjtahid, required a deputy to act on his behalf in certain matters. Nizām al-Mulk states that “when the king is a Turk or a Persian or someone who does not know Arabic and has not studied the decrees of the shari‘a, he inevitably requires a deputy to conduct affairs in his place” (ibid., 40). Thus he foreshadows the theory to be put forward in the late 9th/15th century by Fadl Allāh b. Rūzbihān Khlūdji, who states that kings who were mudjtahids were few and far between and that when a kādi was not a mudjtahid it was incumbent upon him to appoint a muttāf (Ṣalāk al-mutlak, B. L., ms. Or. 253, ff. unnumbered).

The documents issued by Sandjār’s diwān collected in the ‘Atabat al-kataba make clear the separation of sharī‘i and ‘urfy jurisdiction and also the subordination of the provincial kādi to the provincial governor. In a taktīl ʿurtṣa, with the agreement of the kādi, imāms and notables of the province (ibid., 25. Cf. also ibid., 28). A diploma in the name of Abu ‘l-Faḥr Marzābān al-Shārk. b. ‘Alā’ al-Dīn Abī Bakr b. Kūmdād for the governorship (ayālat wa shahādāt) of Bālḵ instructs him to give judgment and to settle cases after consultation and according to the advice of experienced and reliable persons and leaders (mukaddamān). ‘Urfy matters were to be referred to the kādi’s court. Rasmiyyāt (matters concerning salaries and allowances), māʿāmlāt (matters concerning mukāya’ contracts) and diwāni affairs were to be referred to the diwāni-rūyāt. Abu ‘l-Faḥr was given full powers in the preservation of order and the punishment of miscreants, but in the exercise of these powers he was to consult the kādīs (ibid., 79). Another diploma in the name of Abu ‘l-Faḥr Marzābān al-Shārk. b. ‘Alā’ al-Dīn Abī Bakr b. Kūmdād for the deputy-governorship (niyābāt-ayālati) of Ray enjoin him to put down the corrupt, transgressors, thieves and highway robbers and to consider the exaction of the legal penalties (ḥudud), after consultation with the kādīs, imāms and reliable persons, as being among those things which are incumbent according to the sharī‘a and upon which the well-being and good order of religion and the world depend (ibid., 85).

Among the duties of the kādi was the supervision of the hisba. A document issued by Sandjār’s diwān for the office of kādi and kibāst of Astarābād entrusts the grantee with the execution of the requirements of the hisba, such as the putting down of transgressors and the corrupt, the prevention of evil by them, and the adjustment of weights and measures and prices, as far as possible (ibid., 82).

So far as the supervision of awkāf was concerned, in the event of a mutawwalli having been designated, the kādi exercised general supervision only, otherwise he administered the awkāf. There was in practice probably a certain conflict of jurisdiction between the kādi and the wazir in the matter of awkāf. The latter, as head of the financial administration, also exercised general supervision over awkāf, though exactly what form this took is not entirely clear. In some cases the awkāf of a district were placed exclusively under the kādi and expressly removed from the control of the diwān (cf. ibid., 33).

In the period between the disintegration of the Great Saljuq empire and the Mongol invasion, the chief official in charge of ‘urfy courts appears to have been known as the ādābīk (see further H. Horst, Die Staatsverwaltung der Grosssaljuqs und Horasanschāds (1038-1231), Wiesbaden 1964, 92-3. See also ibid., on the term juklak-ī ʿālī, which appears to have been some sort of maḥānīm court). Various local officials apparently also exercised jurisdiction. A document probably belonging to the latter half of the 6th/12th century, appointing a certain Shams al-Dīn mīrār of Khizrārz in and entrusting him with the agricultural development of the province, enjoins him to chastise and correct anyone who fails to perform the suffi cient effort in this and if such reproach and censure did not bring the culprip to see the error of his ways,
Shams al-Din was to refer the matter to the supreme diwan so that reproof might be administered to him and he might be replaced by someone who would seek to create abundance (Bahāʾ al-Dīn b. Muʿayyad, al-Tāhirī, ed. Ahmad Bahāʾīnīyār, Tehran 1315/1936-7, 113). That local officials had certain powers of punishment would seem to be confirmed by Nādir al-Dīn Rāzī. He states that bailiffs, village headmen and landlords’ representatives should “reprimand the corrupt and enjoin the people to do that which is recommended and to forbid them from doing that which is forbidden. If they saw presumption or corruption on the part of one of the peasants (raʾṣyāt), they were to punish him and bring him to repentance” (Mīrzālī ʿîshād, ed. Husayn al-Husaynī al-Nīfʿmat Allāhī, Tehran 1312/1933-4, 296).

The distinction between ʿarṣī and ʿīṣāʾi jurisdiction was more sharply drawn under the Ilkhan period prior to their conversion to Islam. The Mongols brought with them their own laws and customs, though it seems improbable that the Great Yasa of Chingiz Khan existed as a written code of laws (see further D. O. Morgan, The Great Yasa of Chingiz Khan and Mongol law in the Ilkhanate in J. M. Rogers (ed.), The Islamic world after the Mongol conquest [forthcoming]; but see also D. Ayalon, The Great Yasa of Chingiz Khan: a re-examination, in SJ, xxxii (1971), 97-144, xxix (1971), 151-80, xxxvi (1972), 113-53, and xxxviii (1973), 107-56). There was a court of interpretation known as the ʿarṣī, but we have very few details as to its terms of reference and rules of procedure. It appears to have dealt specifically with disputes between Mongols, Mongol state affairs and cases against officials, especially of alleged peculation and conspiracy (see further Morgan, op. cit.). With the conversion of the Ilkhan to Islam, the ʿarṣī was probably to some extent assimilated to the maṣūlim courts and the ʿīṣāʾi associated with their proceedings. A ʿīṣāʾi for the appointment of a provincial ʿīṣāʾi issued by Ghazān Khan (694-703/1295-1304) reads as follows, “In the case of disputes which occur between two Mongols or between a Mongol and a Muslim or cases, the decision of which is difficult, we have ordered the ʿīṣāʾi, maʿāks, biṭāqā, ʿīṣāʾi, Aʿlids and ʿulāmāʾ to assemble every month for two days in the Friday mosque in the ʿīṣāʾi and maṣūlim taking the ʿīṣāʾi and maṣūlim as the printed text to hear cases together, and after thoroughly examining a case to give judgment according to the ruling (ḥukm) of the ʿīṣāʾi.” Their decision was to be given in writing so that it might not later be abrogated (Rashīd al-Dīn, Tūrākhī-i muḥārabā-i ghāzānī, ed. K. Jahn, London 1940, 219). The Dastūr al-ʿāṣīr of Muhammad b. Hindūshah Nakhdjīvānī, which belongs to the late Ilkhan period, describes the functions of the amīr ʿĪṣāʾi. He is instructed to act on the basis of equity (ʿadd, maʿdalat, inṣāf, niṣfat and rāṣīt) (ed. A. A. Alīzādeh, Moscow, 1/1 [1964], 1/2 [1971], 2 [1976], 30, and see further Morgan, op. cit.).

Somewhat similar procedures appear to have prevailed in some of the succession states. Ibn Baṭṭūta, describing his arrival at the court of the amīr of Khārazm, ʿUtūdumūr, states “It is one of the regular practices of this amīr that the ʿīṣāʾī comes daily to his audience hall and sits in a place assigned to him, accompanied by the jurists and his clerks. Opposite him sits one of the great amīrs, accompanied by eight of the great amirs and shahiks of the Turks, who are called arghās. The people bring their disputes to them for decision; those that come within the jurisdiction of the religious law are decided by the ʿīṣāʾi and all others are decided by those amirs. Their decisions are well-regulated and just, for they are free from suspicion and partiality and do not accept bribes” (The travels of Ibn Baṭṭūta A. D. 1325-1354, tr. H. A. R. Gibb, Cambridge 1971, iii, 545).

According to Mongol practice, the ʿīṣāʾi and ʿulāmāʾ were granted certain tax immunities. Although they were treated with respect, prior to the conversion of the Ilkhan to Islam, they ceased to enjoy in official circles that pre-emination which had been theirs when religion and state were, at least in theory, one. If, as was probably the case, the ʿīṣāʾi in the main centres continued to receive their appointment from the ruler, al-Ghāzālī’s theory that any ʿīṣāʾi nominated by anyone holding power could give a valid decision would have been of peculiar relevance. Waṣṣāf records a case in Fārs ca. 678/1279-80 of the appointment of two eminent divines to the office of kadī al-ʿīṣāʾī of Fārs. This was made by the waṣṣāf of Fārs after consultation with the religious classes and the notables (Tūrākhī-i Waṣṣāf, Bombay 1269/1853, 205-6). After the conversion of Ghāzān Khan to Islam, the influence of the ʿīṣāʾi in official circles almost certainly increased. Their tax immunities were confirmed and pensions were allocated to them on the revenue (Tūrākhī-i muḥārabā-i ghāzānī, 218).

Under Ghāzān there was a diwan-i qādī, the head of which was the kadī al-ʿīṣāʾī of the empire, who once more became an important official. He was in charge of ʿīṣāʾi officials in general and also of ʿawākāf. These appear to have increased in extent and importance in the 7th/13th century (though for what reason or reasons is not entirely clear) (see further Lambton, Waṣṣāf in the 7th/13th and 8th/14th centuries in Persia, in G. Baer, ed., Social and economic aspects of the Muslim waṣṣāf, forthcoming). An undated document belonging to the late Ilkhan period issued by the ʿawākāf (who had been charged with the appointment of all ʿīṣāʾi officials in the empire and was at the same time mutawwālī of charitable and private ʿawākāf) for his deputy, who was also to hold the office of hākim of charitable ʿawākāf, states it was impossible for him personally to oversee ʿīṣāʾi affairs in all regions because of his being in the reinite of the ruler. He needed a deputy. Consequently, Husayn al-ʿAssādi was appointed deputy kadī al-ʿīṣāʾī with a general designation and with a special designation over Tūrākhī-i ʿArab, Adhārbāyānī and various other districts. He was also appointed mutawwālī of charitable and private ʿawākāf with power to appoint and dismiss those in charge of religious offices and the execution of Islamic decrees (Dastūr al-ʿāṣīr, ii, 191 ff.). Another document in the same collection, delegating the office of hākim of the ʿawākāf of the empire to the kadī al-ʿīṣāʾī Shāykh ʿAllī, gives him full powers in the administration of the ʿawākāf and over the appointment and dismissal of the mutawwālīs and muḥārabās and of deputies to act for him as hākim-i ʿawākāf in the provinces (ibid., ii, 207 ff.). To ensure that the ʿawākāf were properly run and their revenues devoted to the purposes laid down by their founders was no small matter. Usurpation was common. Demands for redress came before the kadī and it was his duty to investigate them (cf. ibid., ii 175-6, 327-9).

Rashīd al-Dīn Fadl Allāh, Ghāzān Khan’s waṣṣāf, gives an extremely unfavourable account of the administration of justice by the ʿīṣāʾi in the Ilkhan empire prior to the reign of Ghāzān Khan (as he does of other aspects of the administration). He alleges that corrupt and ignorant persons insinuated themselves into the service of the Mongols and by flattery and bribery secured the office of kadī and other ʿawākāf offices. Corruption was especially prevalent in transac-
tions over landed property. Fraudulent claims based on obsolete property deeds and bonds which had remained in the hands of the original owners or their heirs after the property had changed hands were common, and there was often no means for the kādīs to verify the validity of such deeds. Rashīd al-Dīn states that Malik-Shāh and his waṣīr Nizām al-Mulk, faced by a similar situation, had issued a decree (miḥālī), conformable to the shari'a, that claims based on title deeds which had not been preferred for thirty years should not be heard and that this decree was given to the mujtāds of Kūrāsān, ʿIrāq and Bāghdād so that there might issue fatwās in accordance with the shari'a, which were then to be sent to the dār al-khulāsa to be signed (ʿīmād al-niṣāḥa and). Rashīd al-Dīn claims that Malik Shāh's decree was extant and that it had been shown (or reported) to Hūlegū, who had issued a yarligh on similar lines, as had Abaka, Arghun and Gaykhuṭ (Tārīḵ-i mubārak-i ḡazānī, 236 ff.). Rashīd al-Dīn also asserts that 'before this time past sultans and Čingis Khān in all their fortūnās and yarlighs made mention that thirty-year-old claims should not be heard' (ibid., 221-2). These decrees, however, had, he alleges, been inoperative, because first they had not had shariʿī, kāfī or ʿurfī confirmation, and secondly those charged with putting them into operation had wished to benefit themselves from the existing situation to buy property. Ghāzān Khān, on the other hand, consulted the kādis and Fākhr al-Hārī, the kādi al-kūdāt of the day, drafted a yarligh and wrote a decision on the back in accordance with the shariʿa stating that land claims which had not been preferred for thirty years would not be heard (ibid., 236 ff.). The yarligh is dated 3 Raḏḥāb 699/26 March 1300. Any kādīs who contravened it were to be dismissed and the names of any powerful persons who urged them to act in a contrary fashion were to be sent to the ḍar al-khulāsa, the kādis and the conduct of kādīs in the matter of land cases (ibid., 218 ff.).

'surf jurisdiction seems to have encroached upon shariʿī jurisdiction under Timūr (807/1405), but under Shāhrukh (d. 850/1446-17) it seems to have been a deliberate reassertion of shariʿī jurisdiction, although 'urfī jurisdiction nevertheless continued to be dominant. Clavijo, who visited Timūr's camp in Samarkand in 808/1405 states that all litigants and criminals were dealt with by one of three courts. The first deal with criminal matters and bloodshed arising from quarrels, the second with money frauds such as might affect the government and the third with cases arising in the provinces. Wherever Timūr's camp might be, three great tents were erected, to which were brought all criminals and litigants for cases to be heard and sentences given (Embassy to Tamerlane 1403-1405, tr. G. le Strange, London 1928, 294-5).

When Ismāʾīl II (907-30/1502-24), the founder of the ʿAfšāwī dynasty, made Imāmī Shīʿism the official religion of the state, a more flexible attitude towards the acceptance of public office in general and that of kādī in particular developed among the Shīʿī šalāmās that had been the case heretofore, although there were always some who refused office out of religious scruple. The Shīʿī šalāmā became, like the Sunni šalāmā before them, public officers and as such relied upon the machinery of the state for the execution of their judgments. Imāmī Shīʿism superseded the Sunni šalāmās, and the Shīʿī šalāmās retained the functions of the Sunni kādis. Although those in charge of shariʿī jurisdiction—though this did not, of course, happen overnight. Changes also took place in the religious hierarchy. The kādī lost some of his importance, first to the sādīr, who became the chief officeholder in the religious institution, and then to the ḥāib al-sīlam, while the muḥāfīds, who owed their pre-eminence not to any official appointment but to their own learning and sanctity, exercised a great, though undefined, influence over the religious institution and the kādī's courts. The general tendency, however, was probably for 'urfī jurisdiction to be strengthened, at least prior to the reign of Shāh Sulṭān Ḥusayn (1105-35/1694-1722), and for subordinate jurisdictions of a local nature to proliferate. There was a bewildering diversity at different times and in different provinces. The fact that the shīʿa did not accept the Sunni principle, kūl mujāhīdī muṣīḥī, resulted in the decisions of the kādī's courts being subject to review and reversal. It was perhaps for this reason that most Persians, according to Chardin, preferred the governments courts to the kādī's courts, in which their cases were not easily brought to a decision (Voyages, ed. Langôt, vi, 91).

Already under Tāḥmāsp (930-84/1524-76) there was growing financial centralisation, and during the reign of Shāh 'Abbās I (996-1038/1587-1629) centralisation spread to all aspects of the administration. The empire was divided into khāṣa and mamlāṭī, i.e., regions under the central government and regions alienated from it, though usually reserved to the provincial governors. The extent of the two categories varied at different times, the khāṣa reaching its greatest extent about 1071/1660-1 (see further K. Rohrborn, Provinzen und Zentralgewalt Persiens im 16. und 17. Jahrhundert, Berlin 1966, 113-14, 115, 118 ff.). In the khāṣa, the provincial waṣīr had general oversight of all aspects of the administration, including the administration of justice, but probably played little part in its day to day administration (ibid., 125). In some cases the provincial waṣīr also appears to have exercised judicial functions, but this was probably exceptional (see ibid., 112). Under Shāh 'Abbās the chief 'urf judge in the capital was the diwānīgī, who ranked among the great amirs. Power of life and death were usually reserved to the shīk (ibid., 64-5), though in some cases he would delegate these powers to the provincial governor, especially if he was a member of the royal house.

The tradition of personal access to the ruler had remained strong and was, to some extent, a curb on the extortion and tyranny of officials, which in the absence of any clearly defined rules was widespread. On the occasion of a royal progress, the local people would bring their cases to the royal court for decision or redress. There were, however, attempts to institutionalise this. Ismāʾīl II (984-5/1576-8), shortly after his accession appointed Ahmad Beg Ustadjū as the officer in charge of the transmission of demands for redress (parvarōndī-ī-a ʿijza wa maṣākīn) (Kādī Ahmad, Khulāsāt al-ṭawāsq, Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, ms. Or. 2302, f. 256 b, quoted by Rohrborn, 66; and see H. Busse, Untersuchungen zum islamischen Kanzeleiwesen, Cairo 1959, 71, on earlier uses of the term parvarōndī). Shāh 'Abbās in 1019/1610 issued an order that demands for redress should be referred to the sādīr-i mamlāṭī and the diwānīgī (and not to him personally when he went out into the countryside). Chardin describes the crowds of plaintiffs who would assemble at the court (Voyages, v, 280).

Ismāʾīl II also set up, shortly after his accession, a diwānī-ī ʿadāliyā. He appointed one of his cousins as diwānīgī-ī ʿadāliyā, a post which he combined with the waṣīr of the supreme diwān and two khīlbāhs.
amirs to hear cases (Rohrborn, 67). There were three types of cases: sharʿiydt, which were decided by the ḥādi al-kudrāt (Shahs, 303), and the kāḍī al-kudrāt of Fars, dated 25 Rabbā II 955/3 June 1548 (H. Horst, Zwei Erlasse Sādūr). The jurisdiction between the diwān-i ḥukkum (diwān-i sādūr, whose decree was sealed by the wazir) and the great sādūr, whose decree was sealed by the shah, was discussed (Muhammad Tahir Wahid-i Kazwīnī, Tadhkirat al-mulūk-i Mirza Rafted, Add. 27, 241, 319a, ff. quoted by Rohrborn, loc. cit.). Shah Abbās II (1052-77 loc. cit.).

Shahwānīs, who was an important official, also exercised jurisdiction in disputes concerning the water of the Zayandārūd. In cases affecting all the landowners and peasants, he would be ordered by the shah to go, with the wazir of the supreme diwān, the wazir of Isfahan, the kāḍī and the muḥassils (officials) to the districts watered by the river to decide the water rights of each district on the basis of the shahī registers and to settle disputes on the basis of common sense (gulʿūr) and "according to what was customary and the practice of past years" (ibid., xvi/4, 433).

In the provinces, the provincial governor was the chief sāfī judge. Lesser cases were sometimes tried by the darāīga. According to Chardin the darāīga was appointed in the second half of the 11th/17th century by the shah, not by the provincial governor (Voyages, v, 259). The provincial wazir, who was appointed by the central government, or his deputies, also took part in these courts (see further, Rohrborn, 68-9).

Many districts in the provinces were alienated in the form of tā♀ūsī and nayırlāhī from the direct control of the government and its officials. These grants frequently, though not invariably, gave the grantee immunity from the entry of government officials. In such cases the holder exercised local jurisdiction. For example, a diploma issued by Shāh Muhammad Khudābanda, dated 989/1581, granting a nayırlāhī to a certain Sultan Ibrāhīm in Fārs, gives him immunity from a number of taxes and dues and states that "cases which occurred between the peasants (na♀ēr) of the districts mentioned [i.e. those granted to him] as a nayırlāhī should be referred to him so that he might settle them in accordance with the law of the gharīa'ī" (H. Horst, Ein Immunitätsdiplom Schah Muhammad Khudābandās von Jahrh 989/1581, in DZMG, cv/2 [1955], 292). A powerful tā♀ūsī, even if rights of jurisdiction were not specifically granted to him, would in practice exercise such usurpation. In cases of arbitration the local kāḍī was probably from time to time associated with the tūsūlār as he was with the provincial governor.

The ṭā♀ūsī had already emerged as one of the chief officials of the religious institution under the Timūrids (see H. Roemer, Staatsgeschichte der Timuridenzeit, Wiesbaden 1952, 143, and also G. Herrmann, Zur Entstehung des ṭā♀ūsī-Amts, in V. Harmann and P. Bachmann, eds., Die islamische Welt zwischen Mittelalter und Nezeit, Festschrift für H. R. Roemer, Beitr. zum Wiesbaden 1979, 278-95). He acquired a new importance under the Safawīs and was the official through whom they controlled the religious institution. He was responsible for the appointment of ṭahrīr officials, though the documents for the appointment of officials such as the provincial kāḍī al-kudrāt continued to be issued in the name of the shah (cf. the diploma issued by Taḥmāsp for the kāḍī al-kudrāt of Fārs, dated 25 Rabiʿ II 955/3 June 1548 (H. Horst, Zuen Erlass Sādūr).
leaders, ḵawājis, muʿaddids, hujjāzs, muʿarrifān, washers of the dead and grave-diggers (the last two on the recommendation of the ghassāl-bāḥīj), their dismissal and the dismissal of the religious hierarchy, as witnessed by the maḵkūfāt-i tawfiqī (xvi/1-2, 64-5). Šarīʿī affairs in Isfahān and the surrounding district (which was administered by the Fayd Āḥār department) came under the sadr-i ḵāṣṣa to the exclusion of the sadr-iʾṣāma (ibid., xvi/1-2, 65). The sadrūd, although their importance declined in the latter part of the Safawid period, nevertheless retained their pre-eminence over other officials of the religious hierarchy, as witnessed by their association with the diwānābegī (see above). Mirzā Raftī makes this point by stating that other šarīʿī officials had no part in the examination of the four offences known as aḏāḥ-i arbaʿa. The two sadrūd also decided cases concerning title deeds (kabālādāḏ) and šarīʿī deeds (ibid.).

In some periods, the sadr-i ḵāṣṣa, according to Mirzā Raftī, also held the office of sadr-iʾṣāma (xvi/1-2, 66). Unfortunately, he does not state which of the sadrūd held this office. That the sadrūd should also be sadr-iʾṣāma would seem to be a natural consequence of his succeeding the sadr-i ḵāṣṣa, who also sometimes held the office of sadr-iʾṣāma, as the most important religious official of the state. However, under Shāh Ismāʿīl and at the beginning of the reign of Tahmāsp, the sadr-iʾṣāma of Tabrīz (or Aḏšārābāyjān), who also had charge of the public treasury (mawkūfāt-i ʿawāfī), was a powerful figure (see Rorbach, 127-8). Before Šūdār were appointed in Isfahān, the sadr-iʾṣāma used to sit in the kāḏiʾ-ḵāna of the diwānābegī and give decisions in šarīʿī cases for the military, but when it was laid down that the diwānābegī should hear šarīʿī cases (unfortunately Mirzā Raftī does not state when this was the sadr-iʾṣāma ceased to come to the kāḏiʾ-ḵāna, and his functions came to be confined to validating with his seal the payment orders made in favour of the army. He had no salary but received a commission of 1% from the military on their pay (Dastūr al-mulūk, xvii/1-2, 70).

Although the importance of the office of sadr-i ḵāṣṣa was reduced by the emergence of the sadrūd, the kāḏīs continued to be influential and in the smaller provincial cities, where they had no rival in the person of the sadr-i ḵāṣṣa, or the religious hierarchy, they constituted an important part in local affairs. So far as the šayḫāʾ al-ʿilām was concerned, there appears to have been some conflict of jurisdiction with the kāḏī in Isfahān if not elsewhere. According to Mirzā Raftī, the šayḫāʾ al-ʿilām of Isfahān heard the cases of the people in his house every day except Friday and enjoined the good and forbade evil. Divorce according to the šayḫaʿ was given in this presence, and for the most part the custody of the property of orphans and those who were absent was his responsibility, though on some occasions these matters were referred to the kāḏīs. The šayḫāʾ al-ʿilām also sealed documents and title deeds, which were not confined to transactions between Muslims but might also be documents exchanged between non-Muslims. Chardin mentions that the šayḫāʾ al-ʿilām of Isfahān signed and witnessed documents concerning a financial transaction between him and some Dutch merchants in respect of a sum of money which the šayḫ owed him (Sir John Chardin’s travels in Persia, London 1927 121-2). The šayḫāʾ al-ʿilām received annually 200 Tabrīzī tūmāns as a pension (waṣafīz) from the public treasury (Dastūr al-mulūk, xvii/1-2, 69).

Under the early Kāḏīs, ṣafīʾi jurisdiction was administered by the šāhs, the sīyāsī provincial governors and other local officials. There was little or no differentiation of function: matters concerning security, law and
taxation were, for the most part, referred to the same officials. The lowest court was that of the village headman, who was empowered to inflict slight punishments and to impose small fines. More serious crimes were referred to the district collector (dibiti) and those more serious still, either because of the nature of the crime or the rank of the persons concerned, to the governor of the province. The right to pronounce the death sentence was seldom delegated by the shah except sometimes to the governors of the royal house or when the country was in rebellion.

The 'urf courts were usually held in public. This, in Sir John Malcolm's opinion, operated "as a salutary check on their proceedings". "These courts", he continues, "are sometimes very tumultuous though the judge is aided by a host of inferior officers, whose duty is to preserve order. The women who attend these courts are often the most vociferous: the servants of the magistrates are not permitted to silence them with those blows, which in the case of disturbance they liberally inflict upon the men" (History of Persia, London 1829, 2 vols., ii, 319). According to Malcom, 'urf officials referred to the shari'i courts all cases which for personal or political reasons they wished to be decided by their authority. In criminal cases the chief judge of the shari'i courts was associated with the 'urf officials and pronounced sentence to the criminal in excess of thirty days imprisonment (ibid., p. 320). Curzon, writing towards the end of the century aptly describes the lack of a clear dividing line between the two jurisdictions. He states, "The functions and the prerogative of the co-ordinate benches vary at different epochs, and appear to be a matter of accident or choice, rather than of necessity; and at the present time, though criminal cases of difficulty may be submitted to the ecclesiastical court, yet it is with civil matters that they are chiefly concerned. Questions of heresy or sacrilege are naturally referred to them; they also take cognisance of adultery and divorce; and intoxication as an offence, not against the common law but against the Koran, falls within the scope of their judgment" (Persia and the Persian question, London 1892, 2 vols., i, 453). Prior to the attempts at judicial reform in the reign of Nasir al-Din Shah (1848-96), it was usual in the 17th and 18th centuries, mainly in the commercial and financial transactions, loans to the government and its officials and transactions between individuals were commonly sealed and witnessed by religious dignitaries. Transactions with government officials were sometimes registered in the diwan-khadna, but neither practice safeguarded those by whom the documents were concluded from litigation (cf. eadem, The case of Haji 4Ab al-Karim, in Iran and Islam, ed. C. E. Bosworth, Edinburgh 1971, 331-60).

Contact with Europe had been joined in the 16th, 17th and 18th centuries, mainly in the commercial field. This had resulted in the grant of immunities to European merchants by the shahs. In the 19th century this contact took on a new form and was dominated by the strategic and political interests of the great powers. Under the commercial treaty concluded at the same time as the Treaty of Turkomanfay (1829) extra-territorial privileges were granted to Russian subjects, which were later also claimed by other foreign states for their nationals under most favoured nation treatment [see further IMTIYAZAT. iii. Persia]. This treaty regulated the position of foreign merchants. Disputes to which they were a party and claims by them were removed from the control of the shari'i courts and were settled by a mufti appointed by the shah or by an official known as the kargahdar and in the capital by the diwan-khadna and later by the Ministry of Foreign
Affairs. Disputes between local dhimmis and Muslims were still heard in the shar'i courts, but from about the middle of the century attempts were made to transfer such cases to the diwân-khâna. In 1851 when Nasîr al-Dîn was in Isfâhan he laid down that inheritance disputes between an Armenian, Jewish or Zoroastrian convert to Islam and an adherent of the community to which he had previously belonged were not to be referred to the shar'i or 'urf judges in the province but that the two parties were to be sent to the capital and the matter investigated by the diwân-khâna (Rûmânâ-yi usûkî-yi ittîfâkîyya, 3 Safâr 1268/1851). On the other hand, an order (ta'llûka) was issued by the sadîr-i 'âzam in Dhu ‘l-Hijjâja 1270/1854 stating that any dispute between a Jew, Christian or Zoroastrian on the one hand and an 'Ishâh 'Aghâri on the other over partnerships in trade or land should go before the Imâm Qûmâ-yi Isfâhan and be settled according to the shar'i a'idî (ibid., Dhu ‘l-Hijjâja 1270/1854). In 1863 new procedures to be followed by the diwân-i 'adliyya in mixed cases were laid down (see Rûmanâ-yi dawlat-i 'âli-yi 'alâ-yi 'Irân, 17 Radjâb 1279/1863).

From about the middle of the 19th century, there were various attempts by Nasîr al-Dîn and some of his ministers to centralise the administration of justice through the diwân-khâna and to extend the field of 'urf jurisdiction, while at the same time regulating its procedure. The first was resisted by the provincial governors and the second by the 'ulâmâ. In 1854 an order was published in the official gazette stating that if anyone refused to attend the diwân-khâna when summoned by the authorities, one-fifth of the claim against him, whether he was of high or low estate, a Kâdîr prince or not, would be confiscated and he would be forced to appear (Rûmânâ-yi usûkî-yi ittîfâkîyya, 4 Dümâdî I 1270/1854). In 1855 an attempt was made to abolish the legal force of contradictory juridical opinions. This, like the order concerning the inheritance disputes of converts to Islam, was also an encroachment on the authority of the shar'i courts.

In the same year, Mîrzâ Akâ Khân Nûrî, who had succeeded Mîrzâ Taqî Khân Amir Kabîr as sadîr-i 'âzam in 1851, apparently submitted a plan to the shâh for the promulgation of a body of laws drawn from various European codes, having as their basis the security of life, property and honour of the subject as in the Ottoman Khâtât i shar'î-yi Guilkhâna (Great Britain. Public Record Office. F.O. 60: 201, Taylor Thomson to Clarendon, no. 23, Tehran, 18 February 1855). Nothing came of this and it was not until 1858 that further steps were taken towards legal reforms. A council of ministers was set up and regulations for the procedure of the diwân-khâna-yi 'adliyya-yi 'a'zâm, or ministry of justice, were laid down (see further MUKîMâ. ii, Persia, and DUSTûR. iv. 'IRân). It was further announced towards the end of the year that a department of justice (diwân-khâna-yi 'adliyya-yi 'a'zâm) would be set up in each province under a diwânâbegî. Its decrees, if they concerned 'a'zâm matters, were to be referred to a mudjâhid, and if they concerned 'urf matters to the provincial governor. 'A'zâm documents were to be registered with the diwânâbegî (Rûmânâ-yi usûkî-yi ittîfâkîyya, 11 Rabî‘ II 1275/1858). This attempt to assert the authority of the central diwân over the provincial courts and of the diwânâbegî over 'a'zâm as well as 'urf courts was abortive. In the face of the opposition from both the 'ulâmâ and the provincial officials the decree was suspended. Whether it was because of the failure of these various measures designed to achieve some measure of legal reform or not, it is not clear. On the 9th of Shaban 1277/1860 that the shâh would hold a maqâlîm court every Sunday (Rûmânâ-yi usûkî-yi ittîfâkîyya, 28 Muhammad 1277/1860). A rescript (dast-khâtî) was issued for the procedure to be followed. The 'ijzhâkâstî-bâghi and the diwânâbegi, and the decisions of the court were to be on duty. The first minister and the deputy first minister were to be present and the latter was to record the answers given to the petitions. Petitions were to be presented by the nasakî-bâghi and the diwânâbegi. Petitioners were not to assemble near the guardhouse; in Tehran they were to gather in the Maydân or the Kûfâ-yi Arg and in Shiraz, or elsewhere in summer quarters, in the open country. They were to come forward one by one or two by two. The Karâwûl regiment, the farrâh-i khâltûstan and the pishkhârdîmâtan were all to be on duty. If the petitioners made a confession when they assembled they were to be punished. Only petitions for the redress of grievances would be received: petitions for an increase of pay, pensions or ta'âdûs would not be heard. Petitions from the provinces could be submitted in writing, through the official provincial post (gâhirîy). These instructions suggest that Nasîr al-Dîn feared both assassination and rioting by the populace; they also recall Nîzâm al-Mulk's fears of commotion by petitioners at the maqâlîm court—though apparently the Safawîs had no such fears (see above).

In 1863 there was an attempt to revive the measures of 1856. Mîrzâ Husayn Khân Moshîrî al-Dawla, who had spent twelve years in Turkey as the Persian representative there, submitted draft regulations for the reorganisation of the Ministry of Justice for the shâh's approval. The purpose of these regulations was to centralise the administration of justice and to limit the authority of the provincial governors. These measures brought Mîrzâ Husayn Khân into conflict with both the 'ulâmâ and the provincial authorities, and the proposal to set up departments of justice in the provinces under the Ministry of Justice was again shelved (Rûmânâ-yi dawlat-i 'âli-yi 'alâ-yi 'Irân, 17 Radjâb 1279/1863, and Lambton, The Persian 'ulâmâ and constitutional reform, in Le Shi'isme imâmite, ed. T. Fahd, Paris 1970, 259-60. See also F. Adamiyyat, Fikr-i 'a'zâm in Persian literature, 2 vols., ed. T. Fahd, Paris 1970-71, 72 ff.). In 1871 Mîrzâ Husayn Khân Khânedâr Khân al-Dawla, who had succeeded his father as sadîr-i 'a'zam, issued a decree in the shâh's name, setting up six courts or departments of the ministry of justice and regulations for their operation. The settlement of disputes outside the court was, however, permitted, provided both parties consented to this. The decrees of the 'a'zâm courts were to be registered and enforced by the Ministry of Justice. In the same year tortuous procedure was again forbidden (see further Shahbâk, Iran: monarchy, bureaucracy and reform under the Qajars, 1858-1896, London 1978, 83 ff.). Mîrzâ Husayn Khân's reforms were also abortive. On 22 May 1888, as a result of promptings by Drummond Wolff, the British minister, Nasîr al-Dîn issued a decree giving security of life and property to all Persian subjects unless publicly condemned by a competent tribunal. The effect of this on the lives of the people was, however, negligible. The last attempt at legal reform was made after the cancellation of the Tobacco Concession in 1891, when Âmîn al-Dawla urged upon the shâh the establishment of regular tribunals. Muhîn Khân Moshîrî al-Dawla, the minister of justice and commerce, was accordingly ordered to set up a so-called addâlat-khâna. This plan also proved abortive (Âmîn al-Dawla, Khâtât-i Mîrzâ 'Ali Khân Âmîn al-Dawla, ed. H. Farnâmfarmanîân, Tehran 1962, 184 ff.).

By the end of the century there had thus been little
change in the administration of justice. The functions of the minister were theoretically to take general note of the law throughout the country and to enforce the execution his power, like that of other ministers, was depended for the execution of their decisions upon the religious leaders. The successor, who would consider all matters proposed in the madjlsis and reject wholly or in part any proposal at variance with the sacred laws of Islam. Article 28 states that the three powers shall always be separate and distinct from one another, and Articles 81 and 82 affirm the irremovability and independence of the judges. (These articles were emended in the reign of Muhammad Rida Shah.) Article 71 states that the Supreme Ministry of Justice (diwan-i 'adlat-i 'ulamâ) and the judicial courts are the places officially destined for the redress of public grievances, while judgment in shar'i matters is vested in just madjlsisahids possessed of the necessary qualifications, thus implying that the jurisdiction of the judicial courts was general and that only those matters which were judged to pertain to the shar'i were to be referred to shar'i judges. The text is, however, ambiguous, perhaps intentionally.

The committee of madjlsisahids laid down in Article 2 of the Supplementary Fundamental Law was set up by the second madjlis in 1911 but later fell into desuetude. The result of its work was the provisional law known as the kânâni-i muwakkati-yi tashkildt wa usul muhabkamat 1329 (the provisional law for the regulations of judicial procedure of 1911). This law, in spite of its provisional nature, was the basis on which the judicial reforms carried out after the grant of the constitution rested. Under its authority a number of provisional laws were passed, a procedure which enabled the government to take "experimental" action and which avoided the question of whether the madjlis was contravening Article 2 of the Supplementary Fundamental Laws or not. Article 45 of the provisional law of 1911 defines shar'i matters as "matters which are established in accordance with the law of the iljustrous shar'i of Islam". The lack of any more precise definition of shar'i and 'urf matters illustrates the difficulty which the legislators experienced in making a separation between the two systems. The law further divides cases into those concerning shar'i matters, 'urf matters and "joint" cases, i.e. cases which concerned both shar'i and 'urf matters. The last could only be referred to the 'adilsya (the Ministry of Justice) with the consent of both parties. Shar'i cases are defined inter alia as cases arising from ignorance of a shar'i judgment or shar'i matters, cases concerning marriage and divorce, debt, inheritance, awâf and the appointment of malâzalâtís and legal guardians. The shar'i courts (muhâzir, sing. muhâzir) were presided over by a madjlsisahid possessing the necessary qualifications (dhimâl-shar'i al) and two deputies (karîb al-shar'i). The effect of the provisional law, although it was perhaps intended to limit the competence of the shar'i courts, there were various
reasons for this: a lack of trained personnel to administer a secular law, lack of familiarity on the part of the public with the lengthy formalities involved by the new procedures, the fact that in the provinces cases were for the most part decided by the governors on an ad hoc basis and the existence of a separate court in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs with branches in the provinces known as kārgudārīhā for cases involving foreign subjects. For these and other reasons, reform proceeded slowly. Courts of first instance and courts of appeal, special commercial and military tribunals and a court of cassation (divān-i tamyiz) were, however, set up.

Under Rūdā Shāh (1925-42) the government embarked upon an ambitious programme of legal reform, and with the increasing power of the central government, the tendency to ride roughshod over opposition on the part of the religious classes grew. Various parts of the civil code were promulgated between 1925 and 1933, thereby increasingly limiting the competence of the shārī'ī courts. Negotiations were begun for the abolition of the capitulations, which finally became effective from 10 May 1928, the provincial tribunals presided over by the kārgudārī having already been dissolved by the law of 12 Shahrīvar 1306/3 September 1927 [see INTEXT, iii, Persia]. In 1305/1926-7 the Ministry of Justice was established and it assumed into its jurisdiction the provisional law of 1911, and as a result a number of new provisional laws were passed. The 'adlīyya was reorganised and the list of matters which were to be referred to the shārī'ī courts was revised. By the law for the regulations of judicial procedure of 7 Day 1307/1928-9, the existence of shīrī'ī courts was reaffirmed, but their competence was limited broadly to cases referring to marriage and divorce, matters of succession and guardianship and the administration of wills and aukāf. In the following year, by the law of Khurād 1308/1929 their competence was further reduced, while the law of 10 Aḏār 1310/1930 abrogated earlier laws concerning shārī'ī courts and recognised only those courts which were presided over by a madžīdhūd possessing the necessary qualifications. Finally, in 1337 new Regulations for judicial procedure ('aṭīn-i dādarāt-yi madānī) in 789 articles were presented to the madżīdī. They were finally passed on 25 Shahrīvar 1318/1939 and replaced the earlier provisional laws.

In these various ways, which would in mediaeval terminology have been described as hīyān, an open clash between the modernists and the authorities of the religious law was avoided and a civil law was codified and brought into operation. The sections on marriage, divorce, inheritance, aukāf, irrigation and dead lands were simply a codified version of shārī'ī law already in operation with minor changes. In matters of divorce, the position was materially altered by the Family Protection Act of 1967. A penal code, based mainly on French law but also influenced by Swiss and Belgian law, was promulgated in 1928 and replaced by a new code in 1939. A provisional law for commercial courts was set up under the provisional law of 1911 and a commercial code promulgated in 1932.

Throughout the period under review down to the early 20th century shārī'ī and 'urfi jurisdictions continued side by side. The former, administered by the kādī and the shārī'ī judges, covered in theory all aspects of the believer’s life, was a written law, and subject to known procedures. In theory it was supreme and unchallenged, but in practice it was limited to the ordinary operation. The latter, administered by the ruler and his deputies, was unwritten, its judgments were executed by the strong hand of power and it was in practice dominant. At best it was regulated by custom and at worst wholly arbitrary and guided by the whim of the ruler. The distinction between the two jurisdictions was not, and could not be, clearly drawn since the shārī’ī could, in theory, have no rival. The operation of the two jurisdictions was personal: now the one, now the other, extended the field of its operation. The relationship between them was uncertain and uneasy. The power of execution in all cases rested with the 'urfi officials, but so far as the shārī’ī officials were associated with the 'urfi courts, a quasi-shārī’ī sanction was given to their proceedings.

Bibliography: Sections on kādī are to be found in all major works on fāhī, both Sunnī and Shi'i. Material on the general principles of taking up government office is also to be found in the sections on al-amn wa’t-nahy and al-makāshī and al-hubā. Information on the exercise of the office of kādī by individuals is to be found in biographical dictionaries and histories. For the modern period, see Ahmad-Daftary, La suppression des capitulations en Perse, Paris 1930; idem, ‘Aṭīn-i dādarāt-yi madānī wa’l-bāzarānī, Tehran 2 vols., i, 1324/1956-7, ii, 1334/1966-7; Mustafa ‘Adl Maṣūr al-Salṭāna, Ḥukkū-i madānī, Tehran 1308/1929; ‘Ali Pašā Sālīh, Kuwas-yi mukhtārāt-i shādī, Tehran 1343/1964-5, Muhammad Qā’far Langārdūz, Dānishmāna-yi huqūk, 3 vols., Tehran 1343-52/1964-74; D. Hinchcliffe, The Iranian family protection act, in The international and commerical law quarterly (April 1968), 516-21; E. Gräf, Der Bruch (urf/ada) nach islamischen Recht, in K. Tauchmann, ed., Festschrift für H. Petri, Vienna 1973, 122-44. (A. K. S. LAMBTON)

4. THE ARAB LANDS AND ISRAEL IN THE MODERN PERIOD

i. Egypt

In the period of direct Ottoman rule in Egypt, the Shārī’ī courts had a very wide jurisdiction, which comprised civil law, including personal status and waqf, and also criminal and administrative matters. Their personal jurisdiction applied also to disputes between non-Muslims and Muslims, between non-Muslims of different denominations, and even between non-Muslims of the same denomination who agreed to litigate before a Shārī’ī court.

Muhammad ‘Ali established many judicial authorities which took away important powers from the Shārī’ī courts: madżīdī ḍhālām al-adwā and madżīdī ḍawāw al-balād, which dealt with claims for specific amounts and with agricultural matters; and al-madżīdī al-markaza-yī, which heard appeals against decisions of the latter courts and had original jurisdiction in claims for greater amounts. The courts of first instance (al-madżīdī al-bītād-yī) in the provincial capitals heard criminal matters and civil claims up to substantial amounts. Their judgments were appealable to the courts of appeal (madżīdī al-is’īn-yī). The highest appellate court was the madżīdī al-ahkām, which sat in Cairo. Other judicial authorities were madżīdī al-tājīrā (a commercial court) and madżīdī ma’dyya-yī al-balād. Jurisdiction in criminal cases and the ‘investigation of complaints’ in the old sense were exercised by the chief administrative office, al-dīwān al-khādūsī, headed by the Khādūsī as representative of the Pasha; the chief of police (dībād) and the mawzaawī also had considerable powers of punishment.

A major reform in the judicial system was carried
out in the days of Isma'il Pasha. The Hasbiyya Courts Law of 1873 was a first, moderate step in restricting the powers of the Sharī'a courts. The hasbiyya courts (reorganised under a law of 1896 and renamed medielle courts, or madjalis nizdmiyya in 1947) were competent to look after the financial interests of local absent persons and minors, both Muslims and non-Muslims. Certain matters of personal status were also transferred to these new courts; the Public Treasury (bayt al-mdl) was abolished. A national system of civil jurisdiction, comprising a number of madjalis, was established in 1874. In 1876, mixed tribunals were set up in which both foreign and local judges served. They heard disputes between foreigners of different nationalities and between foreigners and Egyptians. The local judges of these courts were exposed to the influence of Western legal principles and judicial norms.

The Code of Procedure of Sharī'a Courts of 1880 limited the jurisdiction of the Sharī'a courts to matters of personal status, succession, usūf, and gifts, and cases of homicide. They had concurrent jurisdiction, by the side of the provincial councils, in matters of blood-money.

The British occupation of Egypt in 1882 did not, in theory, change the juridical status of the country, which nominally continued to be part of the Ottoman Empire, though enjoying a large measure of autonomy. As a result of reorganisation, the jurisdiction of the Sharī'a courts was restricted to personal status, succession and part of the law of landed property, including usūf of Muslims; the Sharī'a courts in the major towns had jurisdiction also in cases of homicide referred to them by the madjalis nizziyya.

Until 1883, the Sharī'a courts had general and residuary jurisdiction with regard to all residents of Egypt. They also had jurisdiction in matters of personal status of non-Muslims, both local and foreign, if the parties had no communal court of their own or did not signify their acceptance of milla (communal) jurisdiction, or if they belonged to different denominations, or if a non-Muslim husband had converted to Islam after marriage. The sphere of the Sharī'a courts was restricted, either by direct limitation or by definition of the spheres of the other courts. In 1883, the judicial system was reorganised: the civil courts (madjalis nizziyya) were replaced by national courts (mahākim ahliyya) based on European models (the reform was only completed in 1889). Mixed and national courts took over many of the powers of the Sharī'a courts. They were competent to hear criminal matters (homicide) and many matters of personal status and usūf. The law of 1896 further restricted the jurisdiction of the Sharī'a courts, viz. to matrimony, dowry, divorce, the custody of children, maintenance (including maintenance between relatives), paternity, succession, usūf and gifts; homicide was removed from their jurisdiction to that of criminal courts.

The dichotomy between the sharī'i judicial system, in which the non-codified Sharī'a applied, and the variegated system of the national and mixed courts, in which judges with a modern legal training applied Western-inspired codes, increasingly sharpened. In 1899, Muhammad 'Abduh (q.v.) suggested the amalgamation of all judicial authorities within the framework of the Sharī'a courts or, more concretely, the vesting of the Sharī'a courts with jurisdiction in criminal matters and incidental jurisdiction in other matters (along with the hearing of matrimonial and usūf cases). He also suggested integrating the mufīfs in the higher echelons of the judicial system. His suggestions were not accepted.

Another law, of 1909-10, defined the jurisdiction of the different Sharī'a courts in greater detail, but brought nothing substantively new. The law of 1931, which was in force until the abolition of the Sharī'a courts, superseded it in matters of personal status, non-Muslims can now be tried before Muslim judges, although the latter are supposed to apply the religious law of the parties.

Following the Ottoman conquest, the dominant doctrine in the Egyptian sharī'i system was the Hanafi one, although the population was mainly Shī'ī (in the north) and Mālikī (in the south). The kānūn of the sultan, ostensibly designed to supplement the Sharī'a, superseded it in matters, especially criminal, in which difficulties arose in its application in the Sharī'a courts. Egypt was not affected by the Tanzimāt legislation of the Ottoman Empire, and neither was the Medjīt introduced there.

After an endeavour had been made in 1855, under Sa'id Pasha, to codify the criminal law, one which only resulted in a "confused compilation" based mainly on the Sharī'a, the code of the latest general reform under Isma'il Il Pasha in connection with the creation of the mixed tribunals (1876). At the time of the creation of the national courts (mahākim ahliyya) (1883), new civil, criminal and commercial codes were proclaimed which were based on French models.

In the late 19th century, Muhammad Kadri Pasha prepared codes, based all on the Hanafi doctrine, of several departments of law: (1) Kitāb Murshid al-ḥayrān ilā ma'rifat ahlu al-insān, which dealt with civil law, it was not officially recognised; (2) Kitāb Ahwāl al-sharī'yya fi 'l-ahwāl al-ahliyya, which dealt with personal status, succession, incompetence, gifts etc.; though not adopted by act of parliament, it was published by the Egyptian government in 1875 and enjoyed semi-official status; it was only intended to meet the increased need, caused by the creation of the mixed and national tribunals, for a convenient summary of the law administered by the Sharī'a courts and had no authority of its own with the latter; there are official translations into French and Italian and a commentary by Muhammad Zayd al-Ibyānī; and (3) Kānūn al-uds wa l-issal fi 'l-kādā' wa l-muḥākāt al-aqəq (Būlāk 1893, 1894, and later editions), which deals with pious foundations.

A law of 1890 provided that the judgments of the Sharī'a courts could be based exclusively on the most approved opinion of the Hanafi school, except for
cases of homicide, in which the kādi's, to avoid corruption and the spilling of innocent blood, were permitted to follow the two disciples of Abū Ḥanīfa, Abū Yūsuf and al-Shāfi'i, or, in cases of deliberate homicide, the three other schools. Muhammad 'Abduh, within the framework of reforms in the sharī'ī judicial system, suggested appointing a commission of 'ulamā' to prepare comprehensive codes, especially as to personal status and 'urf, culled from all the Sunnī doctrines according to considerations of public welfare; they were meant to be applied in the Sharī'a courts by order of the ruler; but 'Abduh's suggestion was not adopted. The Sharī'a Courts Organisation Law of 1910 again required the kādi's, in principle, to follow the most approved opinion of the Hanafi school.

From 1920, Parliament engaged in extensive reformist legislation on matters of personal status, succession and 'urf; it deviated from the Hanāfi doctrine and adopted elements of other Sunnī doctrines and of the Shi'a. This legislation comprised Law no. 25 of 1920 and Law no. 25 of 1929 on maintenance, divorce and other matters; Law no. 78 of 1931 on the organisation of the Sharī'a courts, introducing also reforms in family law; the Succession Law, no. 77 of 1943; the Testimentary Disposition Law, no. 71 of 1946, the 'urf Laws, no. 48 of 1946 and no. 180 of 1952, and Law no. 116 of 1952 concerning the denial of guardianship over a person. The Civil Code of 1948, prepared by 'Abd al-Razāzāk al-Sanhūrī, who served as model for the civil codes of several Arab countries, draws inspiration from the Sharī'a as one source among many, and not the most important. It is based on the codes of 1875 and 1883, which in turn go back to the Code Napoléon. Part of the reforms were at first carried out in the Sudan, through the Grand Kādi, who was an Egyptian jurist.

The Sharī'a Courts Abolition Law, no. 462 of 1955, provides that the national courts shall decide matters of personal status and 'urf in accordance with section 280 of the Sharī'a Courts Organisation Law of 1931, that is to say, in accordance with the most approved opinion of the Hanafi school, except for matters specially provided for in that law and in statutes of the nineteen-twenties and subsequent years supplementing it. In the national courts, Islamic law applies also to non-Muslims in matters of succession and wills and where the parties do not belong to the same denomination, or one of them has converted to Islam in the course of the proceedings.

After the unification of the judiciary, there were several attempts to codify the law of personal status. There was a growing realisation that the national courts should apply a uniform material law, valid for members of all religions and for foreigners as well as for local residents. But reformist legislation was only resumed in the second half of the nineteen-seventies, and even then not to the extent planned: Law no. 26 of 1976 introduced amendment in matters of maintenance and Law no. 44 of 1979 brought important reforms in matters of maintenance, divorce, maintenance of divorced women and custody of children.

In recent years, the efforts of Islamic orthodoxy have centred on an attempt to disprove the legitimacy of statutes inconsistent with the Sharī'a. The prime objective was establishing the position of the Sharī'a in the constitution of the state. The provisional constitution of 1964 (i.e. of the time of 'Abd al-Nāṣir) did not mention the Sharī'a at all. The 1971 constitution (art. 2) says that Islam is the state religion and that the principles of the Sharī'a are a chief source of legislation, i.e. one of several. On 22 May 1980, following a referendum, it was laid down that the Sharī'a was the chief source of legislation. There have been several attempts by superior courts, in reliance on article 2 of the constitution, to disprove the legality of laws contrary to the Sharī'a (see, e.g. al-Dir'awī, February 1980). The Muslim Brothers [see al-Tikrāwān al-Muslimūn] demand that the judicature, even at its lowest levels, should be enabled to pronounce on the legality of statutes. Alternatively, they suggest including the sharī'ī laws, especially the penal ones, among the statutes (see e.g. al-Dir'awī, July 1980).

Since 1972, legislation has been proposed, by both private and governmental agencies, to introduce Kur'ānic punishments (kaddād) for theft and embezzlement, the consumption of alcoholic beverages, armed robbery, unchastity (zinā), false accusation of unchastity (kadiyy), and apostasy from Islam (ridāda). In 1975, a supreme committee for the initiation of laws conforming to the Sharī'a (al-Lajnah al-`ulāyya li-tatwir al-`aṣlulāmin waft al-shari`a) was set up. Up till now, these efforts have had scanty results. The legislative proposals were not adopted, except for a bill concerning the consumption and sale of alcoholic beverages, which became law in 1976 (al-Masām, August 1980).

In the period prior to the occupation of Egypt by the British, procedure and the rules of evidence in the Sharī'a courts were based on the Sharī'a. Upon the reorganisation of the courts under the law of 1880, procedure was also revised. In 1883, immediately upon the British occupation, new regulations for civil and criminal procedure, based on French models, were proclaimed (the criminal code was brought up to date in 1904); but they were only applied by civil courts. As to the Sharī'a courts, in the Règlements since 1897, there has been an increasing tendency to do away with oral evidence of witnesses and acknowledgment (tkār) as means of proof and to prefer documentary evidence. Muhammad 'Abduh suggested making the use of written documents a condition of the jurisdiction of the Sharī'a courts. Reformist legislation from the nineteen-twenties onwards concerning personal status and succession included also procedural provisions which served as means to circumvent substantive sharī'ī legislation.

The Sharī'a Courts Abolition Law, no. 462 of 1955, provides that the Civil Procedure Law shall apply to matters of personal status and 'urf in national courts, except for matters to which special provisions apply according to the Sharī'a Courts Law or laws supplementing it. In addition, Law no. 57 of 1959 (amended by Law no. 106 of 1962) is to be applied to proceedings before the Court of Cassation (mahkamat al-nakbi).

In the days of Muhammad `Abli, there was in Cairo a chief kādi, sent every year from Istanbul, who delegated the bulk of the business to the deputy he brought with him from Istanbul. The plaintiff had, as means of proof and to prefer documentary evidence. Muhammad 'Abduh suggested making the use of written documents a condition of the jurisdiction of the Sharī'a courts. Reformist legislation from the nineteen-twenties onwards concerning personal status and succession included also procedural provisions which served as means to circumvent substantive sharī'ī legislation.

In addition to this chief court of justice, there were subsidiary courts in Cairo and the suburbs at which official witnesses of the chief court administered justice as deputies and under the supervision of the
chief kādī. In the country towns there were also kādīs, who were usually aided by muftīs. The kādīs were paid by the litigants and not by the state. Saʿīd obtained the right to nominate kādīs (but not the chief kādī) and ʿIsāʾi requested permission to nominate, temporarily at least, the deputy of the chief kādī, who himself remained in Turkey. By a law of 1880, the benches of the Shariʿa courts in Cairo and Alexandria were made to consist of three judges, the court in Cairo became a court of appeal from the decisions of single judges, and the judgments of the two courts were made appealable to the Hanafi (chief) muftī; in cases of doubt, the courts were referred to the competent muftīs, but for the rest they were made independent of them.

A further step forward was marked by the Règlement de Réorganisation des Mehkemehs of 1897, modified in 1909-10; between the two versions came the fatawa of Muhammad ʿAbduh on the reform of Shariʿa jurisdic-
tion of 1899. Both versions provided for an organisa-
tion in the Shariʿa courts in three stages: sommâr (qiyāṣʿyya), de première instance (ibštīdaʿyya) and suprême (ʿulāya), according to the terminology finally adopted; single judges sat in the first stage, colleges of judges in the other stages (always three according to the earlier version, three in the intermediate instance and five in the highest court in Cairo according to the later version). The court of appeal was the next highest court; the more important cases were at once brought before the court de première instance. The earlier version gave the muftīs definite places on the bench of the collegiate courts; in the later version, the vice-president acted as muftī, except in Cairo. The Règlement of 1931 brought the number of judges in the highest court down to three. The Shariʿa Courts Abolition Law of 1955 provides that matters of personal status shall be dealt with by national courts of three grades, to be specially established for this purpose. Those of the lowest grade, called the summary courts (al-μahdākim al-djazʿyya), are to hear all matters of personal status, as defined in the Shariʿa Courts Law no. 78 of 1931, except guardianship, succession and personal status, which are to hear matters of wakf and appeals from judgments of the summary courts as far as these are appealable. Non-final judgments of the courts of first instance sitting as courts of original jurisdiction are appealable to the Personal Status Appeals Department of the Court of Cassation.

A summary court has a bench of one; a court of first instance has a bench of three and may include shariʿi kādīs. The president of the court of first instance is a senior judge of the Court of Appeal. Courts of first instance exist in every provincial capital. The Personal Status Appeals Department has a bench of three, one of whom may be a shariʿi kādī of the rank of qābīb or a member of the Supreme Shariʿa Court of Appeal. The president of the Supreme Shariʿa Court is made a member of the Court of Cassation, of which the Personal Status Appeals Department forms a part and which sits in Cairo.

The law of 1955 provides that the kādīs of the Shariʿa courts of all grades shall be integrated into the national courts system, the public prosecutor's department and the Ministry of Justice as far as matters of personal status are concerned. Actually, most shariʿi kādīs have been integrated into the summary courts, in which judicial proceedings in matters of personal status are mainly conducted. At the same time, a not inconsiderable number of civil lawyers deal with matters of personal status of Muslims. The Shariʿa Courts Law of 1931 provided that only advocates might represent parties in court, a kādī's school established in 1907 trained also shariʿi advoca-
tes. They set up a bar association similar to the bar association of civil advocates. Since the abolition of the Shariʿa courts, shariʿi advocates have been permitted to appear, in matters that had formerly been within the jurisdiction of the Shariʿa courts, before national courts of the corresponding grade.

In the mid-seventies a tendency emerged—to tolerate by the authorities for reasons of domestic policy—to apply Shariʿa laws, even if not anchored in statutory legislation, in the jurisprudence of the national courts and to refuse to apply statutes considered inconsistent with the Shariʿa (Rose al-Yusuf, 18 February 1980; al-Dawwa, 18 February 1980, February 1981).


ii. Syria

In the Ottoman era, the shariʿi judicial system of Syria was integrated in the Ottoman legal system. The powers of the Shariʿa courts were re-determined by Law no. 261 of 1926; they comprise matters of personal status, succession and wakf. However, in contrast to the position in Lebanon, the Shariʿa courts are regarded as the ordinary judicial authorities in matters of personal status of non-Muslims, except for matters left to the jurisdiction of the communal courts. In matters of guardianship, succession, wills, interdiction (hadīr), legal majority (rushd), maintenance of relatives within the wider family, wakf kāshri and the like, non-Muslims are amenable to the Shariʿa courts. Matters of personal status of foreign Muslims who in their countries of origin are subject to civil law are amenable to the civil courts. The Shariʿa court consists of a single kādī, whose judgment may be appealed to the shariʿi department of the Court of Cassation (mahkama al-tamyiṣ). The judicial authority Law, no. 12 of 1961, provides for 25
Muslim courts throughout Syria, each consisting of a single kadi, except for those in Damascus and Aleppo, which have three kadis each. The Shi’a courts, unlike those of Lebanon, have no courts of their own, and are theoretically subject to the Sunni Shari’a courts. But it seems that they settle matters of personal status through unofficial arbitration by their leaders.

By virtue of the law of 1926, the non-Muslim communities have religious courts of their own, with jurisdiction limited to some matters not within the competence of the Shari’a courts: betrothal, marriage, divorce, maintenance and children’s maintenance.

The Syrian Law of Personal Status of 1953 replaced the Ottoman Family Rights Law of 1917. It is based on the Hanafi doctrine and on reformist legislation anchored in other Sunni doctrines. In the absence of an express provision in it as to a particular matter, the ruling opinion of the Hanafi school is to be followed.

The Syrian constitutions from 1950 onwards provide that the Shari’a courts shall be the principal source of legislation. The said law applies also to the Shi’is, as well as to non-Muslims (Christians and Druzes), except for those matters within the competence of the religious courts of the latter to which their religious law applies (art. 308). In other words, this law represents an attempt to frame a code of personal status, applying to all citizens of Syria without distinction of school or religion.

Procedure was unified by the Law of Procedure of 1947. Under the Jurisdiction Law of 1961, Shari’a, Christian and Druze courts apply the rules of procedure of the civil courts; the special rules of the different communities, including the Ottoman Shari’a Procedure Law, were abolished.

The 1945 law established a two-grade judicial system for the Druzes: courts of first instance consisting of a single kadi and a court of appeal—the Principal Council (al-hay’a al-na’izya)—which is the supreme madhhabi authority and whose seat is in the province of Djabal al-Duruz. The latter’s judgments were to be final. Law no. 294 of 1946 provides that the Principal Council shall consist of three madhhabi leaders. The kadis were to be appointed by the Minister of Justice upon the recommendation of the Religious Council (al-hay’a al-diniyya), on which the spiritual heads of the Druze community were represented. The judges were to be enforced by the authorities of the state. Law no. 56 of 1959 restricted the judicial autonomy of the Druzes. It provided that a Druze kadi should be appointed, by order, on the recommendation of the Minister of Justice of the Syrian province of the United Arab Republic. Appeals against his judgments were to be heard before the civil Court of Cassation in Damascus (in which the Druzes were not represented) under the rules of procedure obtaining in respect of Muslim shar’i kadis. The Druze Court of appeal was abolished and, by way of compensation, a “Druze Department of Legal Opinions” (da’u’at al-itt’a li ‘l-madhab al-durzi) was set up, consisting of the kadis of the former court of appeal. This body is unconnected with the judicial system. Law no. 56 of 1959 was amended by Law no. 98 of 1961, which provides that, in the event that the Druze kadi requires not only the recommendation of the Minister of Justice but also the consent of the High Judicial Council (madijadi al-kadi’ al-a’la),

The Bedouin of Syria used to settle their disputes before an arbitral board (lajnda takhdimiya) consisting of two arbitrators and an umpire, elected by the parties, which followed tribal custom (taf). The Tribes Law, no. 124 of 1953 (amended in 1956), forbed Bedouin, by means of penal provisions, to carry out raids (ghawu). In 1956, matters of personal status of Bedouin were assigned to the Shari’a courts, and in 1958 the Tribes Law was repealed and the Bedouin became amenable to the ordinary legal system of the state and to the laws applying therein.

Upon the severance of Lebanon from the Ottoman Empire, the status of the Muslims was assimilated to that of the other communities. The French administration made the Mufti of Beirut a "Grand Mufti (al-madjlis al-shar'i al-aHa)," designed to assist him in running the religious affairs of the community and administering the waqfs. It consists of six kaid and the President of the Supreme Shar'i Court.

The Lebanese Shi'is, unlike their brethren in Syria, were recognised as a religious community entitled to their own judicial autonomy. The powers of the Sunni and Di'aafari Shi'it Shar'i courts were defined by Law no. 241 of 1942 (amended in 1946) and by the Law Concerning the Organisation of Sunni and Di'aafari Shar'i Jurisdiction of 1962, which superseded the former. They comprised personal status, succession and wills and matters such as legal majority (balagh, raqd), interdiction (kadir), missing persons (mafkud), control of moneys of orphans, waqf dhawri and mustasfi, wakf madbuth and wakf malbuk of Sunni is within the jurisdiction of their waqf administrative council, while those of Di'aafar is waqf jurisdiction of the Di'aafari courts.

The Ottoman Family Rights Law of 1917 is still in force in Lebanon. In the absence of an express provision in this law as to a particular matter, the SunniShar'i court must follow the dominant opinion of the HanafI school. The court also uses the codification of the laws of personal status of the Egyptian, Kador Pagla (see Section i above). In matters of interdiction and legal incompetence and of management of moneys of minors, the Shar'i court applies the Medjelle as amended by Lebanese legislation, which sometimes deviates from the Hanafi doctrine.

The Di'aafari court applies the laws of the Di'aafari doctrine and the provisions of the Ottoman Family Rights Law compatible with it. Where the parties do not belong to the same school (Sunni or Di'aafari), the doctrine is determined by the court in accordance with the matter under consideration. In matters of succession and wills, e.g., the courts follow the school of the deceased. For reasons of convenience, a certain mobility exists among Shi'is and Sunnis in matters of personal status and succession. The Hanafi doctrine applies to many matters of non-Muslims, such as succession (until 1959), waqf, interdiction and legal incompetence. The laws of 1942 and 1946 laid down also rules of court deviating in some respects from the Ottoman ones; there are certain differences in procedure between Sunni and Di'aafari courts.

There are two separate systems of courts, a Sunni one and a Di'aafari one. Each consists of courts of first instance, manned by a single kaid, in major centres and a supreme court, manned by three kaidis, in Beirut, which acts as a court of cassation (mahkamat al-tamyiz) in some matters and as a court of appeal (mahkama istanfiyya) in others. The judgments of both courts are enforced by the execution offices of the state. The state appoints and dismisses the kaidis and pays their salaries.

The wide autonomy of the courts of the Christian communities (mahkamat ruhiyya) is another carry-over from the special status of the Province of Mount Lebanon in the second half of the 19th century. Article 156 of the Ottoman Family Rights Law of 1917 abrogated the judicial powers of the spiritual heads of the Christian communities in matters of personal status, but the French administration ignored that article; in fact, it was repealed by order of the governor of December 1921 and the Christian courts remained in existence. The powers of the courts of nine Christian communities (and of the Jewish community) were defined by laws of 1930 and 1951. These powers are wider than those courts had in the past but still narrower than those of the Shar'i courts. The widening of the powers of the Christian courts met with strong public opposition for national reasons (submission to foreign law) and legal-professional ones. The laws of wills and succession of non-Muslims, of 1929 and 1959, respectively, freed the Christian communities from the sway of Islamic law.

The Druzes of the Province of Mount Lebanon were not recognised as a religious community under Ottoman rule. At the same time, there is evidence that they enjoyed a certain autonomy, by administrative arrangement, in matters of marriage, divorce and wills in which Druze religious law takes a special position; the Spiritual Head of the Druze community dealt with these matters "in accordance with ancient custom." That autonomy was abolished by order of the Shaykh al-Islam during World War I, together with the judicial autonomy of the Province of Mount Lebanon, and Druze matters of personal status were assigned to the Sunni Shar'i courts; but the order was not implemented, and the autonomy remained in force.

In 1930, the Druze courts were granted jurisdiction in matters of personal status of the members of the community, similar to that exercised by the Sunni and Di'aafari Shar'i courts. In 1936, the Mandate authorities formally recognised the Druzes as a religious community. The powers of the courts were re-defined by a law enacted in 1948 and especially by the Druze Administration of Justice Law, no. 3473 of 1960. The courts are competent to hear all matters to which Druze religious law, Druze custom and the Law of the Personal Status of the Druze Community apply.

Until 1948, the Druze courts applied non-codified religious law, Druze custom and the Hanafi doctrine as far as was not inconsistent with Druze tradition and custom. The Law of the Personal Status of the Druze Community in Lebanon, of 1948—the most impressive modern family law at the time—is a synthesis of many sources of law, religious and secular, local and foreign, but its most important source of inspiration is ancient Druze religious law. In the absence of an express provision in the 1948 law as to a particular matter, the Hanafi doctrine is to be followed.

Order no. 3294 of 1938 requires Druze courts to apply the rules of procedure applicable in Sunni and Di'aafari courts. The Druze Administration of Justice Law of 1960 provides that, in the absence of an express provision in that law as to a particular matter, the Druze courts shall apply the rules of procedure applicable in Muslim Shar'i courts, and that in the absence of an express provision also in the latter, they shall apply the general principles of civil procedure as far as they are not repugnant to Druze religious law and Druze tradition.

Before the establishment of statutory Druze courts, the two shaykh al-'aks served as an appellate authority acting, in a traditional manner, in accordance with customary law. The statutory status of the shaykh al-'aks as spiritual heads of the Druze community was regulated in 1962. In 1947, it was prescribed that the court of appeal, known as the Supreme Council (al-
hay'a al-‘wilāya), should consist of the two shaykh al-‘akl and a Druze civil judge. If it was not possible to man the Council, the Minister of Justice might appoint one or several judges of the court of first instance (other than those whose judgment was appealed against) to complete the bench. In 1958, it was ordained that if it was not possible to appoint a second shaykh al-‘akl, the Minister of Justice should appoint a second Druze civil judge and that judgments relating to minors or legally incompetent persons, the Public Treasury (bayt al-mādi‘), waqf, and dissolution of a marriage on the ground of absence of the husband, might only be executed after confirmation by the appellate authority.

The Druze Administration of Justice Law of 1960 (amended in 1967) establishes a two-grade judicial system integrated in the general Lebanese legal system: courts of first instance, manned by a single kādi ma‘ṣūḥab, in Beirut, ‘Āliya, Bā‘lān, Rasheyyā and Hāshayyā and a Druze civil judge and a court of appeal (Supreme Court), manned by a presiding judge and two assessors, in Beirut. The court of appeal performs the functions of a disciplinary committee for kādī of the first instance. The status of the Druze kādī is the same as that of the Muslim sharī‘i kādī, with certain modifications. In the absence of an express provision in that law as to a particular matter, the provisions of the Sunni and Dja‘fari Sharī‘a Law are to be the same as that of the majority of the inhabitants.

In July 1916, after the capture of Baghdaḍ by the British, the ʻāliyya courts were reconstituted in Baghdaḍ and other cities. Early in 1918, the sharī‘i judicial system was reorganised with a view to adapting it to the new political situation. Personal jurisdiction was limited to Sunnīs, and matters of personal status of Sharī‘i, Christians and Jews were assigned to civil courts of first instance, which followed the personal status law of the parties or any custom applicable to them, provided it was not contrary to justice, equity or good conscience. These courts were authorised to render such matters to the Sharī‘ī muḍāḥah or to the Christian or Jewish religious authority, as the case might be. The judgments of these were subject to confirmation by the civil court. In 1921, the Dja‘fari courts were set up in Baghdaḍ that were authorised to hear matters of personal status. Their judgments, too, were subject to confirmation by a civil court. Appeals against judgments of the Sunni courts were heard before the Sharī‘a Council of Cassation (mahkama tāmisir al-‘wilāya) under the Sharī‘a Courts Regulations of 1918.

After independence, the judicial system was reorganised. In 1923, a dual system of Sharī‘a courts, Sunni and Dja‘fari, with equal status, was set up. Their jurisdiction comprises personal status in a wide sense, succession and wills, waqf, orphans’ money, etc. A Basic Law of 1925 confirmed the dual system of courts. It provided that separate courts for the two schools should be set up in Baghdaḍ and Baṣra, but only one court in other places, where the school of the kādī was to be the same as that of the majority of the inhabitants. The Establishment of Courts Law of 1945 provided that the Sharī‘a courts should be set up in localities where there were civil courts and that in the absence of a kādī, the case should be taken by a judge of the civil system.

Until 1963, appeals against judgments of Sharī‘a courts were heard before the Sharī‘a Council of Cassation, which had separate departments for Sunnīs and Dja‘farīs. It could only confirm or set aside the judgment or direct the court to re-hear the case. The Minister of Justice had power to amend the decisions of the Council. In 1963, the Council was abolished, and appeals were to be heard before the State Court of Cassation (mahkama tāmisir al-ʻwilāya), which combined the functions of the Sunni and Dja‘fari Departments in the Personal Status Committee (hay‘a al-muwāhid al-‘wilāya).

In the Ottoman era, the Sharī‘a courts followed the non-codified official Hanafi doctrine. The two Ottoman māfas of 1915 relating to personal status, and the Meğdelle, the land law, with certain modifications, applied in ʻIrāq, but not the Ottoman Family Rights Law of 1917. The Hanafi doctrine applied also to matters of succession of Christians and Jews until special laws were enacted for them by the Civil Courts Regulations of 1918.

After World War I, the Hanafi kādī, if the parties belonged to another Sunnī school and demanded that the Hanafi doctrine be not applied, might either deal with the matter himself according to the school of the parties or refer it to an ʻālim of that school. If the parties belonged to different schools, the court, under the Sharī‘a Courts Law of 1923, had to follow the school of the deceased in matters of wills and intestate succession, the school of the husband in matters of marriage, divorce, dower, guardianship and the like, the school of the founder in matters of waqf and the school of the defendant in matters of maintenance of relatives. In ʻIrāq, the Dja‘fari doctrine was applied if, in a place where there were no separate courts for the
two schools, a Sunni kadi dealt with matters of Shi'i, he had to rely on a fatwa of a Shi'i alim, and vice versa.

After several abortive attempts (in the nineteen-forties) to codify the 'Irakî law of personal status, the Supreme Muslim Council took over the task of codifying personal status law, applying equally to all 'Irakî Muslims, both Sunni and Shi'i, was promulgated in 1959 following 'Abd al-Karîm Kâsim's coup d'état the year before. A succession law was taken over from a European source. Other important reforms concerned marriage and divorce. The 1959 law presents a blend of Sunni and Shi'i principles in some sections, while other sections preserve separate norms for the two branches of Islam. In 1963, after 'Abd al-Salâm 'Arim's coup, under pressure from the 'ulamâ, a retreat occurred from reforms which did not seem compatible with the Shari'a. The foreign succession law was repealed, and in its stead the system of succession of the Twelver Shi'a was made applicable to all 'Irakî Muslims. In 1978, further important amendments were made in the Personal Status Law of 1959 in matters of marriage, divorce, alimony and probate. The other matters of personal status and succession are within the jurisdiction of the civil courts.

In the Ottoman era, tribal courts (mahbûkîn al-`ashdûr) applying customary law operated among the Bedouin. These courts were reorganised by the British in 1916 on a pattern borrowed from Indian legislation. A "political officer" appointed special tribal councils (mahdûš) authorised to hear civil and criminal cases if at least one of the parties was a Bedouin. The relevant law was replaced by the Tribal Actions Regulation (nisâm al-da`awî `l-`ashdûr) of 1918, which was amended several times (in 1924, 1933 and 1951). Some of the tribal customs were abrogated by statutory legislation. The judgments of the tribal courts were subject to scrutiny by the mulasârrîf. The tribal courts were abolished in 1938, after the coup d'état, with a view to integrating the Bedouin into the general legal system, which included also the Shari'a courts.

operated among the Bedouin. In the years 1919 to 1922, the government maintained a "Blood Council" (madjlis al-damum) which tried homicide cases, and in 1924 permanent tribal courts with specified powers were appointed; each court consisted of two representatives of the clans of the major Negev tribes, with the District Officer of Beersheba as chairman. In 1928, these courts were given power to hear criminal cases and impose light prison sentences and fines. From 1933 there was also a tribal court of appeal; it consisted of two members, with the District Officer as chairman.

The Government of Israel has reconstituted the Shari'a courts with the same powers as they had under the Mandate, except for a few modifications: the Age of Marriage Law, 1950, vests exclusive power to permit the marriage of a girl under seventeen in the District Court, and the Succession Law, 1965, reduces the jurisdiction of the Shari'a courts—like that of the other religious courts—from exclusive to concurrent in matters of succession and wills, but not in matters of personal status, in which it is still exclusive. The revocation of the Supreme Muslim Council Order of 1921 by the Kadi's Law, 1961, implicitly revoked the Defence (Muslim Waf)' Regulations, and it seems that the powers of the Shari'a courts are thereby restored to their original extent, so as to include wa'ifs of the madhab category.

The Knesset intervened in many matrimonial matters with a view to equalising the legal status of women with that of men. Nevertheless, it abstained from impinging on any religious-legal prohibition or permission relating to marriage or divorce and resorted to procedural provisions and penal sanctions rather than substantive provisions as means of deterrence, and in matters for which substantive provisions were enacted, the parties were usually left an option to litigate in accordance with their religious law. It is only in matters of succession that there is—since 1965—a clear separation between religious justice, in which religious law applies, and civil justice, in which secular law is followed.

The Shari'a judicial system is integrated in the general legal system. The Shari'a Courts (Validation of Appointments) Law, 1953, validated the appointment of the first kadi (madhun) and with the settlement of disputes in matters of marriage and divorce, made by administrative action immediately after the establishment of the state. The Kadi's Law, 1961, regulates the appointment and tenure of the kadis. They are appointed by the President of the State upon the recommendation of an appointments committee, most of the members of which are Muslims. Their salaries are paid by the Government. Shari'a courts of first instance, consisting of a single kadi, exist in Nazareth, Acre (with an extension in Haifa), Jaffa (with jurisdiction—since 1967—including also East Jerusalem (see Section 4. vi below)) and the village of Tayyia in the "Little Triangle".

The tribal courts have been abolished in Israel (though not their juridical basis), and the Bedouin are now amenable to the Shari'a courts in matters of personal status and succession. The Negev Bedouin were under the jurisdiction of the Shari'a Court of Jaffa till 1976. In that year, a separate court of first instance was established for them in Beersheba.

A court of appeal of two or three kadis exists in Jerusalem. Until 1975, this court consisted of the kadis of the courts of first instance, except the kadi whose judgment was appealed against. In that year, it was administratively ordained that the court of appeal should consist of permanent members not serving in courts of first instance.

In Palestine, the Druzes were not recognised as a religious community. In the Ottoman era, the Shari'a court had residuary jurisdiction over them. They in fact resorted to it, especially in matters of succession. At the same time, they enjoyed a certain autonomy within the framework of their religious and customary law, in matters of personal status and wills. The Mandatory authorities refused to recognise them as a religious community, in the interest of maintaining the status quo in matters of religion. They continued to recognise a certain Druze autonomy with regard to the performance of marriages, while residency jurisdiction was transferred from the Shari'a courts to the civil courts, though in fact the Druzes continued to resort to the Shari'a courts.

In Israel, the Druzes were recognised as a religious community in 1957. Pending the establishment of their own religious courts in 1963, they continued to resort to Shari'a courts, although this practice has no foundation in law. But in matters in which the Druze religious system is utterly different from the Islamic, such as polygamy, divorce and wills, the Druzes turned to religious functionaries who acted by voluntary agreement of the parties; their decisions had not the effect of judgments enforceable in execution proceedings but of arbitral awards anchored in their personal authority and supported by religious and social sanctions. The arbitrators decided in accordance with custom and tradition ('alddi wa-tak'dlil); there were no strict rules of procedure.

The institutionalisation of arbitration and its transformation into a judicial proceeding began in the Ottoman era with the appointment of the first "kadi" in Palestine in 1909. He acted as an arbitrator, and his existence did not do away with the residuary jurisdiction, in respect of the Druzes, of the Shari'a court in the Ottoman era or of the District Court under the Mandate. The office of "kadi"—arbitrator was hereditary in the Tarif family. In 1954, a "Committee of Religious-Legal Supervision" (ladghat al-mar'ikaba al-madhabiyiyah) was set up to supervise marriage solemnisers (madzahin) appointed under an Ordinance of 1919. In 1959, a "Committee for Druze Wakf Affairs" (al-ladghat al-mu'taqi al-madhabiyiyah) was established. The two committees in fact also dealt with the settlement of disputes in matters of marriage and divorce. They did not act as statutory judicial authorities; their decisions were valid only with the consent of the parties and could not be enforced in execution proceedings. At the same time, they showed many characteristics of institutionalised judicial authorities. The awards of "judgments" of the committees were recognised, though with some hesitation by the various state authorities. The committees were a kind of unofficial courts of law, and most of their members later became kadis of the Druze courts.

The Druze Religious Courts Law, 1962, vests the courts with exclusive jurisdiction in matters of marriage and divorce of the Druzes in Israel and with concurrent jurisdiction in all their other matters of personal status. They also have exclusive jurisdiction in matters relating to the creation or internal administration of a religious endowment established by the various state authorities. The committees were a kind of unofficial courts of law, and most of their members later became kadis of the Druze courts.

In its original version, the law provides that the Court of First Instance shall consist of three kadis and the Court of Appeal of not less than three. In 1967, it was laid down that if it was not possible to form such courts the court might consist of two kadis, and in 1972 it was provided that the Court
of First Instance might consist of one kādi. The kādis are appointed by the President of the State on the recommendation of an appointments committee, most of the members of which are Druzes. A transitional provision prescribes that the first Court of Appeal shall consist of the members of the “Religious Council”, i.e. the Spiritual Leadership of the Druze community. The Druze courts are integrated in the general legal system of the State, which enforces their judgments. Since the establishment of Druze courts, the Druzes have ceased to resort to the Muslim shari‘a courts.

The Druzes of the Golan Heights formerly settled most of their matrimonial affairs, without resort to any judicial authority, by means of religious functionaries acting as arbitrators, and in so far as they did go to a court, it was, in the Ottoman era, the Druze madhab court in Djabal al-Duruz or in Hāshbayyā in Lebanon, and under Syrian rule, the Muslim shari‘a court in Kunaytra. In 1967, after the Six-Day War, the latter court ceased to function. In 1970, by order of the military commander of the region, a court of first instance and a court of appeal were set up with powers similar to those of the Druze courts in Israel. From 1972 onwards, the kādis of the Israeli Court of First Instance and Court of Appeal acted as members of the corresponding Golan Heights courts by virtue of the above mentioned order. In 1974, a court of first instance consisting of local kādis was set up in the Golan Heights.

Before being recognised as a religious community in Israel, the Druze had no codified law of personal status and succession. They dealt with these matters in accordance with their esoteric law and with custom, and in so far as they restored to a judicial authority, it was the shari‘a court, which applied the Ottoman Family Rights Law or, in the absence of an express provision in the latter, shari‘a law according to the Hanafi school. In 1961, the Spiritual Leadership of the Druze community in Israel, in its statutory capacity as the “Religious Council”, adopted the Personal Status Law of the Druze Community in Lebanon of 1948 (see Section 4. iii above) with the following modifications: (a) the Hanafi doctrine, which served as a source of law in matters of intestate succession and in the absence of the express provision of law in a particular matter of personal status, was replaced by custom and “the law accepted by the members of the Druze community in Israel”; (b) Lebanese legislation designed to supplement the Druze Personal Status Law was replaced by Israeli legislation. The “Religious Council” sanctioned the Druze Courts Procedure Regulations of 1964, which incorporate norms of Israeli law.

The law applying to matters of personal status in the Golan Heights was until the introduction of Israeli law there on 14 December 1961 the Syrian Personal Status Law of 1953 (see Section 4. ii above). The Israeli Succession Law of 1965 was extended to the Golan Heights by the above-mentioned order of the military commander of 1970. In practice, the kādis, in matters of personal status, apply the Lebanese Druze Personal Status Law, as adopted by the Religious Council. Since the introduction of Israeli law in the Golan Heights, this practice has been validated. All Israeli legislation in matters of personal status expressly referred to religious courts is likewise applicable in Druze religious courts there.

Under Egyptian military rule in the Gaza Strip, there were three shari‘a courts of first instance at Gaza, Khan Yunis and Dayr al-Balah, respectively. They had jurisdiction in matters of personal status and wakf within the meaning of the Palestine Order in Council, 1922. Under Israeli military rule (since 1967), two additional courts have been set up in Djabal Lydda and Rafah. A shari‘a court of appeal operates in Gaza in accordance with the Egyptian Law of Procedure of Muslim Religious Courts no. 12 of 1965. The Ottoman Family Rights Law of 1917 applies in these courts. The salaries of the kādis are paid by the Military Government.
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minister and is directly subordinate to the Prime Minister.

The jurisdiction of the Shari'a courts in the West Bank has been assimilated to that of their counterparts in the East Bank. The Jordanian constitution of 1952 and other enactments of the early nineteen-fifties vest the Shari'a courts with jurisdiction in all matters of personal status and succession as defined in Islamic law, which definition is wider than that of the Palestine Order in Council, as well as in matters of waqfs and blood-money (diva) of Muslims. Their jurisdiction in matters of personal status is limited to Muslim courts. Administrative jurisdiction of personal status of non-Muslims has been transferred to a civil court of first instance, except where the parties agree to the jurisdiction of the Shari'a court. In matters of blood-money and of waqfs established before a Shari'a court, the Shari'a courts have jurisdiction also with regard to consenting non-Muslims.

The law applying to matters of personal status on both banks of the Jordan was until 1951 the Ottoman Family Rights Law of 1917. In 1951, it was replaced by a liberal family law. Previously, in 1927, a new personal status law was adopted in Transjordan, but it was repealed in 1943 in favour of the traditional doctrine of family law. A provisional Jordanian family Rights Law, no. 26, was enacted in 1947, to be superseded by the law of 1951. The Law of Personal Status, no. 61 of 1976, replaced the law of 1951. The new law is more extensive and detailed than the earlier one and includes important amendments. The Shari'a Courts Establishment Law and the Personal Status Law of 1951 provide that the courts shall hear matters within their jurisdiction in accordance with the most approved opinion of the Hanafi school, save where a provision of law to the contrary exists. A similar provision exists also in the laws of personal status of 1951 and 1976. An overwhelming majority of the Kingdom's population belongs to the Shi'i school. The Shari'a courts on both banks of the Jordan apply the Shari'i Procedure Law, no. 31 of 1959, which replaced the Procedure Law no. 10 of 1952.

The Shari'a Courts Establishment Law of 1951 established a unitary judicial system on both banks. Twenty-four courts of first instance, each consisting of a Muslim judge sitting alone, were set up at district and sub-district centres, eight thereof in the West Bank. The Court of Appeal consists of a president and two members. It passes decisions by a majority of votes and its judgments are final. The law enables the establishment of an additional court of appeal, and in fact two courts of appeal, one in 'Amman for the East Bank and one in Jerusalem for the West Bank, were set at first up; however, after a short time, in August 1951, it was decided that there should be only one Shari'a court of appeal, which was to have its permanent seat in 'Amman but might be convened in Jerusalem when necessary. The Shari'i Law Council, headed by the Director of the Shari'a Office, is responsible for the appointment and dismissal of kadis. Its decisions require the approval of the king.

The powers of the courts of the Christian communities in Jordan have been greatly widened compared with the Ottoman period and assimilated to those of the Shari'a courts. According to the Religious Councils Law, no. 2 of 1938, which was extended to the West Bank in 1958, and the Constitution of 1952, they have jurisdiction in all matters of personal status and succession, as well as in matters of the establishment and internal administration of waqfs founded for the benefit of the community. They apply the law of the community except in matters of succession and wills, which are governed by Islamic law.

The Bedouin in Jordan are not amenable to Shari'i jurisdiction. They have tribal courts (mahakmam al-'azhar'ir) regulated by a law of 1966, which replaced a law of 1924. Every muftiyar is responsible for the activities of the court by virtue of his office, and the army commander is responsible for the court in the Desert District. A law of 1949 provides that these courts shall have jurisdiction in all disputes of Bedouin, except matters of ownership and possession of immovable property and written partnership agreements concerning thoroughbred horses. The muftiyar enforces the judgments, but the penalty for offences must not exceed one month's imprisonment and a fine of a specific amount. The muftiyar or the army commander, however, as the case may be, may transfer cases from the tribal court to a civil court.

A judgment of a tribal court is appealable to a tribal court of appeal. This court may consult experts in tribal law. It may increase or reduce the penalty or return the matter to the court of first instance for a re-hearing. The tribal courts apply customary law. However, state law forbids certain customs, such as giving girls as diva. Procedure in tribal courts is also customary.

As a result of the Six-Day War in 1967, the West Bank was separated from the Kingdom of Jordan, but Jordanian law still applies there, except in East Jerusalem, where Israeli law has been introduced. This situation affects the functioning of the religious establishment. The Shari'a courts of first instance have been left without their court of appeal, the permanent seat of which, as stated, is in 'Amman. On 24 July 1967, Muslim political leaders and religious functionaries in East Jerusalem set up a "Muslim Council" (al-hay'a al-islamiyya), which assumed authority for the conduct of Muslim affairs in East Jerusalem and the West Bank. The sole purpose of this body, which has no statutory status in either Jordanian or Israeli law, is to fill the place of the absent Muslim sovereign. The Council appointed its president to be kadi'l-kudsi of the West Bank with powers as defined by Jordanian law.

The Israeli Shari'a Court of Jaffa, the area of jurisdiction of which has been extended to include East Jerusalem (see Section 4. v above), is not recognized by the Jordanian Government as an integral part of the West Bank. Despite this, the local Shari'a court, which is subject to the Muslim Council, is not recognised by the Israeli authorities. East Jerusalem Muslims do not resort to the Israeli court unless they are interested in the execution of a judgment or in the performance of some act in a government office on the strength of a certificate from the court. In the West Bank, the Israeli Military Government has inherited the powers of the Jordanian Government in its various spheres of activity and is consequently charged with the operation of the courts, the appointment and dismissal of the kadiis and the payment of their salaries, and the collection of court fees. In fact, however, it is the Jerusalem kadi'l-kudsi who appoints the kadiis and the Jordanian Government which pays their salaries. The Military Government recognises their appointments ex post facto and the executive officers subject to it enforce their judgments. As the Shari'a Court of Appeal of the West Bank is in Jerusalem, its judgments are not valid in the West Bank, but in day-to-day reality they are enforced there. The Shari'a courts of the West Bank and of East Jerusalem apply the Jordanian law of personal status and rules of procedure.

Along with their judicial tasks, several East Jerusalem kadiis carry out various other functions—exegetic (the Mufid of Jerusalem), administrative and public—connected with the religious establishment.
The Muslim Council has conferred on the Shan^a Court of Appeal the powers of the Council of Endowments and Islamic Affairs, the General Administration of Endowments and the Committee for the Rehabilitation of the al-Aksa Mosque and the Dome of the Rock, bodies anchored in Jordanian legislation.


(vii) Saudi Arabia

The Arabian Peninsula was under the nominal sovereignty of the Ottoman Empire, but the 19th century legal reforms of the Empire were not applied there except in the major urban centres of the Hijaẕ, and even there with only limited success. At the time of his conquest of the Hijaẕ in the early 20th century, 'Abd al-'Aziz Ibn Sa'ud found there a legal system progressive by the standards of other regions of the peninsula. In the small towns of Najḏ, disputes were settled by the local amir or a kadi appointed by him. Among the Bedouin, customary law, applied by arbitrators, reigned absolute.

The 'constitution' of the Hijaẕ of 1926 makes no express reference to the judicial system, but says that the King is limited by the Shan^a and that the legislation of the kingdom shall be based on the Kur^an, the Sunna of the Prophet and the ijma of his Companions. A faits of the 'ulama', of 1927, demanded inter alia that 'Abd al-'Aziz forthwith repeal the Ottoman laws in force in the Hijaẕ and restore the position of the Shan^a.

A royal decree of 1927 established three grades of courts in the Hijaẕ:

(1) Expedient Courts (mahkama musta'qila), competent to try misdemeanours (dhanah) punishable by a fine not exceeding a specific amount, offences the penalty for which was left to the discretion of the kadi (a'zirah) and felonies (djinayat) entailing Kur^anic punishments (haddah), except mutilation (ka'ti) or death; they consist of a single kadi. Some courts were set up in Mecca and Medina and later in Riyadh and other major cities. Mecca had a further Expedient Court, hearing claims by Bedouin. In small administrative units, and especially among the numerous tribes of desert Bedouin, the local amir acts as kadi; he generally applies the Shan^a but sometimes resorts to the local practice.

(2) Greater Shan^a Courts (mahkama shari'ya kubra), competent to deal with serious criminal (qaza') matters and civil (hanḍi) claims, except those under the jurisdiction of the Expedient Courts, and with matters of personal status, probate and land. One such court exists in Mecca and one in Medina.

The one in Mecca consists of three kadi. Ordinary cases are heard by a single kadi, but the judgment is given by the full court. Cases in which the punishment may be death or mutilation are heard by the full court. The court in Medina consists of a single kadi (with a nãhû) and so does the one in Qidda, but after the recent abolition of the Expedient Court in Qidda the Greater Shan^a Court there hears all cases, except those under the jurisdiction of al-madjlis al-hubal (see below). In all the other towns of the Hijaẕ and Najḏ, the court, consisting of a single kadi, hears all cases.

The practical application of the law in certain Arab states; on the Shan^a courts in the West Bank and East Jerusalem, see A. Layish, ha-Mismad ha-dati ha-muslemini ha-gadah ha-ma'avorit ha-tekufa ha-yardenit ("Muslim religious institutions in the West Bank under Jordanian rule"), in Medina, Minhag al-Yahud ve-Yahadut Beinumyam, xi (1977), pp. 97-108; D. Farhi, ha-Mo'atza ha-muslemini be-mizra' Yerushalayim we-Yehuda ve-Shomron me-as milhemet sherhet ha-yamin ("The Muslim Council in East Jerusalem and in Judea and Samaria since the Six-Day War"), in Haminizra' Hehadasha, xxvii (1979), 1-2, 3-21, Y. Meron, The religious courts in the administered territories, 195-66. On the position of the Shan^a and the Shan^a courts in tribal society, see J. Chelbod. Le droit dans la société bidounie, Paris 1971; A. Layish and A. Shmuely, Custom and shan^a in the Bedouin family according to legal documents from the Judean Desert, in BSOAS, xlii (1979), 1-29-45, A. Layish, The islamization of the Bedouin family in the Judean Desert, as reflected in the stijlis of the Shan^a court, in E. Marx and A. Shmuely (eds.), The changing nomad: Bedouin in and around Israel, New Brunswick, N. J., 1983.

(3) The Commission on Judicial Supervision (hay'at al-mursakha al-kadd^iyya), the seat of which is in Mecca. It comprises a Board of Judicial Review (hay'at al-talddikí) consisting of four members and headed by a ra'i al-kadd^i. This body acts as a court of cassation (mahkamat al-tamýiz). It examines judgments and confirms them or returns them to the lower court for a re-hearing in order to clarify a point or to rectify a procedural error. It may reverse judgments incompatible with the Kur^an and the Sunna and direct the lower court to retry the case. If the kadi abides by his original decision, the case must be referred to another kadi. The Board also examines sentences of mutilation, death and confiscation. The Commission on Judicial Supervision gives legal opinions on matters not within the competence of the Shan^a courts.

The ra'i al-kadd^i performs the functions of President of the Supreme Court and Minister of Justice. He also supervises the Public Treasury (hay'at al-mal),
the mechanism of religious-legal opinions (ijāta) and disciplinary proceedings against kādis, and handles complaints against the functioning of any part of the sharī‘a system. Moreover, he supervises all the Public Morality Committees (hay‘at al-amr bi ‘l-ma‘ṣūfa wa l-nahy ‘an al-munkar) in the Hidżāz and Najd, the religious functionaries, education and şarī‘a institutions, including the Islamic University of Medina, and religious instruction at state educational institutions.

This şarī‘a judicial system remained in existence until the mid-seventies. Minor amendments were made by orders of the years 1931, 1936, 1938 and 1952. The name of the Commission on Judicial Supervision was changed in 1938 to Office of the Chief Justice (rīsālat al-kādāh), but its functions remained the same. In 1967, amendments were introduced in the organisation of the judiciary and in the powers of the kādis, and in 1970, a Ministry of Justice was set up. In 1974, the şarī‘a judicial system was thoroughly reorganised. Three grades of courts were established on the Western pattern: magistrates’ courts (mahākim dżuz‘yuna), district courts (mahākim ʿāmmma) and a court of cassation (mahākimat al-tamyīz). Moreover, a High Judicial Council (maddīlīs al-kādāh al-ʿalā) was formed whose functions were to supervise the kādis and to try disciplinary offences. The law ensures the independence of the kādis (they cannot be removed from office); their appointment and promotion are effected by the king on the recommendation of the Judicial Council.

Şarī‘a law applies to all matters within the competence of the Şari‘a courts. In 1927, the kādis were ordered to decide in accordance with the teachings of the Hanbali school. Six books of that school, in a specific order, were recognised as authoritative sources that must be adhered to. Thus, in a way, introduced an element of codification and unification of the material law into the nation’s judicial system. In 1927, ‘Abd al-‘Azīz Ibn Sa‘ūd, inspired by Ibn Taymiyya, suggested the preparation of a code of Islamic law based not only on the Hanbali doctrine but also on any other doctrine which, with regard to the matter in hand, was close to the Kur’ān and the Sunna. But he abandoned the idea under pressure from Hanbali scholars. In the Ottoman era, the Hanbali doctrine prevailed only in Najd and the Şarī‘a doctrine in the Hidżāz, except for the courts in the major towns, where the Hanafi doctrine enjoyed official status. An order of 1930 provided that where an express provision existed in those authoritative sources as to a case being heard by a Şari‘a court consisting of several kādis, a decision might be given without convening the members of the court; in the absence of such a provision, they were to be convened in order to exercise their collective discretion. The kādis were permitted to resort to other orthodox doctrines where the opinion of the Hanbali school was likely to cause damage and was not compatible with the public interest (majlubat al-ʿumūr). An order of 1934 required the court, in deference to local custom, to decide matters relating to contracts of lease of agricultural land (wukūd al-musākāt) or palm plantations (ṣīţār al-nakhl) in accordance with the doctrine prevailing in the locality where the action was brought. In matters containing religious observances (ibādat), the individual is free to follow the doctrine of the school to which he belongs. The Şari‘a courts are subject to the şarī‘a rules of procedure. Enactments relating to these rules were made in 1931, 1936 and 1952.

Professional lawyers have recently been authorised to appear before Şari‘a courts. In 1928, a Notarial Office (kībatat al-ṣadd) was established for the registration of şarī‘a documents (ṣuhib), powers of attorney, sales and pledges, but not of waqfs, which are within the competence of the Şari‘a courts. There are notaries in Mecca, Djidda and Medina. In provincial towns, the functions of the notary are performed by the kādi. A programmatic statement by Crown Prince Faysal’s government in 1962 promised the creation of the post of State Public Prosecutor at the Ministry of Justice.

From time to time, the King confers quasi-judicial powers on various bodies with a view to solving problems cropping up in the economic, social or administrative sphere. Some of these bodies in fact enjoy extremely wide powers. They function concurrently with the şarī‘a judicial system and are ostensibly designed to supplement it, but in reality restrict it.

The most important of these bodies is the Grievances Board (diwil al-ma‘alīm), established in 1954, whose seat is in al-Riyād, with an extension in Djidda. Anyone who believes that an injustice has been done to him by a decision of a judicial authority or by an administrative authority may complain to it. Its functions are to investigate the complaint and to suggest to the Royal Chancellery and to the government ministry concerned the adoption of measures against the authority in question; to investigate, together with other bodies, corruption offences, disciplinary offences in the army, and offences against economic boycott regulations (if the recommendations of the Board are rejected, the matter is to be brought before the King); to hear appeals against decisions of the Minister of Commerce in matters relating to foreign capital investments; to supervise the application of Şari‘a by the government in day-to-day life (the Board includes experts on Şari‘a matters and sometimes refers complaints to the Şari‘a court) and—at the special request of the King—to deal with serious matters relating to Bedouin and matters in which foreigners are involved; and to execute foreign judgments.

The chairman of the Board is appointed by the King and has the status of a government minister; since 1964, he has been responsible to the King for the work of the Board (all the other members of the Board require the approval of the King). The Grievances Board is a permanent institution. Its simple procedure and the fact that most of its members are lawyers with a modern background ensure greater flexibility in the conduct of proceedings than prevails in şarī‘a justice.

Other administrative-judicial bodies are the Commission on Cases of Forgery (taṣawwīr), established in 1960, headed by the Minister of Justice and including representatives of the Grievances Board; the Commission on Cases of Bribery, established in 1962 and headed by the chairman of the Grievances Board; and the Commission on the Impeachment of Ministers, competent to try various offences, ranging from interference by Ministers in the working of the judicial system to high treason (punishable with death); it is an ad hoc body appointed by the Prime Minister and consists of ministers and senior kādis; death sentences must be passed unanimously; the judgments of the Court are appealable to the King.

Several judicial bodies deal with commercial matters: the Central Committee on Cases of Adulteration (ghishsh tidjari), which tries offences connected with food and drugs; and Chambers of Commerce (şurūfat al-tidjara), established in 1963 and consisting of representatives of the economic minorities, which can act as arbitral boards in commercial disputes. The most important of these bodies was the Commercial
Tribunal (mahkama tidjariyya), first established in Djidda in 1926 for the handling of commercial disputes. Its composition and powers were laid down by a commercial regulation in 1931. It consisted of a presiding man. Their judgments were appealable to the Commercial Tribunal in Djidda. Damman were abolished and their functions taken over by the Ministry of Commerce in 1954. They were restored in 1963, when Commercial Disputes Arbitration Boards were set up, one in each city, each Board consisting of three officials of the Ministry of Commerce and Industry. A Commercial Disputes Appeals Board was established in 1967, consisting of three officials of the same ministry, one of them, its head, the Deputy Minister. These Boards are not bound by the Shar‘i ‘a, but can draw upon it as well as upon Western law and international law and agreements. The Saudi authorities have recently directed that agreements of commercial companies shall contain an express clause forbidding the settlement of disputes by arbitration contrary to the principles of the Shar‘i ‘a.

A Supreme Board on Labour Disputes was set up in 1963; it consists of the legal advisers of the Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs and the Ministry of Petroleum and Minerals. Disciplinary Councils for Civil Servants try offenders—by virtue of regulations of 1958—only after they have been convicted by a Shar‘i ‘a court. Disciplinary Councils for Military Personnel act as military tribunals by virtue of regulations of 1947. Their judgments may be set aside or appealed by the Chief of the General Staff or the Minister of Defence. Disciplinary Councils for Internal Security Personnel try police officers, members of the coast guard, frontier patrolmen, members of the fire brigade and criminal investigators. The King supervises the judicial system by virtue of his being the supreme šerif and sometimes sits on the bench himself. The same system operates in Egypt. In 1962 the country was divided into four provinces, each with a high court (zakf). The provinces are administered by a governor assisted by a high commissioner.

Saudi Arabia was not subject to the influence of foreign systems of law other than the Ottoman, the impact of which was limited to the Hijaz. The Shar‘i ‘a functioned here in a sovereign Muslim state which had grown out of the Wahhabiyya, a movement directed that agreements of commercial companies have been entered into, although the terminology is Shar‘i ‘a as far as possible; social laws and laws regulating labour relations and transport have been enacted; slavery was abolished in 1962 in deference to international public opinion, although there are indications that reality is still stronger than the law; Shar‘i ‘i criminal law, including the harsh Kur‘anic penalties (decapitation and mutilation for theft), is still mainly applied, although a tendency to replace corporeal punishment by imprisonment or fines is discernible; new penalties, not strictly conforming to the provisions of the Shar‘i ‘a, have been introduced (e.g. the drinking of wine (shurb al-khamr) entails a discretionary punishment (ta‘zir), not a Kur‘i ‘i one (had); blood-money (diya) has been limited; penalties have been prescribed for forgery, strikes, causing death or injury in road accidents and military offences); there are deviations from the Shar‘i ‘a as to the status of non-Muslims (e.g. their testimony in criminal proceedings has the same weight as that of Muslims and their oath is accepted; the same blood-money is exacted for them as for Muslims).


Towards the end of their rule in Yemen, the Ottomans tried to apply their laws there and firmly to establish there the Şafi‘i school, whose main foothold was in the Tihama region and in the south of the country. The Imam resisted this attempt successfully. A sultanate firmân of 1913 confirmed the Treaty of Dâ‘ân of 1911, by which the Ottomans agreed to the demands of the Imam, the most important of them being the reinstatement of the Shar‘i ‘a as the only system of law in Yemen. The Imam was fact impair its substantive validity; important reforms have been made in commercial law: regulations based on the Ottoman Commercial Code of 1850, in turn based on a purely French model, have been enacted with the omission of all references to interest (that Code is applied in the tribunals of the chambers of commerce); banks have begun to operate on the basis of interest, although it is called commission; marine and other property insurance is permitted, though not, for the time being, life insurance; extensive fiscal legislation (customs duties, income and alms (zakat) tax, etc.) has been enacted; contracts regulating oil concessions to foreign companies have been entered into, although the terminology is Shar‘i ‘a as far as possible; social laws and laws regulating labour relations and transport have been enacted; slavery was abolished in 1962 in deference to international public opinion, although there are indications that reality is still stronger than the law; Shar‘i ‘i criminal law, including the harsh Kur‘anic penalties (decapitation and mutilation for theft), is still mainly applied, although a tendency to replace corporeal punishment by imprisonment or fines is discernible; new penalties, not strictly conforming to the provisions of the Shar‘i ‘a, have been introduced (e.g. the drinking of wine (shurb al-khamr) entails a discretionary punishment (ta‘zir), not a Kur‘i ‘i one (hadd); blood-money (diya) has been limited; penalties have been prescribed for forgery, strikes, causing death or injury in road accidents and military offences); there are deviations from the Shar‘i ‘a as to the status of non-Muslims (e.g. their testimony in criminal proceedings has the same weight as that of Muslims and their oath is accepted; the same blood-money is exacted for them as for Muslims).


Towards the end of their rule in Yemen, the Ottomans tried to apply their laws there and firmly to establish there the Şafi‘i school, whose main foothold was in the Tihama region and in the south of the country. The Imam resisted this attempt successfully. A sultanate firmân of 1913 confirmed the Treaty of Dâ‘ân of 1911, by which the Ottomans agreed to the demands of the Imam, the most important of them being the reinstatement of the Shar‘i ‘a as the only system of law in Yemen. The Imam was
authorised to appoint kadis to the courts in regions populated by Zaydi Shi'is (the San'a region and the northern mountainous province). The power of the Ottoman sultan was confined to the enforcement of their judgments.

After World War I, when Yemen obtained full independence, it became a theocracy. Zaydi Shi'i law, which is nearest to Sunni law, held unlimited sway in the imamate. The Imam was the spiritual head, the head of the executive branch and the Supreme Judge (al-kadi al-lā'i).

The powers of the Shari'a courts are very wide. They comprise personal status and criminal law. Severe Kur'anic punishments, such as death and mutilation, are still applied, though not frequently. The Imam has directed that Zaydi Shi'i law shall be applied in the courts. The Shari'a courts system consists of several grades. The court of first instance is manned by a single judge (ādām). His judgement is appealable, with the consent of the local governor (āamil), to a higher judge and finally to the High Court of Appeal (ra'a' al-istīn 'nāf), which has its seat in San'a. The Imam is the supreme appellate authority, but appeals to him are infrequent. The Imam appoints the judges in all the districts and sub-districts from among the graduates of al-Madrasa al-ilmīyya in San'a. The amir al-lā'ī enforces their judgments, but the supervision of the shari'a system is the prerogative of the Imam.

Concurrently with the Shari'a judicial system, a judicial system of the provincial governor (âmīl) functions which handles civil matters. Its judgments are appealable to the prince as ruler of the principality (lūđ) or, in certain cases, to the Imam. This system is governed by the Shari'a as far as commercial transactions and tax matters are concerned.

The Imam's courts operate in the towns. Outside the towns, among the tribes, an arbital (mankud) system exists, and tribal councils adjudicate disputes concerning water, boundaries and criminal offences in accordance with tribal custom (urf) and tradition (ādāliyya). Appeals against judgments of tribal courts are heard by the āamil, whose judgments are in turn appealable to the provincial amir. Here, too, the Imam is the supreme appellate authority. The Imam has sought to eliminate customary justice and to subject the Bedouin to the Shari'a. For this purpose, he has appointed persons with a religious training as judges in the customary judicial system, hoping that they will gradually substitute the shari'a for traditional customary law, but he has had only partial success. He has had to recognise 'urf justice officially by the side of shari'a justice.

When Aden was a British protectorate, it had a dual judicial system, part shari'a (with wide powers in matters of personal status and criminal law) and part customary. The Imam of Yemen accepted the situation on condition that the Shari'a was applied. Most kadis were ordered to adhere to the Shafi'i doctrine and even more to that of Ibn Ḥadār. There is evidence of the application of Kur'anic punishments, including the death penalty. Only minor reforms were introduced during that period.

In the period preceding the British conquest of Aden in 1839, the kadis of Lahj and al-āmil were appointed by the Imam of Yemen; their judgments were only enforced with the consent of the parties. After the British conquest, a central administration was established in the sultanate of Lahj and, inter alia, Shari'a courts equipped with wide powers, including the imposition of sanctions, were set up there by the sultan. Customary courts functioned side by side with them; their procedure and rules of evidence differed only slightly from those of the Shari'a courts. In 1950, a law establishing an Agricultural Court (al-mahkama al-zir'īyya) was enacted in the sultanate of Labdh; this court applies the provisions of that law as well as custom and agricultural practice. The purpose of that law was to exclude agricultural matters from the jurisdiction of the Shari'a courts and the application of the Shari'a.

Since the achievement in 1967 of the independence of the People's Republic of Southern Yemen, of which the Aden Colony and the Western and Eastern Protectorsates form part, the judicial system has, in the main, continued unchanged. On the other hand, in 1974, a family law was enacted of a rationalism unparalleled in the Muslim Middle East. Under Marxist influence, it aims at complete equality between the sexes. Some of the reforms contained in it have no basis whatsoever in Islamic law (see Section 4, x below). The courts apply a combination of customary and shari'a procedure. A procedural law was under consideration at the beginning of 1972.


ix. The Gulf states

Under the British protectorate, most of the Persian Gulf Shaykhdoms and Trucial States had no courts of law in the accepted sense of the term. Justice was administered "under the palm tree" by the rulers themselves, who applied the Shari'a loosely and arbitrarily or were assisted by kadis. Some of the Shaykhdoms had a dual judicial system: part shari'a, dealing with matters of personal status, and part civil, dealing with all other, including criminal and commercial, matters and strongly influenced by English law.

After independence, the judicial system was reorganised. The Provisional Constitution of the United Arab Emirates of 1971, confirmed for another five years in 1976, provides that Islam shall be the religion of the Union and that the Shari'a shall be a principal source of the Union's legislation. But in fact, even the Shari'a judicial system is not, in most of the countries, based on pure shari'a law. Shari'a law is here attenuated or superseded by customary law or modern legislation. The civil courts apply several sources of law, of which the Shari'a is only one and not the most important. In some of the countries, a civil code modelled on the Egyptian Civil Code of 1948 has been introduced, of which the Shari'a is supposed to be one source of inspiration; but the role of the Shari'a is this context should not be exaggerated. The new graded civil system comprises many lawyers from other Arab countries.

In Kuwait, a dual judicial system, part shari'a and part civil, was functioning under the British protectorate. The jurisdiction of the Shari'a kadis was confined to matters of personal status. The ruler set up two new courts, for criminal and civil matters, respectively. He had jurisdiction not only over his own subjects but
also over resident nationals of some other Arab countries. Those courts applied the Šarīʿa and the ordinances of the ruler. The harsh Kūrānic punishments were abolished. In 1959, an Organisation of Judicial and other matters, including the personal status and succession. The legal system remained unchanged after independence (1961).

The courts apply the products of some very intensive modern law-making: codes of procedure, of criminal law and of commercial law have been enacted. Matters of personal status and blood-money (diya) of Muslims are still dealt with in accordance with the Šarīʿa, as taught by the respective schools. The Kuwaiti constitution provides that the Šarīʿa shall be the principal basis of legislation, but in point of fact the main source of inspiration is reformed Egyptian legislation, especially the Civil Code prepared by ʿAbd al-Razzāk al-San히ī. In 1977, a commission was appointed to amend and develop Kuwaiti legislation in accordance with the provisions of the Šarīʿa, but it is too early to assess the real significance of these terms of reference.

Under the British protectorate, a dual judicial system, part sharʿi and part civil, was set up in Bahrayn. The Šarīʿa courts, subdivided into Sunnī and Diʿāʾi sharʿi sections, dealt with matters of personal status and applied the Šarīʿa in accordance with the relevant doctrine. The Shāykh and members of his family acted as judges in the civil courts. These courts applied the ordinances of the Shāykh and customary law, which was largely based on Sudanese law; in any case, the Šarīʿa was not applied in these courts. The ruler also had jurisdiction over resident nationals of some other Arab states.

The dual, Šarīʿa and civil, system remained in existence after independence (1971) and so did the subdivision of the Šarīʿa courts (including the appeal stage) into Sunnī and Diʿāʾi sharʿi sections. The powers of the Šarīʿa courts are confined to matters of personal status of Muslims, while the civil courts have jurisdiction in civil, commercial and criminal matters and in matters of personal status of non-Muslims. The Constitution of Bahrayn of 1973 provides that the Šarīʿa shall be a principal source of legislation, and the Judicature Law of 1971 lays down that in the absence of a suitable provision in legislation, the judge shall base his decision on the principles of the Šarīʿa or, if the latter, too, fails to offer a solution, on custom. Local custom is to be given priority over general custom, and where no guidance is found in custom, the tenets of natural law or the principles of equity and good conscience shall be applied.

In Kātar, too, a dual, Šarīʿa and civil, judicial system was established under the British protectorate. The Šarīʿa courts decided matters of marriage, divorce and succession in accordance with the Šarīʿa as taught by the Hanbali school. The ruler set up a civil court, which heard also criminal cases. It applied customary law and the decrees of the ruler. The ruler had advisers from among the religious leadership, whose task it was to see that the decrees did not deviate from the Šarīʿa. The ban on the import, sale and consumption of alcoholic beverages was also strictly enforced. Through the activity of the ruler's British adviser, who served in the civil judiciary, English law, as applied in India and the Sudan, greatly influenced the criminal law of Kātar. The harsh Kūrānic punishments, such as mutilation, had long been abolished. The last few years have seen a considerable output of civil and criminal legislation, which is applied in the civil courts. In 1971, a Civil and Commercial Law was enacted, based on the Egyptian Civil Code of 1948. It designates the Šarīʿa as a source of law only to be applied in the absence of a suitable norm in either statute or custom. There has also been legislation in specific spheres of commerce, such as the Share Companies Law, 1961, for the settlement of disputes with foreign oil companies by arbitration.

Šarīʿa justice in Abū Ḍubayḥ Zabī is regulated by legislation of the years 1968 and 1970. A distinction is made between matters of personal status and succession, dealt with by Šarīʿa kādīs, and other civil matters, dealt with by civil judges. However, there is no formal distinction between a Šarīʿa and a civil judicial system. Every District Court has a Šarīʿa kādī. A civil matter other than of personal status or succession may be referred to the Šarīʿa kādī with the consent of the parties. Both the civil judges and the Šarīʿa kādīs are to act in accordance with justice or conscience or with the general principles of justice, provided that they are guided by Islamic law. The ruler appoints all the judges, including the kādīs.

The dual judicial system in Dubayy is still the Šarīʿa one. The entire legal system is regulated by the Courts Law of 1970. The civil courts are competent only for a few specific matters, leaving the Šarīʿa courts with residiary jurisdiction. Still, under the same law, the ruler may transfer any matter or action from the Šarīʿa court to the civil court. Most commercial matters have recently been so transferred. There are also criminal courts. The Šarīʿa courts are competent to apply the Šarīʿa with the qualifications required by the laws of the emirate. Except for a few matters regulated by local custom and tradition, legal disputes are settled in the Šarīʿa court in accordance with the principles of the Šarīʿa. The civil courts are to apply usage and custom, the principles of natural justice, the law of equity, and the laws and legal practices of neighbouring countries, in addition to the laws of the emirate and the Šarīʿa. The Law of Procedure of 1971, which relates to civil and commercial matters, allows significant deviations from Šarīʿa procedure, such as written testimony. The ruler appoints the kādīs, including the Chief Šarīʿa Judge.

Until 1968, Šarjah (al-Šārika) had only Šarīʿa courts. Sunnīs and Shīʿīs had separate courts (and waqf administrations). These courts had jurisdiction in all matters. In 1968, the judicial system was reorganised: civil courts were established by the side of the Šarīʿa courts, whose jurisdiction was from then on confined to matters of personal status, succession and wills of Muslims, and waqf and blood-money (diya) where at least one of the parties was a Muslim. The civil court has jurisdiction, in civil and criminal matters, also over non-Muslim foreigners. A law of 1971 reconfirmed the dual judicial system and empowered the ruler to establish ad hoc judicial bodies for all matters. The law applying in the Šarīʿa courts is
Islamic law, Sunni or Shi'i, as the case may be. The civil courts are to apply the statutes of the Shâhkîdîm, the principles of Islamic law, the decisions of Muslim jurists, common law and local custom, and the general principles of English law: right, justice and equity. There has been intensive legislative activity in the fields of criminal law, contracts, commercial law etc., as a result of which the Sharja legal system is the most developed of any of the United Arab Emirates.

TheSharî'a is the principal system of law also in 'Adjmân, Umm al-Khaywayn, Ras al-Khayma and Fujayrah. 'Adjmân and Ras'a al-Khayma have also civil courts. In Ras'a al-Khayma, a Courts Law patterned on the corresponding law of Dubaiyy was enacted in 1971; it confers wide powers on the Sharî'a courts, also in civil matters other than personal status and in criminal matters. A law of 1972 regulates the functioning of the Sharî'a Court of Appeal. In the case of death sentences, appeal is automatic.

In the sultanate of Muscat and Oman (Maskat and 'Umân) (Oman since 1970), the Sharî'a is about as firmly established as in Sa'ūdi Arabia. There is no written constitution. The Sharî'a courts have wide jurisdiction, including criminal matters involving Kur'ânic punishments, although there is a tendency to mitigate the latter. There are still public executions, but decapitation and mutilation are banned. The Sharî'a courts apply the non-codified law of the Iṣâbi sect (see Mādīyya), to which most of the population of the sultanate belongs, with such modifications as are out of legislation enacted by the Sultan in civil and commercial matters to meet present-day requirements, viz. legislation relating to investments by foreigners, commercial companies and banking. The judgment of the kâdi is appealable to a bench of kâdis and to a Chief Court, the seat of which is in Oman. A final appeal lies to the Sultan.

There is a separate court for matters in which foreigners are involved; its seat is in Muscat. When the sultanate was a British protectorate, the Consular Court had jurisdiction in certain matters concerning British nationals, but when the British subjects and local nationals, the Sultan had jurisdiction. The Commercial Companies Law of 1974 established a Committee for the Settlement of Commercial Disputes, vested with judicial powers. In large areas of the sultanate outside the urban centres, tribal justice and custom reign almost absolute.


x. Morocco

Before the establishment of the French and Spanish Protectorates, the peoples under the sultan's authority had recourse, more or less, to matters of personal status, property and contracts or religious enforcements (aškā, to the kādis who were to be found in centres of some importance. Till the middle of the 19th century, the kādi of Fâs had the title of kādi 'l-kudâr and filled all religious offices. Later, the Moroc-
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quenty controlled them; they were nominated, transferred on their own demand (because they were immovable) and on occasion penalised, by dahirs. At the time of their nomination they received a silver seal, which charged no fees. In any case, a dahir of 20 Shawwāl 1332/11 September 1914 already envisaged the retention of customary law (which some Berberists strove to collect and record in written form), but it was the dahir of 10 Dhu ‘l-Hijja 1348/15 May 1930 which firmly established courts at Rabat (4 Sha‘bān 1345/7 February 1927), Tétouan and Tangiers.

In his mahkama, the kāddis is assisted by a number, fixed for each centre, of notaries which he proposes himself but who have to pass an examination unless they have certain qualifications. These ‘udul, whose status was established by a decree of 24 Rabī‘ II 1337/23 June 1936, are paid, according to complicated calculations, on the issuing of the judicial deeds which they have to task of drawing up. Furthermore, the mahkama has in certain cases an executive official (‘awm) and a matron (‘arifa) to take care of women. After the dahir of 16 Sha‘bān 1342/23 March 1924, litigants could be represented by an oukli (wakil, pl. wukalā‘) or legal pleader whose functions were laid down in a very detailed dahir of 18 Safar/7 September 1925. Advocates, for their part, could only intervene, and then only on a written basis, before an appeal court. In each gharīz court, six registers had to be kept: for landed property, miscellaneous deeds, successions, lawsuits, appeals and the careers of the ‘udul: after the dahir of 12 Safar 1363/7 February 1944, acts of witness were entered in a separate register.

As for the mahkān [q.v.] courts (al-mahkāmāt al-makhzanīyya), that is, those of the pashas in the towns and of the kā‘ids among the tribes, these were regulated by several dahirs, the most important of which was that of 26 Shawwāl 1336/4 August 1918. These officials had limited competence up to a certain sum of money in civil and commercial cases; they could refer complicated cases to the kā‘ids or have recourse to expert criminal law. As early as 17 Muharram 1376/25 August 1956, the shari‘a courts had a certain number of Moroccans who had the protection, as individuals, of a foreign power benefited from the capitulations [see smrīzār] and thus received justice from the regular courts; these last were replaced in the French zone on 9 Ramadan 1331/13 August 1913 and in the Spanish one on 1 June 1914 by courts with exclusive competence in all cases where non-Moroccans were involved, whilst at Tangiers mixed courts were set up by dahir of 16 February 1924.

For its part, the Jewish community in Morocco had, in respect of personal legal status, courts which were controlled by dahir, in 1918 in the French zone, in 1914 at Tangiers and in 1914 in the Spanish zone, as well as a rabbinical high court. Finally, foreigners and a certain number of Moroccans who had the protection, as individuals, of a foreign power benefited from the capitulations [see smrīzār] and thus received justice from the regular courts; these last were replaced in the French zone on 9 Ramadan 1331/13 August 1913 and in the Spanish one on 1 June 1914 by courts with exclusive competence in all cases where non-Moroccans were involved, whilst at Tangiers mixed courts were set up by dahir of 16 February 1924.

Among the Berber tribes, it was the djama‘a which continued to decide cases between members of the group according to local customs, also unwritten. As the French forces advanced into the dissident areas, some kā’ids were progressively installed there, but experience showed that those seeking justice continued in general to address themselves to the djama‘a, which charged no fees. In any case, a dahir of 20 Shawwāl 1332/11 September 1914 already envisaged the retention of customary law (which some Berberists strove to collect and record in written form), but it was the dahir of 10 Dhu ‘l-Hijja 1348/15 May 1930 which firmly established courts at Rabat (4 Sha‘bān 1345/7 February 1927), Tétouan and Tangiers.

For its part, the Jewish community in Morocco had, in respect of personal legal status, courts which were controlled by dahir, in 1918 in the French zone, in 1914 at Tangiers and in 1914 in the Spanish zone, as well as a rabbinical high court. Finally, foreigners and a certain number of Moroccans who had the protection, as individuals, of a foreign power benefited from the capitulations [see smrīzār] and thus received justice from the regular courts; these last were replaced in the French zone on 9 Ramadan 1331/13 August 1913 and in the Spanish one on 1 June 1914 by courts with exclusive competence in all cases where non-Moroccans were involved, whilst at Tangiers mixed courts were set up by dahir of 16 February 1924.
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For its part, the Jewish community in Morocco had, in respect of personal legal status, courts which were controlled by dahir, in 1918 in the French zone, in 1914 at Tangiers and in 1914 in the Spanish zone, as well as a rabbinical high court. Finally, foreigners and a certain number of Moroccans who had the protection, as individuals, of a foreign power benefited from the capitulations [see smrīzār] and thus received justice from the regular courts; these last were replaced in the French zone on 9 Ramadan 1331/13 August 1913 and in the Spanish one on 1 June 1914 by courts with exclusive competence in all cases where non-Moroccans were involved, whilst at Tangiers mixed courts were set up by dahir of 16 February 1924.
called sadadiyya, regional (iklimisyya) courts and the high Sharifian court and fixing their spheres of competence in both civil and criminal affairs. A dahir of 14 Radjab 1348/16 December 1929 had created conciliation boards with the task of settling conflicts in labour matters; these were replaced on 28 Ramadan 1376/29 April 1957 by labour courts (mahkāmat al-shughl).

As for sharī‘i justice, it had been reorganised by a dahir of 5 Dū‘amād 1 1376/8 December 1956, which had created several new courts, apart from those which were to replace the customary law courts, and had instituted in the various regional courts boards with the task of examining appeals directed against judgements of the kādis‘ courts. In the following year, on 23 Dū‘amād I 1377/16 December 1957, the procedure to be followed by the sharī‘i courts was fixed by a law less detailed than the code of civil procedure promulgated in 1913. In the same year, on 22 Muharram/16 August, there was set up a commission with the task of codifying fākh. It began immediately on the law of personal status, which was naturally to remain in the sphere reserved to the kādis‘, and it speedily brought its activities to an end. On 20 November 1962 a criminal code, in large measure based on French legislation, was promulgated.

Regarding appeal courts, the dahir of 25 Sa‘far 1377/29 September 1957 ended that of Tetouan, reorganised the one at Tangiers and created one at Rabat to replace the high Sharifian court; a third appeal court has been set up at Fās on 29 Shawwāl 1380/15 April 1961. From 2 Rābi‘ 1377/27 September 1957 onwards, control over the Moroccan legal system was vested in the Superior Council (al-māqālīs al-a‘dād). The law of 23 Ramadan 1384/26 January 1965 made the Moroccanisation, Arabisation and unification of the administration obligatory, and this was followed by a formal unification of the judicial system and by a decree of the Minister of Justice requiring use of the Arabic language in all documents laid before the courts. Despite the progress achieved, in particular in the sphere of criminal law, which is no longer in the hands of administrators, there still exists a certain vacillation arising from the divergent tendencies of the personnel involved, some wishing to preserve at least part of the system bequeathed by the Protectorate whilst others want to create a totally new and original system.

Bibliography: For the pre-independence period, see H. Bruno, La justice indigène, in Introduction à la connaissance du Maroc, Casablanca 1942, 413-30; A. Coudindo, Fonctionnement de la justice berbère, in ibid., 431-46; and the ch. on the legal system in the treatise of ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd Benāshenhu, al-Bayān al-mustūri li-nizām al-hukmāt al-Maghribī, Rabat 1370/1957. For the following period, an unpublished account by Idrīs al-Dahālīk, al-‘Adlī al-magHRĪṣYI min khilāl rābi‘ karn, has been used. (Ed.)

xi. Algeria. [See Supplement]

xii. Tunisia. [See Supplement]

xiii. Reforms in the law applying in Shari‘a courts.

In the 20th century, many reforms, some of them very far-reaching, have been effected in matters of personal status: succession and wakf, which are under the jurisdiction of the Shari‘a courts. The most important of them are the raising of the age of competence for marriage and the imposition of restrictions on the marriage of minors; the prohibition of forced marriages; the prohibition of marriage of persons having reached the age of competence for marriage; the prevention of great differences in age between spouses; the restriction of the institution of equality in marriage (kafā ‘a) to the point of complete abolition and the limitation of the functions of the marriage-guardian; the limitation of the amount of the dower (Southern Yemen, 1974); the refinement of the use of stipulations in the marriage contract to improve the position of women; the performance of marriages in courts of law (‘Irāk, 1978); and the prohibition of polygamy, leaving discretion to the kādis‘ to permit it under special circumstances (in Southern Yemen, the consent of the District Court is required for polygamy, 1974).

The amount of maintenance of the wife is fixed in accordance with the economic position of the husband; both spouses are responsible for their own support and that of their children, each according to his or her ability (Southern Yemen, 1974); maintenance awarded by the court is paid by a government authority, which in turn recoups itself from the judgment debtor (Egypt, 1976; Israel 1972).

Worongs resulting from the husband’s right of arbitrary divorce have been redressed: repudiation pronounced in a state of drunkenness or in a state of ignorance or a fit of anger and divorce by way of an oath or a threat (provided there is no intent to divorce) are invalid; the effect of a double or triple repudiation pronounced on a single occasion has been reduced to that of one revocable divorce; divorce against the wife’s will is prohibited (Israel 1951, 1959); the husband must seek judicial approval or registration of the divorce or dissolution of the marriage by the court (Southern Yemen, 1974); compensation to the amount of one or two years’ maintenance, in addition to waiting-period maintenance, is due to a wife divorced without justification (Syria, 1953; Jordan, 1976; Egypt, 1979); the respective economic resources of the spouses must be equalised upon divorce (Israel, 1973). Additional grounds have been provided for dissolution or the initiative of the wife by the court: spouses: a physical or mental defect of the husband, sterility of the husband; non-payment of prompt dowry (before consummation of marriage) or of maintenance to the wife; cruelty; the taking of a second wife; prolonged separation from or abandonment of the wife without legal cause (even if maintenance is provided), prevention of the wife from entering the conjugal dwelling after marriage; imprisonment of the husband for several years, together with non-supply of maintenance; and adultery of the spouse (‘Irāk, 1978).

The period of the mother’s custody of minors has been extended in the interest of their well-being; both parents have been declared the natural guardians of their children (Israel, 1951, 1962). The rights of heirs within the nuclear family have been strengthened, with daughters, in the absence of sons, being given preference over other Kur‘ānic heirs; the spouse enjoys the radd, the residue of the estate, in the absence of Kur‘ānic heirs and dhu‘ayn ‘l-‘aridim; germane brothers—contrary to the position of the Hanafi school—share the uterine brothers’ portion of the estate in cases where the Kur‘ānic portions exhaust the estate (Jordan, 1976); the Shi‘ī system of succession, which is not based on the agnatic principle, has been adopted (‘Irāk, 1963); the rights of heirs have been determined on the basis of equality of the sexes (‘Irāk, 1959 to 1963; Palestine, 1923; Israel, 1951,
bequests in favour of legal heirs have been permitted to the extent of one-third of the estate; the absence of the principle of representation has been indicated in the deed; a stipulation by the founder as to the conduct of the beneficiary is no longer valid; the disinheritance of legal heirs by means of a Wakf exceeding one-third of the estate has been prohibited; Wakf property is to be administered by the beneficiaries; Wakf property damaged beyond repair through neglect is to be liquidated. Most of these reforms relate to Wakf to be established in the future. The military regimes in Syria (1949) and Egypt (1952) abolished the family Wakf completely. In 1957, Egypt nationalised the property of that Wakf for the purposes of agrarian reform. In Israel (1965), the family and Khayr al-husn was as far as they comprised absentee property, were abolished; the property is to pass into the full ownership of the beneficiaries and of Muslim boards of trustees, respectively. Important reforms have also been effected in the rule of law in most of the countries of the Arab world. Written evidence is now admissible and is accorded the same weight as oral testimony—in fact, with regard to some matters, documentary evidence is eligible but not oral testimony; witnesses may be cross-examined; the court is given discretion to assess the credibility of the witness and the testimony; the defendant may bring witnesses to refute the testimony of the plaintiff’s witnesses; the defendant may return the oath to the plaintiff; circumstantial evidence is admissible; periods of prescription of actions have been introduced. Rulers and parliaments have used a wide gamut of methods to introduce reforms in the law applied by the courts: (1) The procedural expedient: refusal of legal relief to parties who disregard a particular reformist norm, such as the age of competence for marriage. That expedient is based on the ruler’s right to restrict the powers of the court (takhsí i l-kadí). (2) The takhassus expedient: the selection of elements within or outside the horizon of the ruling school which suit the purpose the legislator seeks to achieve; sometimes such elements, patched together into a statute, contradict one another (talif). The theoretical justification of this expedient lies in the power of the ruler to direct the kadi, his agent, to apply a particular doctrine, and disregard others, in the public interest (maslah). In the Sudan, the direction was given by means of a “judicial circular” issued by the Grand Kadi with the consent of the British Governor-General. (3) Administrative orders, provided that they do not conflict with the Sharí’a; they rely on the duty of Muslims to obey their rulers. In Saudi Arabia, the reforms are carried out by means of royal orders based on the utility principle: al-maslah al-mursala or maslahat al-umum or istiṣḥāṣ al-khawāṣṣ. (4) Criminal legislation which, while its sanctions are supposed to deter potential violators of reformist norms, such as the age of competence for marriage and the prohibition of polygamy, does not derogate from the substantive validity of the Sharí’a. (5) A “modernistic” interpretation of the textual sources (Kur'ān and Sunnah) which is aimed at adapting them to the requirements of present-day society. In Saudi Arabia, the plenum of the Greater Sharí’a Court may practise legal reasoning (iṣlāḥ) collectively. (6) The abolition of the Sharí’a courts and the application of Islamic substantive law by civil courts; that is, the doctrine of legal reasoning (iṣlah) in the absence of the principle of representation has been abolished; iṣlah is implied to be a Court may practise legal reasoning (iṣlah) collectively. This has been considered by some scholars as a purely technical, resemblance to the classical iṣlah (q.v.). There are material differences as to the mode of using those sources (replacement of the deductive kiyās (q.v.) by the maslahah or utility principle) and as to the sources of inspiration and motivation of the reforms (Western ideas, and pressures arising from a disturbance of balances in Muslim society as a result of modernisation and Westernisation). The reforms rely on state-imposed, not religious, sanctions, and their somewhat forced link with Islamic sources has been severed in the process of legislation. They have an autonomous existence, independent of the sources, and should only be interpreted within the framework of the statutes in which they are embodied. In some cases, they have no basis at all in religious law. They are, first and foremost, legislative acts of the legislators. It is true that even in the past the secular legislation of caliphs and temporal rulers was outside the Sharí’a, but there was then the pious fiction that this legislation was intended to supplement the Sharí’a and that everybody, including the ruler, was subject to the latter, whereas today the parliaments are the declared sources of sovereignty and set bounds to the Sharí’a. Most Arab countries are today at an advanced stage of transition from jurists’ law to statute law, and the question of iṣlah has thus ceased to be relevant. The purpose of resort to traditional mechanisms in legislation is a national and tactical one: the creation of the impression that the reforms are a kind of internal renovation of the Sharí’a. Islamic law is conceived as part of the Arab national-cultural heritage; this prevents the creation of an ideological deth and subjection to the West. Reference to the modernist school of Muhammad Abduh is intended to facilitate acceptance of the reforms by the 'ulamā’ and conservative circles and by the sharī'ī judiciary. The success of the reforms depends, to a decisive extent, on the kāfis charged with the application of the legislation designed for the Sharí’a courts. The kāfis, including those integrated into the national courts in Egypt, have in their vast majority had a traditional sharī’ī training. It seems that, contrary to the expectations of the legislator, they do not exercise the wide discretion given to them and that in many cases, out of devotion to taklīf, they ignore reformist legislation. At the same time there have been cases (in Israel) in which that legislation impressed the kāfis and they explicitly relied on it in their judgments. Here the kāfis were not opposed to legislation in so far as it did not supersed the Sharí’a. Some kāfis would even welcome additional legislation, procedural or penal, with a view to using the statutory sanction to buttress the sharī’ī norm, which is sustained by a toothless ethical sanction. Druze kāfis still use religious and social sanctions of court. Some kāfis do not shrink from calling for legislation for a definitely substantive character. The increasing ascendency in the Sharī’a courts of lawyers with a secular training and a modern social outlook will eventually, in judicial practice, lead to a
kind of synthesis between the *Shari'a* and national law. There are *kādis* who, in their liberal interpretation of religious law, do not hesitate to deviate from *takhlīd* and *thaflīk*, by means of the techniques of *tadkīq* and *talīfīk*, have scored achievements not inferior to those of parliamentary legislation. In Saudi Arabia, the *kādis*, in the absence of an express provision as to a particular matter in authoritative Hanbali literature—as designated by decree—are permitted to rely on elements from other doctrines as far as it is in the public interest to do so, and there have in fact been cases in which they applied the *majāla* mechanism in their decisions.

The *kādis* make use of their personal authority, sometimes with the assistance of mediators, to bring about a peaceful settlement of disputes and to give the effect of judgments to compromises that have been reached. They thereby continue a tradition of tribal arbitration. This method also prevents a confrontation with religious law. The proceedings are simple, quick and matter-of-fact. Druze *kādis* are sometimes called upon to act as arbitrators in criminal cases heard before civil courts.

The *kādis* react in different ways to the encounter of *Shari'a* and custom (*urf, *nda* [q.v.]), according to their degree of orthodoxy, education and professional training, their social philosophy and the measure of their understanding of the Islamisation processes of a society not yet wont to regard Islam as an obligatory way of life. Some reject custom absolutely; others acquiesce in its sovereign existence by the side of the *Shari'a*, but there are also attempts to absorb custom, whilst compromising with it, into the *Shari'a*. Custom is an extremely important source of law in the jurisprudence of the Druze courts, owing to the absence of a tradition of institutionalised communal justice and the esoteric character of Druze religious law.

Following the introduction of a uniform and binding material law (secular statutes), and a hierarchy of collegial courts and appeal stages, in the *shari'ā* judicial system, there are significant indications of the development of a case law, a phenomenon alien to the *Shari'a*. For the time being, there are no significant effects of the abolition of the *Shari'a* courts in Egypt. The *kādis*, who have been integrated into the national courts, continue, out of loyalty to *takhlīd*, to resist not only Islamic substantive law but also the Islamic rules of evidence and procedure, as they used to do in the *Shari'a* courts. But there can be no doubt that in the long run, as their place is taken by civil judges with a secular legal training and no traditional *shari'ā* education, the reform will make itself felt and Islamic law will be exposed to the influence of secular—national and Western—legal principles.


5. THE INDO-PAKISTAN SUBCONTINENT. [See Supplement]

6. INDONESIA

The complex history of Islamic courts in Indonesia is evident in the many names by which they have been known over the last century in various parts of the country: among them *Pengadilan Sarambi*, *Priesterraad*, *Road Agama*, *Penghulu Gerecht*, *Rapat Kadi*, *Pengadilan Agama*, *Makhamah Syariah*, and at the appeals level *Makhamah Islam Tinggi*, *Keranatan Kadi Besar*, *Makhamah Syariah Propensi*, and *Pengadilan Tinggi Agama*. The mixed roots of these terms reflect the subtle interplay of Islamic, pre-Islamic, and Dutch colonial influences in the evolution of the courts. When in 1960 the Ministry of Religion finally imposed a uniform religious-judicial nomenclature throughout Indonesia, *Pengadilan Agama* (*pengadilan = court, agama = religion), combining Arabic and Indic roots, rather than the Arabic and Islamically derived *Makhamah Syariah*, became the name of choice for first instance religious courts. Appellate religious courts are now called *Pengadilan Tinggi Agama* (*tinggi = high*).

Unlike many other Islamic countries, where religious courts have been progressively restricted, in Indonesia they have actually grown in number and influence. Despite continual efforts to confine or eliminate them, since the late 19th century the politics of their development has led, at every stage, to some institutional accretion. Legally, they are subordinate to civil courts, on which they depend for enforcement decrees, but socially they enjoy a measure of autonomy and authority guaranteed by Islamic commitment and political power.

The modern history of these courts began in 1882 under the colonial administration of the Netherlands East Indies. Earlier they existed in various forms throughout Java and only here and there in the other major islands, always under the control of local aristocratic authorities whose Islamic credentials were often dubious. In Java, where Islamic courts were paid most attention in the colony, they were known as *swârmbi* courts, from the forecourt of the mosque in which they convened, serving in part as general courts of the land and in part as Islamic courts proper. In the colony these *swârmbi* courts were related to the first instance colonial civil courts for Indonesians (*landraden*) in two ways: religious judges served as advisers to the *landraden*, and Islamic court decisions were required to obtain enforcement decrees (*executor verklaring*) from the *landraden*. The first rule has long since faded, but the second still survives.

In 1882 the colonial administration reorganised the Islamic courts, which were now called *Priesterraad* (priest's courts)—though popularly *raad agama*, or *landraad agama*, after the style of the Dutch courts—on an erroneous understanding of the mosque administrators, *penghulu*, who staffed the courts. The new courts were collegial, with three judges, following from European rather than Islamic judicial traditions. The most important effect of the reform, however, was to make the courts formally more autonomous, and potentially independent of the local Javanese aristocracy that had traditionally appointed and controlled Islamic officials.
The reform of 1882 was roundly criticised by the famous Dutch Islamologist C. Snouck Hurgronje, whose arguments helped to inspire a second round of reforms, resulting in a new regulation of 1931 whose implementation, for economic and political reasons, was delayed until 1937. Applying only to Java and the nearby island of Madura, the new law responded superficially to Snouck’s earlier criticism by renaming the courts Penghulu Gerecht (penghulu court) and reconstituting them, following Islamic tradition, as a single kadi (kadi) accompanied by two assessors and a clerk. Originally, the reform had called for payment of regular salaries to the religious judges and their staffs, who had acquired a reputation for venality, but this measure was put off because of budgetary short-tages during the depression. Only later, during the revolution, did the Islamic courts begin to receive financial support from the state. But the heart of the 1930s reform, promoted by Dutch and Indonesian adat (customary) law scholars who opposed recognition of Islamic law except as far as it was “received” by indigenous customary law, had to do with issues of substantive jurisdiction. Matters of waqf (waqf) and, crucially, inheritance, were removed from the competence of the Islamic courts and given over to the civil landraden. When this provision was implemented, it caused an uproar among Islamic groups, who have tried unsuccessfully ever since to restore the inheritance jurisdiction to Islamic courts in Java. It was a major symbolic as well as practical loss for Islam, which at about the same time was able to ward off a challenge to polygamy. In compensation, the reform established a new Islamic appellate instance, the Mahkamah Islam Tinggi (Islamic High Court) to hear appeals from all the religious courts of Java. Although suspect at first among Islamic officials, the Mahkamah Islam Tinggi was eventually opened in the central Javanese city of Surakarta, where it remains today. Outside of Java, only in Kalimantan (Borneo) were similar reforms begun, also in 1937, mainly by way of reorganisation of local religious courts (Rapat Kadi) and the creation of appellate courts (Kerapatan Kadi Besar), before Japanese forces occupied the country during the second World War.

During the occupation and early in the revolution (1945-50) against the returning Dutch administration, efforts to eliminate Islamic courts failed utterly in the face of Islamic determination to preserve and develop Islamic public institutions. A political compromise led in 1946 to the establishment of a new Ministry of Religious Justice, which soon absorbed various elements of Islamic administration, including the existing courts, and later became a driving force behind their consolidation and expansion throughout independent Indonesia. Islamic judicial affairs were organised in the Ministry under a Directorate of Religious Justice. With the revolution, the primary issues of the Islamic judiciary shifted to the islands outside of Java, particularly Sumatra, where religious courts were few and poorly developed. In 1946, during a period of violent local conflict, Islamic groups in Aceh (northern Sumatra) established new Mahkamah Syariah (Qa’ri’s councils). These courts ambitiously assumed a wide jurisdiction, which the national government later whittled away gradually by creating competitive civil courts and subjecting the Mahkamah Syariah to legal limits as a condition of their incorporation into the national religious bureaucracy. In response to what had happened in Aceh, however, in 1947 the republican governor of Sumatra issued an instruction to establish Islamic courts, also fashioned as Mahkamah Syariah, elsewhere in Sumatra. The tempo-
judiciary. But only a few such appeals have been heard, by late 1982, and it is too early to predict the influence of the Supreme Court on the religious courts.

The next major stage in the evolution of Islamic courts was unexpected and rather surprising in its effects. In 1973 Parliament considered a new unified marriage law for all religious groups which incensed many Muslims by its challenge to polygamy and other Kur'ānīc legal symbols. Islamic groups protested vehemently, and after a great deal of political tension the government revised the original drafts of the law to meet Islamic objections. One result of the new law in its final form was to place more authority and functional responsibility squarely on the Islamic courts.

Until the passage of the 1974 marriage law, the overwhelming daily fare of Islamic courts everywhere in the country was made up of divorce issues. Despite the additional jurisdiction over inheritance of the courts outside of Java, not many cases of the sort actually came to them. (Ironically, the Javanese religious courts continued informally even after 1957 to hear many inheritance cases, often deciding them in the form of fatāwis, advisory opinions, as people continued to bring them; sometimes because they were ignorant of the legal change, sometimes because the Islamic courts were much speedier than the civil courts, and sometimes because devout Muslims simply regarded the Islamic courts as the proper authority to take care of their inheritance problems.) The vast majority of the Islamic courts’ clients were women, as only women had to go to court for a decree invoking their husband’s divorce (talak) on prescribed grounds. Husbands bent on divorce need only pronounce the talak and register it at a local religious office.

The law of 1974 changed all this, however, making divorce more difficult for men by requiring them also to go to court, an equalising measure intended to promote family stability. The traffic in Islamic courts naturally increased, though less than expected because the new legal procedures themselves had the effect of discouraging divorce. In addition, all Islamic courts now have jurisdiction over a wide range of family law issues, including, among others, permission for a husband to take an additional wife, permission to marry in the absence of or disagreement among appropriate kin, dispensation from marriageable age rules, prevention of marriages, annulments, charges of neglect, determination of child custody, support of divorced wives, child support, legitimacy of children, withdrawal of parental authority, appointment of a wali, and review of administrative refusal to allow mixed marriages. Several of these questions require only administrative action, while others constitute litigation, but all together impose on the courts a more variegated responsibility, indeed main symbolic.

A consequence of this burgeoning significance of the religious courts, the Ministry of Religion moved enthusiastically to demand more courts, more funds and more facilities. By ministerial regulation, two new appellate courts were provided for West and East Java, confining the old Mahkamah Islam Tinggi to the territorial jurisdiction of Central Java. Increasing attention has begun to be paid matters of recruitment and training of religious judges. The national standardization government revised the original drafts of the law to incorporate a further commitment to uniform policies in their development.

Indonesia’s Islamic courts have survived as one critical symbol of the Islamic community, but they have been progressively integrated into state administration. The law of 1974 has transformed them into rather fully-fledged domestic relations tribunals, responsible for profoundly important matters of social life and state policy.


MAHLUL (A.), a term used in the Ottoman administrative parlance to mean vacant. It is used in the registers of a grant or office which has been vacated by the previous holder, by death, dismissal, or transfer, and not yet re-allocated. The term is also used more generally for land and other assets left without heir (see also MULULALAF). (Eb.)

MAHMAL (modern pronunciation of the word vocalised by the lexicographers mawšul, mawšul, or mawšul, a type of richly decorated palanquin, perched on a camel and serving in the past to transport people, especially noble ladies, to Mecca (cf. al-Sam‘ānī, Kītāb al-Ansāf, under the word al-makāmilī). The famous al-Hādjīdājī b. Yūsuf is said to have been the first to use them.

In a more restricted and precise sense, the word designates palanquins of this same type which became political symbols and were sent from the 7th/13th century by sovereigns with their caravans of pilgrims to Mecca (or the principal caravan when it was split up) in order to bolster their prestige. In the modern period in Egypt, the head-rope of the camel which carried it was solemnly presented to the leader of the pilgrimage, in the course of a ceremony during which the camel, followed by some musicians, performed seven circuits on the ground in front of the officials’ platform. In time, the crowds accorded these palanquins, encompassed by the glory of the Holy Places, a veneration which was excessive and at times condemned (e.g. the kissing of the head-rope, the seven circuits, the participation of the religious brotherhoods in the ceremonies, allowing the belief that it was actually a religious emblem). Forming the centre of picturesque demonstrations in Cairo, Damascus and other cities, the caravans accompanied by the returns of the caravans of pilgrims, they were mentioned by European travellers. At the end of...
1952, the Egyptian mahmal, the last still in service, was suppressed by a governmental decision. The camel which carried it, a splendid and well-nourished animal, stayed resting all the year at the dar al-kiwa, at Khurumish Street in Cairo, waiting for the ceremonies in default of journeys.

There exists little precise evidence, in the Middle Ages, on the form of these political mahmals. On the other hand, those of the modern period have been described, photographed and displayed in museums. In Egypt, the last ones were built of wood and approximately cubic, broader (1 m 75) than they were long (1 m 35), crowned by a four-faced pyramid, with, in the upper angles of the cube, four gilded balls and on top of the pyramid, a much larger ball surmounted by a stem, a star and a crescent: the whole was covered in an embroidered material. There existed two types of coverings: the first, for towns and the parade, was in a very rich brocade, enhanced by pompons and fringes. The name of the sovereign and a verse of the Qur'an (e.g. a "throne verse", II, 255, on that of King Fu'ad I) was embroidered respectively on the face in front of the pyramid and on a band encircling the top of the cube. The second covering of simpler material (green in recent times) was put on for the journey or minor halts. The oldest covering which has been preserved is that of the mahmal of Sultan Kansâwâl al-Ghûrî (d. 922/1516) at present in Istanbul, in the Topkapî Museum (Turkish embroideries section, no. 253, Mehmel). A good photo of it is supplied in the magazine La Turquie Kémalisite, Istanbul, August 1941. The embroidered text expresses pious wishes but is not Kur'ânic. It is reproduced in J. Jomier, Le Mahmal du sultan Qânsâwâl al-Ghûrî, in Annales Islamologiques (1972), 183-8. The richness of certain coverings has been mentioned by chroniclers: such as that of the mahmal of the 'Irâkîs in 721/1221, crusted with gold, pearls and precious stones (Die Chroniken des Stadt Makka, ed. Wûstenfeld, ii, Göttingen 1859, 278).

Various legends concerning these mahmals are to be dismissed at the outset. The legend according to which the Egyptian mahmal goes back to the reign of Queen Shaddarat al-Durr is not found in any previous source. The first covering to which the palanquin contained Kur'ânic or served to transport the hangings (kiwa) of the Ka'ba have no firm basis. The mahmal was normally empty. The word "sacred cloth" used by Westerners to designate it is pure fantasy. In Arabic it is called the noble mahmal, al-mahmal al-sharîf, an adjective very often applied to that which is in contact with the Holy Places. It is in this period that the Yemeni mahmal ceased to be sent. Toward the end of the same century, M. d'Ohsson (Tableau général de l'Empire Ottoman, iii, Paris 1790, 263-6) mentions as customary a symbolic departure of the mahmal at Istanbul, with the official delegation of the pilgrimage, this palanquin then being dismantled and returned to its store.

When the Wahhabîs seized the Holy Places in 1807, the Egyptian mahmal fell into their hands and was burnt by them. Its sending was only resumed after their defeat. The war of 1914 put an end to the sending of the Syrian mahmal; the Egyptian one continued to be sent until 1926, the date on which a clash between the soldiers of the escort and the Wahhabîs of 'Ith Îwân caused its despatch to be definitively suppressed. The Egyptian Government and King Husayn of the Hijâjz (1915-21) had already confronted each other on the subject of this palanquin and especially the ceremonial which was to preside over its reception. Despite exchanges of points of view, the conflict twice led to the suspension of its sending. After Ibn Sa'îd had become King of the Hijâjz, negotiations took place on the same subject, the Wahhabîs refusing to allow the music which accompanied the procession and various superstitious practices. Symbol of a political protection over the Holy Places, the mahmal no longer had its raison d'être after the suppression of the caliphate and the Wahhabîs' desire for independence.

The popular festival aspect was manifest in Egypt in the course of three annual ceremonies (in the Middle Ages), in the course of which the mahmal was solemnly led across the city with a large escort and parts of the caravan, accompanied by troops armed with lances and sometimes even clowns. Ladies were accustomed to go out to see the processions. The first procession announced the approach of the season of pilgrimage, the second was that of the departure and the third that of the return.

In the desert, the mahmal was the centre of the principal caravan. When in 1882, and then in 1884 and after, the Egyptian caravan ceased to take the desert route and left by train (for Suez) and then by boat, the mahmal was hoisted into a train (it had its own special carriage) and then embarked. From 1920 to 1931/1910-13, it went via Alexandria, the sea, Haifa and the Medina railway. In the Hijâjz itself, the small caravan re-formed and it was always the centre of it. The goings and comings of this caravan have been described in the valuable reports, full of realistic details, composed by the physicians who accompanied it and published pro-manucripto from the beginning of the century by care of the Quarantine Service. Information and photos are also to be found in al-Barâmandjî, al-Rihîl al-hijâjî, Cairo 1929 A.H. and Rifât, Mir'at al-harâmîn, 2 vols., Cairo 1925. Two of the old processions (departure and return) lasted until 1926 in Cairo. Suppressed after the incident with the
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Sacudi Ikhwan, they were re-established in 1937, the year in which the hangings (kiswd) of the Ka'ba were once again again and accepted, although the mahmal was formally refused. These processions inside Cairo lasted until 1952, the date of their definitive abolition. The custom in Egypt was for the façade of the pilgrims' houses, in the popular quarters, to be decorated around the door with naive frescos recalling their journey. These frescos painted at the time of their return might stay in place for several years before being worn away by time. Until 1952 the mahmal was almost always represented. At present it appears only rarely: the new generations no longer know what it is. See Giovanni Canova, Nota sulle raffigurazioni popolari del pellegrinaggio in Egitto, in Annali della Facolta di lingue et letterature straniere di ca' Foscari, xiv/3 (1975), 83-94, with 8 plates (University of Venice).

Finally, how can one explain the choice by Baybars of this type of symbol? Did he merely want a royal tent? Did he dream of the leather kubbah, carried on chariots in the steppes of Asia, familiar to some Mamluks, and which had a religious meaning or at least one of honour? Or should we not look in the direction of the known symbolic palanquins of the Arabs, such as the one among the Rwala at the beginning of this century which was the emblem of the tribe (G. May, London 1919, p. 8 ff., described under the name Abû Zhûr al-Markab), or that which bore 'Abbâs at the Battle of the Camel? The question remains open.

Bibliography: J. Jamier, Le Mahmal et la caravane égyptienne des pèlerins de la Mecque (XII-XVII siècles), Cairo 1953; R. Tresse, Le pèlerinage syrien aux villes saintes de l'Islam, Paris 1937; Lance, Manners and customs of the modern Egyptians, London 1936, ii, 180-6, 245 ff. (with a reproduction of the Egyptian mahmal); Burton, A pilgrimage to el-Medinah and Mecca, London 1856, iii, 12, 267; Snouck-Huqronje, Mecca, i, 29, 83 ff., 152, 157 (with a photograph in the Atlas, P. v.); T. Juynboll, Handbuch des islamischen Gesetzes, 151 ff. In Arabic, apart from the texts mentioned in Jamier, op. cit., see 'Abd al-Kâdir an-Nâṣîr al-Dhajjar, Al-Durr al-farqûb el-munazzama fi akhbars al-mahâl wa-ṣair Makkah al-mu'azzama, especially the autograph ms. at al-Azhâr (first version and the autograph ms. at Fâs, Karawiyûn (completed version, printed by the Matba'a Salâfiyya, Cairo 1384, sponsored by Sa'ûdîs). The author was for a long time the official responsible (kâbi) for the Pilgrimage Office (diwân al-hadîj) in the 10th/16th century. The work is a compendium of all the knowledge (Arab tribes, itineraries, gifts to make, functionaries, a chronicle of the pilgrimage year by year, etc.) necessary for an Amir al-hadîj.


MAHMÔD, the name of several mediaeval rulers of the Deccan.

1. MAHMÔD I, Nâṣîr AL-DîN (846-64/1442-59), was a descendant of Ilyâs Shâhî dynasty of Bengal. On the assassination of the tyrant, Shams al-Dîn (ca. 846/1442), the grandson of the usurper, Râdja Ganîèh (817-21/1414-18), a scramble for power began among the nobles, which led one of them, named Nâṣîr Khân, to seize power by killing his rival, Shâdî Khân. But within a week, Nâṣîr Khân himself was put to death. Thereupon, the nobles chose Mahmûd, who was a descendant of Sulîn Ilyâs Shâh and was living in obscurity, carrying on agriculture. He ascended the throne as Nâṣîr al-Dîn Abu 'l-Mu'âzamâr Mahmûd.

Mahmûd was just and liberal and an able administrator. Since the Shârkti rulers of Djuwanûr (846-842), the chief constant threat to the kingdom of Bengal, were involved in conflicts with the Lodîs, Mahmûd was able to enjoy peace, and this he utilised in promoting the prosperity of his people, in constructing mosques and khânkâhs, bridges and tombs. In Gâwr, his capital, he built a fort and a palace and other buildings. Unfortunately, only the five-arched bridge, the Kôtwâl Darwâza and a part of the walls of the fort have survived. These were not the only achievements of Mahmûd. He also strengthened his military power and extended the boundaries of his kingdom by annexing parts of the districts of Djuasawir and Khuânî along a portion of the twenty-four parganas. He died after a successful reign of approximately seventeen years and was succeeded by his son, Rûkûn al-Dîn Barbêk.


2. MAHMÔD II, Nâṣîr AL-DîN, was the third Habâshî (Abyssinian) Sultan. Some modern historians consider him to be the son of Djalâl al-Dîn Fath Shâhî (886-92/1481-87), the last ruler of the Ilyâs Shâhî dynasty; but Firîghla, ii, 300-1, and Nizâm al-Dîn, iii, 269, regard him as the son of Sayf al-Dîn Firûz Shâh (857-90/1452-87), the grandson of a Habâshî Sultan of Bengal. This view seems to be correct, because it was Firûz who appointed a tutor for Mahmûd's education and,
when he died, Mahmud succeeded him. However, since Mahmud was very young, the government was carried on by his tutor, Habash Khan. Meanwhile, another Habash, Sidi Badr, nicknamed Diwana (“the Mad”), killed Habash Khan and declared himself himself Sultan and ascended the throne as Ghiyath al-Din Mahmud III. Makhdum, however, refused to recognise him and allied himself with Shir Khan (later Shih Shah), whose power was steadily growing. Mahmud, on the other hand, refused to enter into an alliance with the Nuhans of Bihar, who were weak and without an able leader. The result was that, when in 940/1533 Mahmud sent the army against Makhdum, who was defeated and slain, as the Nuhans were able to prevent Shih Khan from coming to his assistance. However, the victory did not benefit Mahmud because after setting out to fight, Makhdum had entrusted all his treasure to Shih Khan’s envoy. Meanwhile, Jalaal Khan, the Nuhani ruler of Bihar, plotted the assassination of Shih Khan, but his attempt having failed, he was affected with panic, and crossed over to Bengal with his supporters and sought the protection of Mahmud, which was given. Mahmud succeeded in occupying Bihar and, in Ramadān 940/March 1534, a strong force under Ibrahīm Khan moved out of Monghyr and met Shih Khan on the plain of Suradjgarh, near the town of Bhar. But Ibrahīm was defeated and killed, while Jalaal Khan again fled to Mahmud. Now it was Shih Khan’s turn to retaliate and, taking advantage of Humayūn’s preoccupation in Gudjarat, he opened a campaign in 942/1536. Since Mahmud had strongly fortified the Teliyagafhi Pass with Portuguese help, Shih left behind a detachment under his son, Jalaal Khan, and having made a detour, marched through the Jharkhand country and appeared before Gaur, Bengal’s capital. Mahmud was taken by surprise. The Portuguese advised him to hold out until the outbreak of the monsoon, when Shih’s retreat could be cut off by their navy. But Mahmud was so demoralised that he did not follow their advice and, instead, came to a settlement with Shih Khan, by agreeing to pay him an annual tribute of ten lacs of tankas and to cede the territory from the river Kosi to Hadjpur and from Gafhli to Monghyr, which was of considerable importance to the security of Bengal. Shih Shāh (who had by now assumed the title of Shāh) was too ambitious to remain satisfied with these gains and, on the pretext of non-payment of tribute by Mahmud, invaded Bengal. He entered the Telīyāghiri Pass, which the Bengalis failed to defend, and laid siege to Gaur. But hearing that Humayūn had invested Čunār, he at once set out to relieve it, leaving behind his son Jalaal to continue the siege. Mahmud despairing of any outside help, for the Portuguese refused immediate assistance, and being faced with dwindling supplies, sallied out of the fort to give battle. But he was wounded and fled to north Bihar. Meanwhile, on 6 Dhū al-Ḥijjah 944/4 April 1538, the Afghans captured the fort by an assault. Mahmud, now a fugitive, appealed to Humayūn, who immediately marched towards Gaur. But before he could reach the city, Shīr Shāh had carried away all its treasure. It was on his way to Gaur with Humayūn that Mahmud heard of the murder of his two sons by the Afghans. This effected him so much that he died soon afterwards. Mahmud was a voluptrious, but the Portuguese account that he had 10,000 women in his harem is an exaggeration. He was incompetent, and inept in the art of diplomacy, lacking courage, tact and imagination. His mistake in antagonising Shīr Shāh and his failure to make an alliance with the Mughals and the Sultan of Gudjarat led not only to his own overthrow but also to the loss of Bengal’s independence.


MAHMUD, the name of two of the Dihli sultans of mediaeval India.

1. MAHMUD I, NĀṢIR AL-DĪN was the son of Ilutmish (Firuzshāh, i, 70-1; Minḥāḏ-i Sirādī Džudžānī, i, 471-2) and not his grandson, as some modern historians have asserted. He ascended the throne on 23 Muharram 940/10 June 1246 through the joint efforts of Balban [q.v. in Suppl.], and Mahmud’s mother. Since Mahmud was weak and of a retiring disposition, devoting himself “to prayers and religious observances”, and he owed his throne to Balban, the latter became very powerful. He further strengthened his position by marrying his daughter to the young Sultan and securing the important office of wakil-i dar-āmīn and the title of Ulūkh Khān (Premier Khan). His younger brother, Sayf al-Dīn Abībak, was given the title of Kāshī Khān and made amīr-i hādij, while one of his cousins, Shīr Shāh, was appointed governor of Lahore and Bhatinda. In 651/1253, however, a eunuch named ‘Imād al-Dīn Rayhān, who was jealous of Balban, organised a group of discontented Indian Muslims and some Turks and succeeded in persuading the Sultan to dismiss Balban and his relations. They were accordingly ordered to leave for their respective tābi‘āt. Balban was replaced by Rayhān, who now became wakil-i dar and virtual ruler. Shīr Shāh was replaced by Arslīn Khān as governor of Lahore and Bhatinda. Deprived of power and position as a result of these changes, the Turkish element became discontented and organised itself under Balban’s leadership to overthrow the Sultan, and in Ramadān 652/October 1254, marched towards Dihli. Mahmud, under the influence of Rayhān and his followers, moved out against the rebels and encamped near Samana. Rayhān wanted an armed conflict, but Mahmud refused, because most of his nobles favoured Balban, and agreed on a compromise. Rayhān was dismissed and transferred first to Bahārī and then to Bādā’un. Balban was reappointed nāb and his
kinsmen and followers were reinstated. In consequence, the Turkish nobility, and with it Balban, became even more powerful and strongly entrenched than before.

But the problems which Balban had to confront were great, because Ilutmish had not been able to consolidate the Sultanate; nor had his immediate successors done anything to strengthen it. In fact, it was threatened with dissolution by refractory Hindu zamindars, ambitious provincial governors and Mongol pressure. Already in 645/1247-8, a year after Mahmud’s accession to the throne, Balban had led a campaign against a zamindar in the Dō āb and captured a fort called Talsindah in the Kannawdj district. He had then attacked a Rādjiūt chief “Dulka va Mulka”, who ruled over the area between the Djamnā and Kalindjar, and defeated and expelled him. It took Balban two campaigns to secure control over the “Katahriya infidels”, who ruled Bādā'ūn and Sambhal. Balban also reduced the refractory tribes of “Djarali and Datolī”.

But these successes were temporary, and he had to undertake annual campaigns in the Ganges-Djamnā area to maintain peace. In 646/1248-9 he attacked Ranthambor and Mēwāt, but the campaign was abortive. In fact, Balban’s efforts to subdue the Rādjiūt during Mahmud’s reign proved a failure; he had, although he had two conditions against the Mēwātīs [q.v.], who were led by the Rādjiūt and massacred a large number of them, he failed to crush them.

Owing to the preoccupation of Mahmūd’s government with the Mongols, who had become a great threat by 635/1237, the provincial governors raised the banner of revolt. Kūṭlugh Khān, Mahmūd’s stepfather, who held the province of Awadh [q.v.] and was anti-Balban, allied himself with Rayhan and defied royal authority. Balban therefore sent Sandjār Siwastānī to take over Bahrāʾī from Rayhan. But Kūṭlugh came to Rayhan’s aid, intercepted and seized Sandjār. Sandjār managed to escape and, having collected a small force, attacked Rayhan and killed him. Balban thereupon ordered Kūṭlugh to leave Awadh and take over Bahrāʾī; but the latter refused and rebelled against Balban and was defeated by the Rādjiūt and the Himalayan foothills. In 656/1258 he came out of his retreat, reoccupied Awadh and even made an attempt to occupy Karra and Mānūkūr; but Arslān Khān, who held the province, expelled him.

In 655/1257, Yuzbeki Tughrī, a Kipcak Turk, who was governor of Lakhnawtī [q.v.] defied the Dihli government. He led a successful expedition into Dīgnagar (Orissa), occupied Awadh and had the khutba recited in his name. But in a campaign in Kāṁrūp, he was taken prisoner by the forces of its Rādjiā and executed.

Yuzbek was succeeded by ʿĪzz al-Dīn Balbān-i Yuzbeki. But the latter did not rule long, for in 657/1259-60, Arslān Khān, governor of Kārrā, without Dihli’s permission, advanced on Lakhnawtī and seized it. Yuzbeki was defeated and slain. Owing to the central government’s preoccupations with other problems, it could do nothing. Fortunately however, Arslān Khān died on 18 Djamāda I 665/27 February 1265. The authority of Dihli over the Pangāb and Sind was weak partly because of the Mongol pressure and partly due to their distance from the centre. In 639/1241, Lahore had been occupied by the Mongols. Although Balban appealed to Dihli for help, Balban at once marched with a strong army, whereupon the Mongols withdrew. Balban placed Mūltān under Kūṭlugh Khān, while Uṭch was left with Kābīr’s family. Kūṭlugh was, however, allowed to annex Uṭch as well on condition that he relinquished Nagawur. But Kūṭlugh refused to give up Nagawur and did so only when he was compelled. In 647/1249-50 Hasan Karīgh returned from Lower Sind and seized Mūltān from Kūṭlugh. Yet he was not able to retain Mūltān long, for it was occupied by Shir Khān, governor of Lahore and Bhatinda, who not only refused to restore it to Kūṭlugh, but dispossessed him of Uṭch as well. It is more than probable that Shir Khān’s action was inspired by Balban.

Although Kīţlūgh was compensated by the governors of Bādā’ūn, he was not reconciled to the loss of Mūltān and joined the anti-Balban faction led by Rayhan. In spite of this, Kīţlūgh was, on Rayhan’s dismissal, given back his former possessions of Mūltān and Uṭch according to the settlement of 652/1254. But after establishing himself firmly, Kīţlūgh threw off the authority of Dihli and transferred his loyalty to Hūlegū, and Mahmūd’s government was not able to return to power. Not satisfied with this, Kīţlūgh, early in 655/1257, joined his father-in-law, Kūṭlugh Khān, and together they marched on Dihli. Balban moved out to meet them near Samana. While the two forces were preparing for a conflict, some religious leaders of Dihli sent word to Kīţlūgh that they would surrender the town to him. This leaked out and the conspirators were banished. So when the rebel army reached Dihli on 21 June 1257, after eluding Balban’s forces and Kīţlūgh found that no support was forthcoming, he returned to Uṭch. Nothing is known as to what happened to Kīţlūgh. But Kīţlūgh paid a visit to Hūlegū in “Irāk seeking help to attack Dihli and, at the end of 655/1257, a Mongol army under Saih Bāḥadūr arrived in Sind; but, deterred by Balban’s military preparations, it did not attack Dihli. Balban succeeded in occupying Bādā’ūn and the Pandjaḏ. Two Kīţlūghs tried to occupy Mūltān with Mongol help, but failed. Early in 656/1258, Hūlegū’s envoys arrived in Dihli. Balban organised outside the city a spectacle, consisting of soldiers and common people, human heads and corpses, to express the might and invincibility of the Sultanate. It seems that Balban was able to arrive at some understanding with Hūlegū, by which he was able to occupy Uṭch. Mahmūd died in 665/1266-7. No contemporary evidence exists to reveal the manner of his death. But Ibn Baṭṭūṭa and ʿĪṣāmī say that he was poisoned by the ambitious Balban, and this is not improbable. On Mahmūd’s death, Balban ascended the throne as Ghiyāḥ al-Dīn Balbān. Bibliography: Dūzdānī, Tabākht-i Nāṣirī, ed. ʿAbd al-Hayy Habibi, Kābul 1342/1963, also ed. Nassau Lees, Khādīm Husayn and ʿAbd al-Hayy, Bibl. Ind. Calcutta 1864; Eng. tr. H. G. Raverty, Bibl. Ind. Calcutta 1897; ʿĪṣāmī, Futūḥ al-sалāṭīn, ed. ʿAbd al-Mahi Huṣayn, Agra 1938; also ed. A. S. Usha, Madras 1948; Eng. tr. A. Ghāz Mahdi Huṣayn, ii, Aligarh 1977; Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, Ed. A. Ghāz Mahdi Huṣayn, Baroda 1953; Dīyāʾ ʿAbd al-Dīn Barani, Taʾrīkh-i Fisal, ed. Sayyid Ahmad Khān, Calcutta 1862; ʿAbd al-Mahi Bādāʾūnī, Muntakhab al-tawdrikh, i, ed. Ahmad ʿAlī, Bibl. Ind. Calcutta 1868, Eng. tr. G. Rank-

2. Mahmûd II, Nâsr al-dîn b. Sultân Muhammed Shah b. Frûz Shah Tabûqulq: ascended the throne of Dihlî on 20 Dîjâmâdâ 796/23 March 1394, on the death of his brother 'Alâ al-dîn Sîkan-dar Shah, after two weeks of discussion between the Frûz Shahi slaves and the Afghân Lodîs amîrs. Maharâmd tried to reconcile the nobles belonging to the two groups. He appointed Malik Sarwar, a eunuch, as supporter and went against Dîjâmâdâ 797/23 March 1395, as governor of Lahore. But on 15 Muharram 800/8 October 1397, Sârang was defeated by Tâtar Khân. Such was the condition of Dihlî and its provinces when the sultanate was in process of disintegration. Proceeds had declared their independence; even the territory around Dihlî was in state of turmoil. In Radjab 796/May 1394, Maharâmd sent Malik Sarwar to suppress the rebellion of a zamindâr in Dijumnâpûr and gave him the title of Sultan al-Shârqi. Malik Sarwar suppressed the rebellion, annexed considerable territory and founded the kingdom of Dijumnâpûr. Meanwhile, Bir Singh Deva, the Tomâr zamindâr of Dânamorl, attacked Gawîlâr [q. v.] and occupied it. Maharâmd marched towards Gwalîyâr with Sa'âdat Khân in 796/June 1394, leaving behind Mukarrâm Khân, the heir-designate, in charge of Dihlî. On approaching Gwalîyâr, Malik Ikbâl, however, escaped to Dihlî to the protection of Mukarrâm Khân. Maharâmd and Sa'âdat Khân therefore returned to Dihlî, but finding its gates closed to them, besieged it. In the course of the siege, which lasted for three months, Maharâmd became dissatisfied with Sa'âdat and went over to Mukarrâm. Thereupon Sa'âdat withdrew to Fîrizâbâd, which he seized, and, in Radj 801/January 1395, set up Nusrât Khân, another grandson of Fîriz Shah, as Sultan. But not long after, Sa'âdat's fellow-slaves turned against him and he fled to Dihlî, where Mukarrâm put him to death. However, the rebel slaves remained loyal to Nusrât Shah and recognised him as king. The result was that there were two rulers: Maharâmd, who was supported by the Lodis [q. v.] and held the forts of Dihlî and Sîrî and their suburbs, and Nusrât, who was supported by the slaves, and was in possession of Fîrizâbâd, including some parts of the Dîsâb, Sam-bâh, Pânîpât and Rohât. For three years skirmishes continued between the partisans of Maharâmd and those of Nusrât, until suddenly Malik Ikbâl, the most unscrupulous of the Dihlî nobles of the period, brought Nusrât to Dijânîpânâh and professed loyalty to him, but then attacked him. Nusrât fled to Fîrizâbâd and then to his wazir, Tâtar Khân, in Pânîpât. Malik Ikbâl occupied Fîrizâbâd and fought against Mukarrâm for two months, and then killed him. But he did not hurt Maharâmd, whom he now acknowledged as Sultan and whom he dominated.

Owing to these interregne conflicts, the Dihlî government was absolutely ineffective and, as Bâda'î'ânî was to observe later: 'the rule of the Sultan of Dihlî is from Dihlî to Pâlâm' (hukm-i shâhâdât-i 'alam ad Dîhllî tâ Pâmân). Ghûjarât, Râdijâshân, Bengal and Bihâr no longer acknowledged the authority of Dihlî: Kannâwâdî, Dalmâw, Awadh and Bahráîî were annexed to the new kingdom of Dijumnâpûr. The Hindû zamindârs to the east and west of Dihlî were in a state of rebellion. In the north-west, Khân Khân held Mûlân; but in 798/1395-6 Sârang Khân, who had been assigned Dijumnâpûr, attacked Khân Khân and seized Mûlân with the help of his brother, Malik Ikbâl. He then defeated Shâykhâ Khokar and appointed his younger brother, 'Adî Khân, as governor of Lahore. But on 15 Muharrâm 800/8 October 1397, Sârang was defeated by Tâtar Khân at the battle of Kôtâdî.

Such was the condition of Dihlî and its provinces when the sultanate was in process of disintegration. The sultanate was in the process of disintegration. Proceeds had declared their independence; even the territory around Dihlî was in state of turmoil. In Radjab 796/May 1394, Maharâmd sent Malik Sarwar to suppress the rebellion of a zamindâr in Dijumnâpûr and gave him the title of Sultan al-Shârqi. Malik Sarwar suppressed the rebellion, annexed considerable territory and founded the kingdom of Dijumnâpûr [q. v.].

Meanwhile, Bir Singh Deva, the Tomâr zamindâr of Dânamorl, attacked Gawîlâr [q. v.] and occupied it. Maharâmd marched towards Gwalîyâr with Sa'âdat Khân in 796/June 1394, leaving behind Mukarrâm Khân, the heir-designate, in charge of Dihlî. On approaching Gwalîyâr, Malik Ikbâl, however, escaped to Dihlî to the protection of Mukarrâm Khân. Maharâmd and Sa'âdat therefore returned to Dihlî, but finding its gates closed to them, besieged it. In the course of the siege, which lasted for three months, Maharâmd became dissatisfied with Sa'âdat and went over to Mukarrâm. Thereupon Sa'âdat withdrew to Fîrizâbâd, which he seized, and, in Radj 801/January 1395, set up Nusrât Khân, another grandson of Fîriz Shah, as Sultan. But not long after, Sa'âdat's fellow-slaves turned against him and he fled to Dihlî, where Mukarrâm put him to death. However, the rebel slaves remained loyal to Nusrât Shah and recognised him as king. The result was that there were two rulers: Maharâmd, who was supported by the Lodis [q. v.] and held the forts of Dihlî and Sîrî and their suburbs, and Nusrât, who was supported by the slaves, and was in possession of Fîrizâbâd, including some parts of the Dîsâb, Sam-bâh, Pânîpât and Rohât. For three years skirmishes continued between the partisans of Maharâmd and those of Nusrât, until suddenly Malik Ikbâl, the most
hearing that Muzaffar Shāh I of Gūḍəṛat was advancing towards Dvānpur, withdrew to save his capital. Mahmūd took advantage of ʿĪbrāhīm Shārkī’s retreat to occupy Baran (Bulandshahr) and Sambhal. It was a temporary success, for in Ramāḍān 811/January 1409, Khīḍr Khān sent Malik Ṭubhā, one of his lieutenants, to plunder the Dōʾ ʾalab, while he himself set out towards Dvāhpur and besieged Mahmūd in Sirī and Iḥṣīyār Khān in Fīrūzābād. Lack of provisions due to famine compelled Khīḍr to withdraw. But in 813/1410-11 he conquered Rohtak, and the next year he again invested Dvāhpur. Iḥṣīyār, who held Fīrūzābād, submitted, but Mahmūd held out in Sirī, and Khīḍr Khān was once again compelled to withdraw on account of the lack of provisions. Mahmūd died in Ṣafar 815/November 1412, and Dawlat Khān Lodū became the ruler of Dvāhpur. In Ramāḍān 816/November-December 1413, Khīḍr for the third time advanced on Dvāhpur and besieged Sirī. He was imprisoned in Hisar-Fīrūza, and Khīḍr obtained possession of Dvāhpur on 17 Rahl 1 817/June 1414, thus laying the foundations of the short-lived Sayyid dynasty.


(Mohibbul Hasan) **MAHMUD**, the name of three mediaeval rulers of Gūḍəṛat,[q.e.v.] in India.

1. MAHMUD I, SAYF AL-DIN, BEGARHA OR BEGRA, a younger brother of Sultan Kūb al-Dīn and son of Muhammad Shāh, ascended the throne on 1 Shāh 863/3 June 1459, at the age of thirteen, with the title of Khan-i Džahan. At the foot of the Gīrnār hills he founded the city of Mustafābād, which became one of his capitals.

2. MAHMUD II, NASIR AL-DIN, died without offering any resistance. It was suggested to Mahmūd that he should annex Sind but he refused, saying that his mother belonged to its ruling family. On his return from Sind, Mahmūd heard that Mawlānā Mahmūd Samarkandī, a poet and philosopher, who had long been in the service of the Bahmānī rulers, while sailing in a ship bound for Hormuz, had been driven to Dwārkā, situated in the north-western corner of Kāthiāwar, where pirates had robbed him of all his belongings, including his womenfolk. After many hardships, the Mawlānā arrived in Muṣṭafābād. Angry at his plight, the Sultan marched towards Dwārkā. Its Rajput chief, Būhm, took refuge in the island-fortress of Bet or Sankhodhār. Mahmūd marched through dense forests, full of wild animals, and invested it. Būhm was defeated in a sea fight and taken prisoner. The Mawlānā’s goods were now restored to him.

4. MAHMUD III, DARIJ AL-DIN, DARIJ AL-DIN, BEGARHA OR BEGRA, a younger brother of Sultan Kūb al-Dīn and son of Muhammad Shāh, ascended the throne on 1 Shāh 863/3 June 1459, at the age of thirteen, with the title of Khan-i Džahan. At the foot of the Gīrnār hills he founded the city of Mustafābād, which became one of his capitals.

In 866/1462, Mahmūd marched to the help of Nizām Shāh Bahmani, whose kingdom had been invaded by Mahmūd Khādīj I,[q.e.v.] of Māwā. But learning that Nizām Shāh had been defeated, he entered Khāndesh,[q.e.v.] and thereby cut off the retreat of Mahmūd Khādīj who had to make his way back through Gondwāna after much hardship. Next year again Mahmūd Khādīj invaded the Dakhan, but withdrew on hearing that Mahmūd Begārha was coming to Nizām Shāh’s assistance. Henceforth, the Khādījī ruler never again committed aggression against Nizām Shāh.

In 868/1464-65, Mahmūd invaded Dūn, situated between Gūḍəṛat and Kōṇkēn, because of its Rāja’s acts of piracy. The Rāja was defeated and his fortress occupied; but it was restored to him on condition of an annual tribute.

In 871/1466, Mahmūd attacked Gīrnār (Dūnāgarh), and compelled its chief, Rao Mandaḷik Gūḍasama, to pay tribute. But although Mahmūd received the tribute regularly, he decided to annex Gīrnār and led an invasion. The Rao retreated to his citadel of Uparkot, situated north-west of the town, but as supplies ran short, surrendered on 10 Dūmmād 875/December 1470. Mahmūd had to undertake three campaigns in four years to subdue the Rao. Gīrnār was annexed and its chief, having entered the service of the Sultan, embraced Islam and was given the title of Khādījī Džāhnī. At the foot of the Gīrnār hills the Sultan founded the city of Muṣṭafābād, which became one of his capitals.

Mahmūd next marched against the frontier tribes of the Sumrās, Sodhās and Kāhāls who lived on the Kaṭhō border and who, although claiming to be Muslims, were in fact ignorant of the ʿArāb’s. They surrendered without offering any resistance and agreed to send their leaders to Ahmadābād to be taught the tenets of Islam.

In 877/1473, the Dāṭī and Bālōc tribes rebelled against Mahmūd’s maternal grandfather, Dāṭā Nizām al-Dīn. Mahmūd crossed the Rann of Kaṭhō in order to suppress the rising, but the rebels dispersed without offering any resistance. It was suggested to Mahmūd that he should annex Sind but he refused, saying that his mother belonged to its ruling family. On his return from Sind, Mahmūd heard that Mawlānā Mahmūd Samarkandī, a poet and philosopher, which had long been in the service of the Bahmānī rulers, while sailing in a ship bound for Hormuz, had been driven to Dwārkā, situated in the north-western corner of Kāthiāwar, where pirates had robbed him of all his belongings, including his womenfolk. After many hardships, the Mawlānā arrived in Muṣṭafābād. Angry at his plight, the Sultan marched towards Dwārkā. Its Rajput chief, Būhm, took refuge in the island-fortress of Bet or Sankhodhār. Mahmūd marched through dense forests, full of wild animals, and invested it. Būhm was defeated in a sea fight and taken prisoner. The Mawlānā’s goods were now restored to him.

Tired of the Sultan’s constant wars and his plans of invading Cāmānpār, which would be a prolonged affair, the Gūḍārī patrons plotted to overthrow him and set up his son on the throne. But Ray Rayān, an important Hindū noble, revealed the plot to the Sultan, they fled. Mahmūd had thus crushed the plot by his courage and presence of mind. Malik Shāb bān, though restored to his office, soon retired and Mahmūd took the reins of government in his own hands.
Accordingly, on Dhu 'l-Ka'ba 887/12 December 1482, he marched towards Campaner on the pretext that its Rādja, Rawal Dājī Singh, had raided his kingdom. The Rādja was defeated and took refuge in the hill fortress of Pavagadh... Above Campaner, Mahmūd thereupon besieged it. But learning that Mahmūd Khālidī I, to whom the Rādja had appealed for aid, was marching towards Gudjārāt, Mahmūd left his officers to continue the siege, and he himself set out to intercept the Mālwa army. But as Mahmūd Khālidī withdrew to Mālwa, the Sultan returned to prosecute the siege. Supplied with a force of three thousand men, after a siege of forty days he captured the place with a bombshell, it was captured. Of the 700 Rādūpsīr, who performed the djəxvar, all were slain except the Rādja and his minister, who were seized and executed. But the Rādja's son accepted Islam and was given the title of Nizām al-Mulk and made the ruler of Idār. Čampaner was renamed Muhammadābād.

Mahmūd now turned his attention to Rādja Ādal Khān II of Khāndesh (861-907/1457-1501), who had not only not paid his annual tribute, but had dismissed his independence. In 904/1498, Mahmūd invaded Khāndesh and compelled its ruler to pay tribute and recognise his suzerainty. Later, on the death of Rādja Ādal Khān's son, Ghazni Khān (914/1508), who left no male heir, Mahmūd took part in the dispute over succession. Ahmad Nizām Shāh of Ahmadnagar, Īmād Shāh of Berār, and Husain Shāh of Gudjārāt, a powerful noble, all favoured Ālam Khān, who belonged to the Fārūqī dynasty. But Mahmūd supported his maternal grandson, also called Ālam Khān, and marched with him to Thālnār, the capital of the Fārūqī rulers. Thereupon, the rulers of Ahmadnagar and Berār, who had arrived in Bārmānpur, withdrew, and on 19 Dhu 'l-Hijādja 914/10 April 1509, Mahmūd installed Ālam Khān as Ādal Khān III on the throne of Khāndesh; and when, subsequently, a rebellion supported by Nizām Shāh broke out, he sent troops to the aid of his grandson, so that the rebels fled.

The Portuguese had diverted the trade between Europe and the East from the ancient route via Egypt and the Red Sea to the new route via the Cape of Good Hope, discovered by Vasco da Gama in 1498. So, in 1526, Alfonso (1410-86) of Portugal sent an expedition to the Gudjārāt coast to destroy the Portuguese power, Mahmūd readily sent his naval ship under Ayāz, a Turk in his service, to his help. In a naval battle off Chaul in Ramadan 913/January 1508, the Portuguese were defeated and their commander, Dom Lourenço, son of the Portuguese viceroy Almeida, was killed. To avenge the defeat and the death of his son, Almeida attacked the combined Egyptian and Gudjārāt navy near Diu and scored a victory. Impressed by this victory, the Sultan sent an ambassador to the Portuguese Viceroy, Alburquerque (1505-15), and a treaty was concluded. It was agreed that the Portuguese would not hinder Gudjārāt trade and would respect the right of Gudjārāt vessels to ply in the Indian waters. In return, the Portuguese prisoners would be released and the Portuguese vessels would be permitted to visit the Gudjārāt ports. Mahmūd released the prisoners of war and offered the Portuguese a site for a factory at Diu.

Mahmūd died on 2 Ramadan 917/23 November 1464. He had been a great builder, and his reign was the most prosperous period of mediaeval Gudjārāt. Brave, just and liberal, possessing great energy and a strong will, he was not only a military genius but also an able administrator. He appointed able officers like Malik Gopi, his Hindu chief minister, to carry on the government. He advanced money to religious houses, he well maintained his planted trees on both sides of the roads, made roads safe for travellers and merchants, freed the country from internal strife and tried to exterminate piracy. Owing to these measures, trade increased, agriculture flourished and the people became prosperous. Mahmūd was a cultured ruler and enjoyed the society of learned men. He had the famous biographical dictionary of Ibn Khallikān translated into Persian, under the name of Manzar al-Islām. He also patronised Sanskrit, and his court poet Udārayādī wrote a poem in his praise. He was also a great builder, and his contribution to Gudjārāt architecture is considerable. He laid out two beautiful gardens, Bāgh-i Firdaws and Bāgh-i Shāhī 8bānī near Ahmadābād. He founded the towns of Musulābād, Muhammadābād and Muhammadābād-Cāmpaner and embellished them with palaces and mosques. He beautified Ahmadābād with broad streets and a number of fine buildings. At Cāmpaner he constructed a magnificent Djamā Masjīd, and at Sārkhādī he built for himself on the banks of a reservoir a grand palace. The fame of Mahmūd's achievements spread far and wide; in Sāfār 914/June 1508, an embassy came from Sikandar Lodi of Delhi. This embassy also visited from Shāh Ḩusain Islām of Persia, but as the Sultan was lying seriously ill he could not receive the Persian envoy.


be assassinated on the night of 14 Sha'ban 932/27 May 1526, and raised to the throne Muzaffar Shah of his six-year-old son Naṣīr Khān as Māḥmūd II. However, jealous of Ḵūshkādām, who was the de facto ruler, the nobles, led by Ṭāj Khān Nāripūlī, offered the throne to Muzaffar Šāh's second son, ʿAlāʾūd-Dīn Khān; Ḵūshkādām appealed to the neighbouring princes and to Bābur, but received no help. On receiving the nobles' invitation, Bābār, who was on his way to Djiawnpur to try his fortune there, rushed back to Ḍuṣmānābād and ascended the throne on 26 Rāmāḍān 932/July 1526. From Ḍuṣmānābād he marched to Cāmpanārī, and having occupied the fort with little out meeting much resistance, executed Ḵūshkādām and later Māḥmūd II, whose reign of about forty days thus came to an end.

**Bibliography:** See that for MĀḤMŪD I; also Mīr ʿAbū Turāb Wālī, Taʿrīḥ Gǔdarjārā, ed. E. D. Ross, Bibl. Ind., Calcutta 1909.

3. MĀḤMŪD III, ʿAḤŪṬ-ŪFĪ ṢĀʿĪD EṢṢ-DĪN, was the third son of Lāṭīf Šāh, son of Sīrūr, Muzaffar Šāh II. On the death of Bābār Šāh on 3 Rāmāḍān 943/13 February 1537, who left no son, Muhammad Zamān Mīrzā, the Empress Humayūn's brother-in-law, claimed the throne on the ground that Bābār Šāh's mother had adopted him as his heir, and he had the ḵūla recited in his name in the Djiāmī Maṣqūdī at Bābār. But the Gǔdarjārā nobles refused to acknowledge him as Sultan and offered the throne to Mīrzā Muhammad Šāh Fārūqī, son of Bābār Šāh's sister. Mīrzā set out from Būrān- pūr, but died on the way (962/1557). Thereupon, the nobles decided to set up on the throne Lāṭīf's younger son Māḥmūd Khān, who, during the reign of Bābār Šāh, had been in the custody of Mīrzā Muhammad Šāh of Khāndesh. But Mūbārak Šāh, Mīrzā's successor, refused to release him, he himself being a claimant to the throne of Gǔdarjārī. So Khān Siyāvūn Khān Siddīkī invaded Khāndesh and brought Māḥmūd to Ahmadābād, where he was enthroned as ʿAḥūṭ-Ūfūḥāt, Saʿīd d-EṣṢ-dīn Māḥmūd Šāh III. But as Māḥmūd was only eleven years of age, Iḥtiyār Khān became the Regent. He was an able man, but jealous of his power, and Muhāfīz Khān and Dārūy Khān had him assassinated. But these two last soon fell out and fought with each other to dominate Māḥmūd. Dārūy Khān emerged victorious; but not long after he was replaced by ʿAlām Khān, another noble, who now dominated the young Sultan. In 856/1546 Māḥmūd, weary of being a puppet king, decided to assert himself and shifted his capital to Ahmadābād, which had been founded by Māḥmūd I.

On 4 September 1538, Sulaymān Pāḫa, the Ottoman governor of Egypt, arrived off the coast of Diū with a large fleet in order to overthrow the Portuguese power in the Indian waters. Māḥmūd helped him when, in Diūmādā I 945/October 1538, he attacked Diū abortively. In 14/1454, Māḥmūd himself made an attempt to seize Diū. The Portuguese governor, Dom Joāo de Castro, retaliated by committing great atrocities on the Gǔdarjārī coast: Realising the inviability of the Portuguese, Māḥmūd made peace with them and granted them favourable terms. In 1551 Māḥmūd thought of invading Mālwā, but instead directed his attention to the suppression of Rājpūt landlords, who had rebelled because of the resumption of the large land grants which they held. The rebellion was crushed with great severity and their lands were seized; but the Rājpūt peasant was not interfered with. Māḥmūd was planning to march towards Māndū to the help of the Emperor Humāyūn when, on the night of 12 Rābiʿ I 961/15 February 1554, he was assassinated by his attendant Būhrān dūn, in revenge for the punishment which he had once inflicted on him.

Māḥmūd was weak and incompetent, but capable of committing acts of cruelty and of displaying occasional outbursts of energy. He was nevertheless generous and distributed food and clothes to the poor, and in winter gave them firewood and even bedding. He was a cultured prince and fond of the society of the learned and the pious. In Ahmadābād he erected an enclosure, six miles in area, which he named the Deer Park (Diāmūn), and in which various kinds of wild animals roamed freely. He built in it splendid buildings and laid out nice gardens and spent his time there in the company of beautiful women, with whom he hunted and played polo.

Māḥmūd left no male heir because, dreading that he would have a rival, he used to procure the abortion of any of his women who happened to become pregnant. So after Māḥmūd's death, the nobles asserted their independence in their districts and fought with each other for power. They first set up a boy, who was related to him as Sultan with the title of Ahmad III, who ruled nominally until 968/1561, and then Muzaffar III who reigned until 980/1572, when the Emperor Akbar invaded Gǔdarjārī and put an end to the prevailing chaos by annexing it.

**Bibliography:** See those for MĀḤMŪD I and MĀḤMŪD II of Gǔdarjārā son (MǔḤRĪBUL ḤASĀN)
out of Mandū towards Sārangpur. This led to the recall of Prince Muhammad by his father. Mahmūd, having prevented any help reaching ‘Umar Khān, defeated and killed him and then, on hearing that Ahmad Shāh had withdrawn to Gudjarat because plague had broken out in his army, he returned to Mandū. But after seventeen days, he set out towards Cānderī and captured it after a siege of four months. Here he received a request of help from Bahār Khān, mutakā 4 of Shahr-i Naw, which was being invested by Dungar Sen of Gwālīyār [q.v.]. Mahmūd, instead of marching towards Shahr-i Naw, advanced towards Gwālīyār. This strategy was successful, because Dungar Sen, realising the danger to his capital, retired from Shahr-i Naw. Mahmūd, having achieved his object, withdrew from Gwālīyār and proceeded to Shahr-i Naw, where Bahār Khān acknowledged his suzerainty.

After consolidating his position, Mahmūd in 848/1440-1 turned his attention towards the border chiefs. He first advanced on Khandwā, situated between Mālāwā and Khāndehāq and of great strategic importance. Ray Narhar Dās, its chief, finding himself unable to resist, fled, so that Mahmūd was able to annex it, along with Khorā and Khikrī, and secured the submission of Kherlā’s chief, Narsingh Deva. From Kherlā [q.v.], Mahmūd marched towards Sargūjā. On the way, the petty zamindārs sent elephants as tribute and begged him to spare their territories. Rājā Bhodjā of Sargūjā submitted and promised to supply elephants to the Sūltān. Similarly, the mukaddams of Raypur and Ratanpur came forward with elephants as tribute. Mahmūd returned from Sargūjā to Mandū in 845/1441-2.

Mahmūd’s reputation having spread far and wide, some of the šāhān 2 of Dihlī invited him to overthrow its Sayyid ruler, Sultān Muhammad Shāh (837-47/1434-43). Mahmūd accepted the invitation and set out towards Dihlī at the end of 845/1442. But in an engagement near Dihlī he was unable to defeat Prince ‘Alī 3 al-Dīn, Sultān Muhammad Shāh’s son, and, finding no hope of future success, he returned to Mandū on 1 Muharram 846/12 May 1442.

Mahmūd now turned his attention to Rānā Kumhār of Mewār, who had caused him to retire a grievance. The Rānā had helped Prince ‘Umar Khān of Gudjarat to seize the throne of Mālāwā, and had reduced the Rājdūpū tribes on the borders of Mālāwā, which had accepted the suzerainty of Sultān Hushang Shāh. Mahmūd took advantage of the rivalry between the Sisodīās and the Rāthrōs and of the struggle for power between Rānā Kumbhā and his brother, Khem Karon. Since the latter was expelled by the Rānā, Mahmūd used it as a pretext for its invasion. On 26 Dhu ‘1-Hijdūd 846/30 November 1442, he advanced towards Mewār. On reaching Kumbhalgarh, he attacked the Banmata temple, situated at its base, occupied it after seven days and razed it to the ground because it contained arms for the defence of the main fort and, although outwardly a temple, formed part of the defences of the main fort. Mahmūd then marched towards Cītor, but before he could attack it, he heard the news of his father’s death in Mandasor. He therefore proceeded to Mandasor and, after the period of mourning was over, returned to Cītor, but finding its capture difficult, returned to Mandū and decided to reduce Mewār gradually. So on 13 Shawwāl 847/3 February 1444 he occupied Gagrawn and named it Mustafābād. Two years later he reduced Kruddā, the last of the Bahmani strongholds on the borders of Mālāwā, but failed. In 851/1447-8, he marched on Gwālīyār and defeated Dungar Sen, who was compelled to retreat into his fort. Mahmūd proceeded to Agra and thence to Bayana, whose chief, Muhammad Khān, submitted to him. In 859/1455, Mahmūd occupied Aqīmār and, early in 861/January 1457, he besieged the strong fort of Mandalgarh. He took it on 1 Dhu ‘1-Hijdūd 861/20 October 1457, by first breaking the dams of the fort’s reservoir, which caused the water to flow out, and then affecting a breach in the fort’s walls. He destroyed an old temple and built a mosque in its place, and returned to Mandū after arranging for its administration. Until the end of his life Mahmūd made several attempts to reduce Cītor, but failed; and although he defeated Rānā Kumbhā, he failed to crush him and occupy any large part of Mewār.

In Sha‘bān 848/January 1444, Mahmūd came into conflict with the Shinjīrī ruler of Dīwān Bīr [q.v.], who had occupied Kālpī and refused to restore it to Naṣīr Khān, his vassal. This led to an armed conflict. However, through the mediation of the Shāykh al-Islām, Sayyidnā Dālī, who enjoyed the respect of both the Sultāns, a settlement was arrived at and Kālpī was given back to Naṣīr Khān [see MAHMUD SHAH SHARJHI].

Mahmūd, taking advantage of the incompetence of Muhammad Shāh of Gudjarat, tried to interfere in the affairs of his kingdom. Accordingly, in 854/1450 he set out to the assistance of Ganga Dās of Čāmpāner, which had been attacked by Muhammad Shāh. But instead of marching to Čāmpāner, he directed his attack on Ahmadābād, capital of Gudjarat. Alarmed for the safety of his capital, Muhammad Shāh raised the siege of Čāmpāner and returned to Ahmadābād. Meanwhile, having received an invitation for the invasion of Gudjarat, Mahmūd marched at the end of 854/January 1451 and entered Gudjarat. But since Muhammad Shāh had died, Mahmūd found himself confronted by his successor, Kutb al-Dīn, at Kāparbandī. On the last night of Safar 855/2 April 1451, he made a night attack on the Gudjarat army, but it proved abortive. In an engagement the next day, Mahmūd suffered a defeat and had to retreat with the loss of eighty elephants and his baggage. On his return to Māndū, Mahmūd, to avenge his defeat, sent Prince Ghānī to raid the Gudjarat ports of Sūrat and Rainder. Accordingly, the prince plundered the suburbs and countryside of Sūrat and returned to Māndū with the booty. However, realising that his chances of success against the Gudjarat army were remote, Mahmūd decided to compel Kutb al-Dīn to make peace by a show of his military power. This device worked, for when, on 6 Dhu ‘1-Hijdūd 855/30 December 1451, he sent an army to invade Gudjarat, Kutb al-Dīn agreed upon a treaty by which they were to respect each other’s territories and Mewār was to be divided into two parts for the military activities of the two rulers.

In Muharram 857/January-February 1455, Mahmūd invaded the Deccan under the impression that the Bahmani Sultān ‘Alī 3 al-Dīn Ahmad II, had died. But on reaching the borders of Mālāwā, he discovered that the Bahmani ruler was not only alive, but had personally come to attack him; hence he returned to Mālāwā.

In 866/1461 Mahmūd again invaded the Deccan, defeated the Bahmani forces at Maheshkar on the Mandjar river and invested Bīdār. The Dūwghar Queen, mother of the boy-king, Nizām Shāh, sent an army under Mahmūd Gāwān and at the same time approached Mahmūd I of Gudjarat [q.v.] for aid. Realising that he was not strong enough to fight the two armies simultaneously, Mahmūd withdrew to
Mâlwa. He for the third time invaded the Deccan on 26 Rabî‘ al-Awwal 867/19 December 1462, and occupied Dawlatabad, but his advance was stopped. But since the route via Khândeh was blocked by the Gujarati forces, Mahmūd had to make his way back through the forests of Gondwâna and suffer great hardship. Convinced that he would not be able to conquer the Deccan, Mahmūd came to a settlement with the Bahmanids. It was agreed that Elijpur in Malwa and the Bahmanids, and that Mahmūd would not in future invade the Deccan.

Mahmūd died on 19 Dhu ‘l-Ka‘da 873/31 May 1469 at the age of sixty-eight and was succeeded by his eldest son, Ghiyâth al-Dîn Shah. He had been a precocious child and, impressed by his intelligence, Sultān Husânh Shâh used to keep him by his side, and gave him the title of Khân when he was only sixteen. So it was no surprise that Mahmūd proved to be the greatest ruler of mediaeval Mâlwa, which reached the height of glory under him. He was wise, brave and benevolent, and a man of great energy and determination.

Although religious, he was tolerant towards Hindus and associated them in his government; Sangrâma Singh was his treasurer and Rây Rayân Siva was one of his most important and respected nobles. It tried some time to settle, but this was done in the territory of his enemies in the course of his campaigns; in his own kingdom he respected the sanctity of Hindu places of worship.

Mahmūd tried to promote the welfare of his subjects. When the crops were damaged by the marches and counter-marches of his troops, he compensated the peasants for their losses. He encouraged trade by patronising the Jains and encouraging them to settle in Malwa, and he made the roads safe for the movements of goods. He established a big hospital in Mândū which he richly endowed. He also opened a college with a hostel, where board and lodging was provided for both teachers and students.

The fame of Mahmūd’s achievements reached as far as distant Egypt and Transoxiana. In 867/1462 al-Muzaffar ibn Khân, the puppet 'Abdâl Shâh of Egypt, sent an envoy to Mândū with a Khâtâ [q. v.] and a diploma of investiture, conferring on Mahmūd sovereign powers. Some years later, in 867/1462, an envoy came from Timūr’s great-grandson, Abī Sa‘îd of Transoxiana and Khûrâsân, with presents for Mahmūd. In return, when the envoy left, he was accompanied by Prince Abī ‘Alâ‘ ibn Khân and his father’s envoy and carried rich presents for Abū Sa‘îd. Unfortunately, no details of Mahmūd’s mission to Harât are available.

Mahmūd was an enthusiastic builder. He completed the mosque and tomb of Husâh Shâh, whose foundations had been laid by the latter. He also erected ten colleges to build monuments to his victory over Rânâ Kunbha of Mewâr.


2. MAHMUD KHALDJî I, whose real name was ‘A‘âmum Hûmâyûn, the third son of Sultan Naṣîr al-Dîn Shâh (906-16/1501-10). The latter had designated his eldest son, Shîhâb al-Dîn, as his successor, but as Shîhâb al-Dîn had rebelled, he nominated ‘A‘âmum Hûmâyûn to succeed him, and gave him the title of Shâh Shâh. Accordingly, on the death of his father, Mahmūd declared himself Sultan. But his two elder brothers, Shîhâb al-Dîn and Shâhîb Khân, refused to recognise him. The former set out towards Mándû, but his advance was checked by Muḥâfîz Khân and Khawâsî Khân, who were in favour of Mahmūd. In consequence, he retired to Khândeh [q. v.]. Mahmūd, who had been following him, succeeded in entering Mándû and ascended the throne on 6 Rabî‘ al-Âsir 1 917/5 June 1511.

Mahmūd was weak, incompetent, fickle-minded and a puppet in the hands of his nobles, who struggled with each other to dominate him. He first came under the influence of ‘Alâ‘ Khân and Muḥâfîz Khân, who were so powerful as to assassinate the wâzîr, Basant Rây, in the audience hall, and secure the banishment of Sangrâma Singh, his minister. But Muḥâfîz Khân soon turned against them and allowed himself to be dominated by Muḥâfîz Khân. ‘Alâ‘ Khân and Muḥâfîz Khân thereupon recalled Shîhâb al-Dîn, and finding their life in danger, left Mándû to join the pretender. Shîhâb al-Dîn advanced from Khândeh by quick marches, but died on the way due to heat and exhaustion. Meanwhile, Mahmūd, weary of Muḥâfîz Khân’s domination tried to overthrow him. But before he could take any action, the minister himself struck and raised to the throne his elder brother, Shâhîb Khân, as Muhammad Shâh II. Mahmūd, finding himself helpless, escaped from Mândû and went first to ‘Ujîdâyin and then to Cândri, where his governor refused to help him. However, he secured the help of Ray Când Pûriya, upon whom he conferred the title of ‘Alâ‘ Khân, and attacked Sahîb Khân. He defeated him and then besieged him in Mándû. Shâhîb Khân, unable to hold out, fled to Gudjârât with Muḥâfîz Khân and was given protection by its ruler, Muzafâr II.

Mahmūd, in recognition of Medni Rây’s services, made him his wâzîr. But this aroused the hostility of the nobles like Sikandâr Khân of Satwas and Bahdjat Khân of Cândri, who rebelled and took up the cause of Shâhîb Khân, who had returned to Mâlwa. Medni Rây succeeded in reducing Sikandar Khân to obedience, but operations against the other rebels had to be postponed because Muzafâr II invaded Malwâ and besieged Mándû. Fortunately, however, finding Mándû too strong to be reduced, Muzafâr withdrew and Mahmūd, with Medni Rây’s help, was able to occupy Cândri and expel Shâhîb Khân in ‘Umâdâ I 920/July 1514.

The victories achieved by Medni Rây made him very powerful, and he began to fill all the important posts by his own Râjpûts followers, dismissing old Muslim officers. Mahmūd resented these changes, and chafing under Medni Rây’s domination, demanded that the dismissed Muslim officers be reinstated, and that the Râjpûts should not keep Muslim women as mistresses. Medni Rây accepted their demands, but his assistant Salîvâhan refused. Mahmūd therefore decided to get rid of both of them by assassination. Medni Rây escaped with minor in-
juries, but Salivahan was killed. This led to the revolt of the Radjputs. Medni Rây, however, pacified them and continued as wâzîr. But Mahmûd, having failed to overthrow him, escaped from Mandû at the end of 923/1517 to Guджràt and sought the aid of Mużaffar II. The latter, thereupon, invaded Mâwîlî in order to restore Mahmûd’s authority. On hearing of the invasion, Medni Rây proceeded to Çitor to seek the aid of Rânà Sàngarámã Sêngî, leaving his son, Rây Pithora, in charge of Mañfûd. Meanwhile, Mużaffar II invested Mândû and having taken it by an escalade on 4 Safar 924/15 February 1518, ordered the massacre of the Radjputs who had defended the fort. He reinstated Mahmûd and returned to Guджràt, leaving behind 10,000 troops for his protection.

These events completely alienated Medni Rây and his Râджût followers from Mahmûd. Medni Rây oc-cupied Gâgrawân and, when Mahmûd besieged him, he appealed to Rânà Sàngarâmã Sêngî for help. The Rânà marched to his relief. Mahmûd raised the siege and set out to intercede the Rânà, but was defeated, wounded and taken prisoner. He was taken to Çitor, and allowed to return to Mâwîlî after his wounds were healed, but had to surrender his crown and leave behind his son as a hostage. On his return to Mândû, he found his position ex-tremely weak; and it was further weakened by the withdrawal of the Guджràtî forces by Mużaffar II at his request. The result was that Rânà Sanga occupied Mân-dasor; Medni Rây seized Çandere; Sîlhdâi oc-cupied Bhîlsa and Raisin; and Sikandar Kîhân declared his independence in Satwa. The disintegra-tion of Mahmûd’s power was almost complete, and he was left with only a small territory around Mândû. But instead of consolidating his position and trying to recover his territories, Mahmûd committed the mistake of giving asylum and support to Çand Kîhân against his brother, Bahâdur Kîhân, who had ascended the throne of Guджràt. Bahâdur Kîhân was greatly offended and invaded Mâwîlî. He besieged Mâyûd, captured it by assault on 9 Shá’îbân 937/2 April 1531, and caused the khutba to be recited in his name. Mâwîlî thus passed into his possession. Mahmûd and his sons were sent as prisoners to Campaner. On the way, he made an attempt to escape, but was seized and killed along with his sons on the night of 14 Shá’îbân 837/2 April 1531; with his death the Khâlîjî dynasty of Mâwîlî came to an end.
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MAHMÚD, the name of two Ottoman sul-tans.

1. MAHMÛD I (1143-68/1730-54), (with the title of Çâhâzî and the literary nom-de-plume of Sabkâtî). The eldest son of Sultan Müştafî II, he was born on the night of 3 Muharram 1108/2 August 1696 in the Palace at Edirne. His mother was Wâhlî Sâlîba Sultân. He undertook his first studies on Wednesday, 20 Dhu ‘l-Hijja 1113/18 May 1702 with a grand ceremony at the Edirne Palace which his father Muştafî II attended in person, and was given his first lesson by the Şaykh al-Islâm Sayyid Fâyîd Allâh Efendi. In due course, the latter’s son Rûmûlî Pâvîlî Ibrahim Efendi was appointed to act as his tutor. Following the deposition of his father Muştafî II as a result of the “Edirne Incident” and the accession of his uncle Ahmed III on 10 Rabî’î 1 1115/23 August 1703, Prince Mahmûd, together with his mother and her other children, was taken into custody by the in-surgents at the Palace in Edirne and was subsequently taken to Istanbul along with the Ottoman palace staff and shut up in a private apartment in the Imperial Palace (the Sarâ-yî dêjîdî). His circumcision was ef-fected with a simple ceremony on Thursday, 22 Dhu ‘l-Hijja 1116/17 April 1705.

Prince Mahmûd’s life of seclusion in the Palace continued for 27 years up to 1730. It was only when Ahmed III was forced to abdicate the Ottoman throne as a result of the Patrona Khâlîf revolt that he was set free, becoming sultan on Monday, 19 Rabî’î 1 1143/2 October 1730. Having ordered his release from the apartment in the Palace where he had been shut up, his uncle invited Mahmûd to spend the night of 1-2 October with him so that he could advise him on the administration of the Empire. He then joined his two sons in swearing allegiance to Mahmûd and was thus the first to recognise him officially as sultan. The formal-ities necessary for his accession were completed at Eyyûb on Friday, 23 Rabî’î 1 1143/6 October 1730, when he girded on the sword and the khutba was read in his name for the first time.

During the first days of Mahmûd’s reign, the rebels had complete control over the affairs of the state. In particular, their leader Patrona Khâlîf forced the sultan to carry out his wishes with regard to new ap-pointments, while Mahmûd I also complied with the rebels’ demands by agreeing to the abolition of one category of taxes and to changes in the way some others were collected, and he had to sit idly by as the buildings at pleasure-grounds such as Kâhîfîhâmîne and Fenerbahcîhâmîne were despoiled by the in-surgents. However, disorderly conduct of this kind was not permitted for much longer. Under the leadership of Mahmûd’s mother Sâlîba Sultân, some of the Empire’s most experienced statesmen—the Kislâr ahgâtî Bèshîr Agha, Kaplan Gîrây, a former Khân of the Crimea, and the Kapudan-i deryâ Dânîm Khôdîa Mehmêd Pâgha—cooperated with Kabakûlak Ibrahim Agha and others in arranging for the leading rebels to be put to death in the Imperial Palace—inside the Rewân Kâs’r and the Sûnnet Odâsî—on 25 November 1730, and Mahmûd was thus assured of the freedom to rule without such interventions.

Despite the outbreak of a second uprising on 25 March 1731, which seems to have been a continuation of the first revolt and may even have been organised by Bâhrî Mas’ud, the daughter of Abdîm III and widow of the executed Grand Vizier Newâbêhéhî Ibrahim Pâgha, in order to revenge herself on the new Sultan, the people’s manifest support for Mahmûd and the strong measures taken by the Grand Vizier Kabakûlak Ibrahim Pâgha and the Kapudan-i deryâ Dânîm Khôdîa Mehmêd Pâgha meant that this disturbance was confined to the neighbourhoods of Bâyezîdî and Aksaray and was suppressed before it could gain strength.

After achieving a strong position in the internal af-fairs of the Empire, Mahmûd I turned his attention to the problems facing it abroad. His first moves were against Nâdîr Shâh, who was causing the Ottoman Empire difficulties in the East. The forces which he sent against Iran under the command of the governor of Baghîdâd, Eyyûbî Ahmêd Pâgha, won the first suc-cess of his reign at the battle of Koridjan on 13 Rabî’î 1 1144/14/15 September 1731, and by the treaty signed on 10 January 1732 the Safawî ruler Shâh Tâhêmâtî II agreed to cede the districts of Gangjâ, Tîfîs, Rewân, Shîrvân and Dâghîstân to Mahmûd. Never-theless, the war between the Ottomans and Iran could not be concluded because of Mahmûd’s objections over the question of Tabriz, and it continued to rage with full force through the districts of al-Mawât, Kûrkî, Baghîdâd, Tabriz, Gangjâ, Tîfîs and Kars until the end of 1735, during the period when Nâdîr
Shāh was acting as guardian to ʿAbbas Mirzā (III). It was on account of the successes of the Ottoman forces during the early years of this war that Mahmūd I adopted the title of Ghāzi. Later on, however, the Ottoman army suffered defeat after defeat and eventual-ly, as a result of negotiations which were initially conducted by the representatives of Nādir Shāh and a Turkish delegation under the commander of Gandja, GenʿAli Pasha, in the Mughān steppe in Adhar-baydājān and later by an Iranian delegation led by ʿAbd al-Bākī Khān and Mahmūd I himself in Istanbul, an agreement was reached between the two powers which dealt with the border question but left the modāghbāh dispute unsettled.

At this point, Nādir Shāh wished to turn his attention to Iran's eastern borders, while Mahmūd I was intent on dealing with the Russian threat from the north. Relations between Mahmūd I and the Russian Empress Anna Ivanovna had been soured by the Polish question and a number of other border disputes, and, because, in the course of the struggle with Nādir for control of Kars and the surrounding area in 1735, a contingent of Crimean troops had crossed Kabartay territory on their way to reinforce the Ottoman army in northeastern Anatolia. Finally, after the Russian attack on the fortress of Azak on 31 March 1756, Mahmūd I held a great divān in Istanbul on 2 May and personally took the decision to declare war on Russia. However, Tāmāl Khān, the Habusburg Emperor's representative in Istanbul, who later joined the Ottoman army in the field, followed a policy of distracting the Ottoman government with plans for peace, this campaign was not given the necessary degree of importance and the Ottoman commanders were therefore unable to gain any success during the first year. Furthermore, from June 1737 onwards, while the Habusburg Emperor Charles VI took Russia's side in this war, Mahmūd I was forced to defend the borders of the Empire along a very broad front. There were engagements on the banks of the Sava in northern Bosnia, in the Nish and Vidin areas south of Belgrade as well as in Little Wallachia, along the Aksu (Bug) and Turla (Dnestr) rivers near Özü and Bender, in the Crimea, and around Azak. In his attempts to gain the upper hand against both these states, Mahmūd I frequently changed his Grand Vizier. Eventually, the victories which the Ottoman forces won against the Austrians on the western front, which was considered the more important, forced both states to come to terms with Mahmūd through the good offices of the French ambassador, the Marquis de Villeneuve, and led to the signing of the treaty of Belgrade on 18 September 1737.

Mahmūd I thereby regained from the Habusburg Empire a number of towns, Belgrade being the most important, which had been lost by the treaty of Passarowitz in 1718. For their part, the Russians had to evacuate several areas they had occupied in northern Moldavia. In return for the Marquis de Villeneuve's services, France's commercial advantages were increased by the capitulation dated 30 May 1740. At the same time, in order to improve his political relations with Russia, Mahmūd I sent the Deftomēnī Mehmed Emni Beyefendi on an embassy to St Petersburg, while the Birindī ṭuğlūkandī Djanīb ʿAli Efendi was dispatched as ambassador to the Habusburg Empire. Meanwhile, a commercial treaty had been signed with the kingdom of Sweden in 1737 and a defence pact in 1740, in which same year a purely commercial agreement was reached between the Ottoman Empire and the kingdom of the Qajar Sālihs. However, while Mahmūd I was still putting his political relations with the European states in good order, his relations with Nādir Shāh reached another crisis point. Nādir Shāh, who had returned from his campaign in India, again marched to Iran's western borders and laid siege to the border cities of Baghādād and Kīrkūk in the spring of 1743 under the pretext that, during the truce, Mahmūd I had not accepted the Qīrāfī school as the fifth modāghbāh, as Nādir had proposed. Because the Turkish mission which Mahmūd I had previously sent to Iran under Mūṁī Muṣṭafā Efendi in July 1741 had been unable to prolong the good relations with Nādir Shāh, the second phase of the war between the Ottomans and Iran had begun before the gates of Baghādād, Kīrkūk and al-Mawṣīl. However, Mahmūd I, with the assistance of Ahmad Pasha, the Ser'ater of Kars, had Šafī Mirzā, a member of the Safawī dynasty who was living in the Ottoman Empire, sent to the Iranian frontier and turned a number of khanān in the Dāḡjāstan and Shir-wān areas south of the Caucasus against Nādir Shāh by granting them their independence. Nādir Shāh was therefore unable to remain in the Baghādād and al-Mawṣīl areas and had to lift the sieges of these two cities and abandon Kīrkūk, which he had already taken, in order to move to the area around Kars. The fighting in this area and around Rewān continued until the end of 1745. In the end, in the face of the determination and perseverance shown by Mahmūd I and despite the fact that he had gained a number of victories, Nādir Shāh, who was also influenced by events at home, abandoned the struggle for the Kars region and made a serious peace proposal to Mahmūd. The peace negotiations between the Ottomans and Iran began at a great divān on 1 February 1746, after the delegation which Nādir had sent under the leadership of FāthʿAlī Khān had arrived in Istanbul.

Mahmūd I reacted favourably to the proposals put forward by Nādir Shāh on this occasion and, having decided upon a new border settlement which was based on the Kār-i Shīrīn treaty of 1639, but leaving aside the problem of the Qīrāfī school, he dispatched a Turkish delegation to Iran under the leadership of Muṣṭafā Nazīf Efendi on 9 March 1746 with authority to negotiate with Nādir Shāh. This delegation met Nādir Shāh in the Kirmānshāh and around Azakh, and, as a result of their negotiations, peace was declared between the two states on 17 Shāban 1159/4 September 1746. Mahmūd I, who signed the instruments of this settlement in December 1746, sent the text of the treaty back to Nādir Shāh in the care of the ambassador Kēsrīyēl Ṭahmāb Pāḥa.

After Nādir's death, Mahmūd I followed a conciliatory policy towards his neighbours such as Iran, Russia and Austria up until his own death. Meanwhile, however, the internal problems of the Empire, such as the agitation among the Palace Aghas, after the death of the Kūstār ṣagāši Behgīr Aḥsā, the suppression of the Lewend bandits [q.v.], who were bringing destruction to Anatolia, the murder of Sayyīd Faḍī in Syria, the revolt of the Janissary garrison at Nīsh, the Wahbābi movement in Nagīd, the uprising in Istanbul on 2 July 1748, and many other similar incidents, occupied his attention. Mahmūd died at the Demirkapī in the Imperial Palace while on his way back from the Friday prayers on 27 Safar 1168/13 December 1754. He was not interred in the mausoleum which he had built beside the Nūr-i ʿOṯmānīyye mosque, but was buried beside his grandfather Mehmed Meḥmed IV and his father Muṣṭafā II in the mausoleum of Wālīde Turḥān Kaḥīdījī Soltānī in the mosque of ʿOṯmānīyye, as ordered by his brother and successor ʿOṯmān III.
He was a thin, short, well-tempered man, who gave priority to the maintenance of public order inside Istanbul and would go to meetings of the divân in order to hear the people's complaints. He knew enough about the sports of ğâlî [p. e.], horse-racing and swimming and was knowledgeable about poetry and music. We know that he used the mâkelâs Sabkâtî and that he wrote poetry in Arabic (Şehîrzâde Sa'îd Efendi, Melâzân ar-şafi, Beleciye Küütüphanesi, ms. Muallim Cevedet 0.74, f. 53b; Tayyâr-zâde Aḥmad 'Aţâ, Ta'rîkh-i Şâhî, iv, Istanbul 1293, 67; 'Ali Efendi, Taqawwâr al-mulîdik, Istanbul 1319, 30). He knew enough about the music to be a composer in his own right, but he is more often spoken of as an instrumentalist and as a patron of other musicians (Yılmaz Öztûnû, Türk müsîkitâ lâğûtî, 120, 407; Sübûh Ezgi, Nâzari, ameli Türk müsîkitâ, İstanbul 1940, iv, 93). This Sultan, who was interested in chess and had a passion for flowers, is also known to have lavished a good deal of attention on the cultivation of tulips. In his free time and while the weather permitted, he would make trips to the pleasure-grounds along the Bosphorus, at Kâğıtštânî and at Fenerbâhçesi, and would spend his time in the summer houses there. Although the Nûr-i Ümânîyiye complex, with its mosque, madrasa, maktûb, library, mausoleum, 'îmârât el-sebîr, was built at his orders, it was given its present name because the whole of it was completed during his reign. He built the Newâbîdîn near the Yali Koshkî, the Dar Kapûfsî mosques and the mosque of the Tulum-Öthman had any children, the Ottoman dynasty was called Newâbîdîn, as he had had it built up from scratch in 1740, and the third in the Ghalata Sarayî in 1754. Furthermore, in his time in the summer houses there. Although the Kâğıtštânî and at Fenerbâhçesi, and would spend his time in the summer houses there. Although the Nûr-i Ümânîyiye complex, with its mosque, madrasa, maktûb, library, mausoleum, 'îmârât el-sebîr, was built at his orders, it was given its present name because the whole of it was completed during his reign. He built the Newâbîdîn near the Yali Koshkî, the Dar Kapûfsî mosques and the mosque of the Tulum-0thman had any children, the Ottoman dynasty was called Newâbîdîn, as he had had it built up from scratch in 1740, and the third in the Ghalata Sarayî in 1754. Furthermore, in his time in the summer houses there. Although the Kâğıtštânî and at Fenerbâhçesi, and would spend his time in the summer houses there. Although the Nûr-i Ümânîyiye complex, with its mosque, madrasa, maktûb, library, mausoleum, 'îmârât el-sebîr, was built at his orders, it was given its present name because the whole of it was completed during his reign. He built the Newâbîdîn near the Yali Koshkî, the Dar Kapûfsî mosques and the mosque of the Tulum-
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2. MAHMÜD II (reigned 1223-55/1808-39). Born at Topkapı palace on 13 Ramadan 1199/20 July 1785, he was the youngest of twelve sons of sultan 'Abd al-Hamid I. He succeeded to Mustafa IV on 28 July 1808. An armed coup led by the provincial governor Mustafa Bayrakdăr [q.v.] aimed at restoring to the throne the formerly deposed sultan Selim III. In the course of the action, however, Selim was assassinated, the reigning Mustafa deposed, and Mahmûd, as the only remaining legitimate candidate, was declared sultan. Until his ascendance to the throne, Mahmûd had spent his entire life in seclusion, according to Ottoman practice.

At this point the Ottoman empire appeared to be on the verge of final disintegration. The central government wielded minimal authority over the provinces, administered largely by self-appointed local rulers [see ÂÇVÂN, DEREBEY]. A temporarily inactive state of war with Russia and Britain imposed further strains on the political fabric. In Istanbul itself political power was exercised by extra-legal forces, composed mainly of ʿulamâ' and soldiers. The sultan's office was reduced to political impotency (Djewdet, ix, 16).

During the first months of Mahmûd's reign real power was wielded by Bayrakdăr, who had himself appointed grand vizier. He convened an assembly of provincial rulers in Istanbul which adopted the Deed of Agreement (see ÂÇVÂN, DERBESE). This document sought to change the constitutional framework of the empire by limiting the sultan's sovereignty and establishing a quasi-feudal political system. In addition, it aimed at reviving Selim III's military reforms. In mid-November 1808, Bayrakdăr's government was brought down by a popular uprising led by the Janissaries of Istanbul. It was the culmination of a movement opposed to reform as well as to the seizure of the central government by provincial elements.

Following their victory, the Janissaries set up in Istanbul a reign of terror and once again began to interfere in state affairs. The anarchy which prevailed at the capital since the fall of Selim III in May 1807 left the political élite hopelessly divided and demoralised. Meanwhile, Mahmûd exhibited characteristics of strong leadership and dedication to traditional values. The religious and bureaucratic élites desiring the re-establishment of orderly government began to turn to the court for guidance (Djewdet, ix, 59-61). Thus were laid the foundations for the restoration of the court as an active centre of government. Mahmûd seized this opportunity to curb the Janissaries. Throughout his reign he consistently endeavoured to strengthen the court's position by subordinating all other political forces. Gradually, he formed a network of advisers and assistants who helped him carry out his policies. Some of these at various times attained positions of great influence [see ŞâLeT EFEND], but throughout, Mahmûd remained the supreme autocrat.

In January 1809 a peace treaty was concluded with Britain, in spite of strong protests by Napoleonic France. But negotiations with the Russians, who had in 1806 occupied Bessarabia, Moldavia and Wallachia, failed. In April 1809 the war was resumed with the Russians attacking south of the Danube. The Ottomans suffered defeat in several battles, but succeeded in foiling a Russian attempt to take Shumla and to storm across the Balkan mountains. Faced with the mounting threat of war with France, the Russians were prepared to compromise. The war was terminated with the Treaty of Bucharest (May 28, 1812) which ceded Bessarabia to Russia, while the Ottomans regained Moldavia and Wallachia.

Meanwhile, Mahmûd initiated a policy designed to restore central authority over the provinces, and when the war ended this became his primary concern. By 1820 Istanbul succeeded in re-asserting its power over most of the provincial centres in Anatolia, as well as over Thrace, Macedonia and the Danube districts. The local ruling notables were replaced by governors appointed from Istanbul. In the view of the government, all local notables were usurpers of legitimate authority (mümteğallibe). Consequently, their suppression was often ruthless and indiscriminate. This tended to destroy the local administrative infrastructure, thereby weakening thereby the very bases of Ottoman power (cf. Şahântâde, ii, 230-1, 246-7, Djewdet, x, 146-8, 181-7, 217-19). This was a factor which facilitated the emergence of the national movements of the Serbs and Greeks.

During the same period, the sultan intervened occasionally in the affairs of his Syrian and Mesopotamian provinces, but achieved ephemeral results only. In Arabia the power of the Wahhabis was curbed by enlisting the military services of Muḥammad ʿAllī, the governor of Egypt. While still maintaining his allegiance to the sultan, Muḥammad ʿAllī gradually transformed Egypt into a formidable state. The sultan had no means with which to reassert his authority over the distant African provinces of Tripoli, Tunis and Algiers, but he claimed suzerainty over them.

The Serbs had taken advantage of the weakening of Ottoman provincial administration to rise in 1804-13 and again in 1815. Under Russian pressure the sultan agreed to grant the Serbs complete autonomy. The process was gradual, and was completed in 1829. The drawn-out conflict between the sultan and Tepecelendi ʿAli Pasha [see ʿALİ PASHA TEPECİLEND], the most powerful noble in Albania and Greece, aided the Greek cause. The sultan initiated the conflict with ʿAli in July 1820 and the Peloponnesus was up in arms in March 1821. Although Mahmûd was profoundly shaken by the outbreak of the Greek uprising, for almost another year he continued to direct the main military efforts against ʿAli, whom he considered the greater threat to the realm (A. Levy, Oto- man attitudes to . Balkan nationalism). ʿAli was finally defeated and executed in February 1822. Meanwhile, a series of border skirmishes with Iran in 1820 escalated into a full-scale war. After several years of desultory fighting, peace was restored in July 1825. The sultan now concentrated all his efforts to subdue Greece. Uprisings in Macedonia and Thessaly were suppressed, but the Ottoman forces proved incapable of advancing into the Peloponnesus and a stalemate ensued. The sultan once again appealed to Muḥammad ʿAllī for assistance, promising to cede to him the governorship of Crete and the Peloponnesus in return.
for his services. In February 1825 the modernised Egyptian army landed in Greece, drastically altering the military balance. The Ottomans renewed their attacks and by April 1826, with the fall of the key fortress of Missolonghi, the Greek position became desperate.

The Greek uprising made a great impact not only on the Ottoman political elite but also on wide segments of the Muslim population at the centre of the empire. The proximity of the fighting and the destruction of long-established Turkish communities in Greece and the islands were among the main reasons which caused Muslim society to view this conflict as a threat to its very survival. In addition, the poor performance of the largely untrained Ottoman troops could be compared with the effectiveness of the modernised Egyptian army. This created a perceptible change in the mood of Ottoman society favouring military reform (Déjewet, xii, 139-46, 159).

In early 1825, Mahmud had been cautiously introducing significant improvements in several military branches, especially in the artillery and navy. But in the spring of 1826, with his authority restored at the capital and in many provinces, and with the Greek rising appearing close to extinction, it seemed to Mahmud that the time had come to carry out more comprehensive reforms. But he adopted a gradual approach. The first step was to adjust the fanar for the organisational structure of the Janissary corps as an elite unit of active soldiers called Efkhindigân. The sultan took precautions to enlist the support of the religious and bureaucratic élites as well as the Janissary officers themselves. Nevertheless, on the night of 14 June the Janissaries rose up in arms. The sultan reacted with speed and determination. He mustered loyal troops and on 15 June, within hours, the rebellion was crushed with considerable bloodshed. Two days later an imperial order declared the Janissary corps abolished.

It is difficult to exaggerate the impact which the suppression of the Janissaries made on contemporary Ottoman society as well as on Europe. It was considered the end of one era and the beginning of another. In an effort to gain for it universal approval, the sultan's treasurer asked the Ottoman ambassadors to: “Beneficial to fair” (wa'ak-a'lid bakrayye) and the court historian Es'ad Efendi was charged with recording the official version of future generations. Es'ad's detailed account entitled The foundation of victory (Uss-i safer) was printed in 1828.

Military defeat and the apparent failure of the government's reform policies rekindled unrest and rebellion in widely flung provinces, especially in Bosnia, Albania, eastern Anatolia and Bagdad. These movements, sometimes led by former Janissaries and their sympathisers, were partly a delayed conservative reaction against the government's reforms. More commonly, they represented protest against increased taxes, forced conscription and, in some instances, the lack of reparation for heavy-handed centralising policies. The government was generally successful in putting down these movements by employing the new disciplined troops, which proved sufficiently effective as an instrument of suppression and centralisation. Nevertheless, throughout the remaining years of Mahmud's reign, unrest and rebellion continued to flare up in various districts.

In 1830 the sultan tried unsuccessfully to prevent the French occupation of Algiers. Meanwhile, Muhammad ʿAli became determined to seek compensation for his losses in Greece. His perception of the sultan's military weakness encouraged him to demand the governorship of Syria. When this was refused, in October 1831 the Egyptian army invaded Syria, defeated two Ottoman armies and completed the conquest by July 1832. When the sultan countered by preparing yet another army, the Egyptians marched into Anatolia, defeated the Ottomans again at Konya (21 December), occupied Kütahya (2 February 1833) and were in a position to march on Istanbul. The sultan sought help from the great powers, but only the Russians dispatched a naval force to defend Istanbul (February 1833). This induced Britain and France to offer mediation, resulting in the Convention of Kütahya (April 8). It conferred on Muhammad ʿAli the government of Syria and the province of Adana. Meanwhile, Russian paramilitary in Istanbul was underscored by the Treaty of Hünkâr (Kânnkâr) Iskelesi (8 July), a Russian-Ottoman defensive alliance. But the treaty alarmed other European powers, especially Britain, who became determined to help the Ottomans liberate themselves of Russian dependence. The Ottoman empire now came under the protection of the European Concert, and its foreign relations with Britain, Austria and Prussia were increasingly improving.

In spite of military disasters and political setbacks, during the 1830s Sultan Mahmud relentlessly proceeded with his reformatory measures. His main objectives continued to focus on centralisation of government and the attainment of greater efficiency in its work. In 1835 the entire administration was reconstituted into three independent branches: the civil bureaucracy (kalemiyye), the religious-judicial...
hierarchy (‘ünime) and the military (seyfiyye). Their respective heads—the grand vizier, the şerîkât-ül-İslâm and the ser-‘asker—were now considered equals, and therefore responsible directly to the sultan (BBa, HH 24031; Lufî, v, 25-6). Throughout most of Mahmud’s reign the court had been the most important centre of power. Now it was officially recognised as such. The aggrandisement of the court was mainly at the expense of the grand vizier’s office. Traditionally, the grand vizier was considered the sultan’s absolute deputy (vâdit-i mâdâh) and as such the head of the entire government, civilian and military. To underscore the reduction of his authority, in March 1838 the grand vizier’s title was officially changed to that of chief deputy, or prime minister (bagh vâdit). At the same time, the grand vizier’s chief assistants were given the title of minister (nâzir and later vâdit). These changes were combined with attempts to attain a better definition of administrative responsibilities. Consequently, from 1836 government departments were being regrouped into ministries (sâset) for internal, foreign and financial affairs. A further distinction was made between the executive and the legislative. Consultative councils were established to supervise military and civil matters and to propose new legislation. The highest of these, the Supreme Council for Judicial Ordinances (Mâgâlis-i ullah-yi ahkâm-i‑sadîqî), established in 1838, acted as an advisory council to the sultan. New regulations granted the civil servants increased security, but also required higher standards of performance. But all these were mere beginnings. The difficulties were due mainly to the lack of trained personnel. In most cases the staffs of new departments were drawn from old ones, and the administrative reforms often amounted to a mere reshuffle of offices. Nevertheless, the groundwork was prepared for the emergence of a new generation of administrators with a more modern outlook.

The military, which during Mahmud’s last years was allocated about 70% of the state’s revenues, continued to be the focal point of reform. Most significant was the gradual extension of the authority of the commander-in-chief (ser-‘asker) of the Manşâre over other services and branches. Thus the headquarters of the ser-‘asker Baş-ı Ser-‘asker (q.v.) gradually came to combine the roles of a ministry of war and a general staff and was in charge of all land forces. The navy continued to operate as a separate organisation under the grand admiral, whose administration comprised a separate ministry. In the different branches of the army, larger permanent units were formed with their regular commanding officers and staffs. Segments of the old feudal (tâmâra) cavalry were reformed. In 1834 a provincial militia (redîf) was established. The last two measures were intended to provide the regular army with reserve forces as well as to co-opt the provincial notability into the new system by conferring on them commissions and honours. After 1833 the strength of the regular armed forces was considerably increased, and by the end of Mahmud’s reign there were some 90,000 men in all the services, exclusive of the militia and other semi-regular organisations. Several European governments began extending modest military assistance. The Russians and British each sent a few military instructors. The British also helped establish the beginnings of a modern arms industry and sent teams of engineers and workmen. Most useful services were rendered by the Prussian military mission which increased from one officer (Helmuth von Moltke) in 1835 to twelve by 1837.

This was the beginning of a continuing pattern of military cooperation which was to last until the 20th century. At the same time, the sultan rejuvenated the military engineering schools which had been founded in the 18th century and had subsequently fallen into decay. He also established a military medical school (1827) and an officer school (1834). The sultan enlisted the support and cooperation of the ‘âlamâr in many of his military reforms (A. Levy, Ulema). But the paucity of adequately trained personnel and limited financial resources made progress difficult. The commissary system could not support the rapid increase of the military establishment as demanded by the sultan. Epidemics were rife and over a quarter of all recruits succumbed to disease. Desertion was also very high, and it was necessary to replenish the ranks continuously with new, untrained conscripts (BBa, Kepesi 6799; Moltke, Briefe, 349-50).

In May 1835 the international community was taken by surprise when an Ottoman expeditionary force occupied Tripoli in Africa, claiming it back to the sultan. In the following years Ottoman fleets appeared several times before Tunis, but were turned back by the French navy (BBa, MMD, ix, 99-110). The continued occupation of Syria by Muhammad ‘Ali could not be tolerated by an autocratic ruler like Mahmud. In the spring of 1839, believing that his army had sufficiently recovered and that a general uprising in Syria against Egyptian rule was imminent, Mahmud precipitated another crisis. On June 24 the Egyptians, once again, decisively routed the Ottoman army at Nizib. On July 1 Mahmud died, probably without learning of his army’s last defeat.

During Mahmud’s reign, due to the inertia effects of long historical processes, the Ottoman empire continued to decline in relation to the West. Its dependence on Europe increased and it continued to suffer military humiliation and territorial losses. Yet, within the reduced confines of his realm Mahmud’s achievements were considerable. He resurrected the sultan’s office, and with that he reformed and rejuvenated the central government. He arrested the disintegration of the state and even initiated a process of consolidation. In spite of his intensive reformatory activity, Mahmud was inherently dedicated to traditional values. He did not attempt to alter the basic fabric of Ottoman society, but rather to strengthen it through modern means. He generally succeeded in integrating the old élite into the new institutions. This was in keeping with his strong attachment to the ideal of justice in the traditional Ottoman sense. The sobriquet he selected for himself, ‘Adî, “the Just,” is an indication of the cast of his mind. It may be said, therefore, that the principles which guided him throughout his reign were Islam, autocracy and justice. Nevertheless, though he may not have intended it, the reforms which Mahmud introduced were to produce basic change and to launch Ottoman society on the course of modernisation in a final and irrevocable manner.

Bibliography:

The Ottoman archives contain a vast number of relevant documents dispersed in numerous collections. All the documents cited above are from Başbakanlık Arşivi (abbreviated as BBA). For a description of the holdings of this archive see M. Sertoğlu, Muhtevî bakımdan Batışkât Arşivi, Ankara 1955. Especially valuable concentrations of documents are located in the following collections: Kanunname-i askeri defterleri (abbreviated as KAD), vols. i, ii, vi (military legislation, organisation, history), the military medical defterleri (abbreviated as MMD), vols. vi-x (mainly internal political matters); Maliyeden mudevver defterleri, vol. 9002 (financial and administrative matters); Tel-
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Cihat ve redif ve mevad ve muhimm-i aski derleri (abbreviated as TRD), vol. xxvi (military reform and financial administration); Tezvat, zehayar, esnaf ve sittihat derleri, vols. xxvii - xxviii, (local provisions and various matters); Kamil Kepçio tasnifi (numerous documents dealing with the financial administration of the government and armed forces). The Cedit tasnifi and Hatt-i hıdıyalar (abbreviated as HH) collections are very useful, but more disparate.

European archives contain extensive information in the correspondence and reports of envoys stationed in the Ottoman empire. At the Archives de la Guerre, Paris, carton no. MR1619 contains an especially valuable collection of detailed and informed reports on political and military conditions.

The Ottoman chronicles for this period are: Ahmed Düşmez, Ta'rikh, 2 vols., Istanbul n.d. (vol. ii discusses the events of 1808); Şahîzade Mehmed 'Ağaullah, Ta'rikh, 4 vols., Istanbul 1290-1/1873-4 (events of 1808-21); Mehmed Es'ad, Ta'rikh, 2 vols., unpublished ms. (events of 1821-6); Ahmed Djuwedit, Ta'rikh, 12 vols., Istanbul 1270-1301/1854-83; 2nd ed. 1302-9/1884-91 (vols. ix-xii discuss events of 1808-26; Ahmed Lu'fi, Ta'rikh, 8 vols., Istanbul 1290-1328/1873-1910 (vols. i-vi discuss the period 1825-39).


Of the extensive western travel accounts, most relevant to the Ottoman empire and other contemporary works, the following have special value: A. F. Andreossy, Constantinople and the Bosporus of Thrace, Paris 1841; A. Boué, La Turquie d'Europe..., Paris 1840; J. Dekay, Sketches of Turkey in 1831 and 1832, New York 1833; V. Fontanier, Voyages en Orient..., Paris 1829; A. Juchereau de St. Denys, Les révolutions de Constantinople en 1807-1808, Paris 1819; idem, Histoire de l'Empire ottoman depuis 1792 jusqu'en 1844, Paris 1844; C. MacFarlane, Constantinople in 1829, London 1829; idem, Turkey and its destiny..., London 1850; Helmut von Moltke, Briefe..., Berlin 1841; R. Wagner, Molte und Mischbahn zusammen unter den Halbmonde, Berlin 1893 (very useful; based on private and public documents).


MAHMUD KHAN, NASIR AL-DIN, the founder of a short-lived dynasty ruling in Kâlpî [q.v.] in the first half of the 9th/15th century. He was the son of Malikzâda Frîzû b. Tâqî al-Dîn Turk, the wazîr of Ghiyâth al-Dîn Tughluk II, who was killed with his sovereign in Dîhilî in 791/1390; after that event he fled to Kâlpî, îskîd, giving it the honorific name of Muhammadaîb, and 'aspired to independence' (dam az istiklâl mizad). This was not difficult to attain in the disrupted conditions of the Dîhilî sultanate after Timûr's sack and withdrawal, and Muhammâd consolidated his position at the expense of his Hindî neighbours. His status was never really secure against the growing power of the neighbouring sultanes of Mîlâwâ and Djawanpur [q.v.], and the historians of those regions indicate that the arrogated titles of shâh and sulûn were contested by the rulers of the larger and more powerful regions. Mahmud died in 813/1410-11 and was succeeded by his son (Ikhât-î al-Dîn Abu 'l-Muqaddâm) Kâdir Khân, referred to by Fîrîha as 'Abd al-Kâdir al-mawium be-Kâdir Shâh (Lucknow lith., ii, 306, 307), d. ca. 835/1432, in a war of succession between his three sons, Mîlâwâ and Djawanpur again intervened, resulting in a son called Djalât Khân being installed under the suzerainty of Mîlâwâ; he managed to assert his independence more firmly than his father or grandfather, for he issued coins as Fath al-Dunya wa 'l-Dîn Djalal Shâh Sultâm in 841/1437-8. The length of his reign is not known, but his brother Nasîr Khân, ruling in 847/1443, was chastised by the Djawanpur forces and temporarily deprived of his throne after being suspected of apostasising from Islam; thereafter, this semi-independent dynasty does not appear in the historians.

Bibliography: The prime text is Muhammad Bihâmâd Khânî, Ta'rikh-i Muhammâdî, B. M. ms. Or. 137 (Kiev, Cat. Pers. ms. i, 84 fl.), completed in 842/1438-9; the author was brought up in the house of Sultan Mahmud's father, and later served under Muhammâd's brother and wazîr Djunayd Khân, receiving the îskîd of îrîc for military services. His information is corroborated by Yâbîy b. Ahmad Sirhindî, Ta'rikh-i Muhabbât Shâhî, and Fîrîha, and he is cited as an authority by Nîzâm al-Dîn Ahmad, Tabakât-i Akbarî (whence also the later information on Nasîr Khân); S. H. Hodvâlî, The unassigned coins of Jalal Shâh Sulûnî, in JASB, NS xxv (1929), Numismatic Supplement N. 41-6 (J. Burton-Page).

MAHMUD SHAH SHARKI, ruler in Djawanpur [q.v.], the eldest son of Ibrahim Shah Shârkî, ascended the throne in 844/1440. In 846/1442, he decided to invade Bengal, but owing to reasons not clear he refrained from carrying out his plans. The account in the Mu'âla' al-îsâdîn that he did so because of a warning from the Timûrid Shâh Rûkh is not accurate.

In 847/1444, hearing that Nasir Shâh, ruler of Kâlpî (Muhammadaîb), had plundered the town of
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Shahpur and harassed its Muslim population, Mahmud decided to punish him, ... of the Council of Regency; Malik Hasan Nizam al-Mulk as Mir NaDib; Fath Allah clamd al-Mulk, also a Hindu convert to

Soon afterwards, Mahmud crushed a rebellion in Cunar and annexed a greater portion of it. He then invaded Orissa which he plundered and, after laying the foundations of two mosques at Paharpur, returned to Dihl!.

Mahmud now put forward a claim to the throne of Dihl! on the ground that its ruler Sultan 'Ali al-Din 'Alam Shah (847-83/1443-76) was his wife's brother. The Sultan was a puppet in the hands of his wazir, Hamid Khan, who was the de facto ruler. But weary of his minister's domination, he had gone away to Badu'un. Hamid Khan, finding his position insecure on account of the machinations of the Sultan and the hostility of some Dihli nobles, invited Bahlul from Sirhind. Bahlul immediately set out towards Dihl! and occupied it on 17 Rabi' 1 855/19 April 1451. He then imprisoned Hamid Khan and declared himself king.

At the beginning of 856/1452, Mahmud Shah, instigated by his queen, Bibi Radji, invited the nobles who detested the uncouth Afghans, advanced towards Dihl! with 170,000 cavalry and 1,400 war elephants under Darya Khan Lod! and Fath Khan eda; a holy man much respected by both the rulers; Mahmud Sharki agreed to restore Kali toNASR Shah.

because Djawna Khàn, the Sharki governor of Shamsabad, refused to surrender it. Bahlul therefore attacked him and after expelling him, handed over Shamsabad to Ray Karan. Mahmud hastened to the aid of Djawna Khan. Kub Khan and Dary Khan made a sally against the town on his behalf, but this proved abortive and Kub Khàn was taken prisoner. Greatly distressed on hearing of Kub Khan's imprisonment, Bahlul set out to attack Mahmud. But the latter fell ill and died in 862/1458. He was succeeded by his eldest son, Bihikam Khan, who ascended the throne of Dijawnpur as Sultan Muhammad Sharji.

Mahmud was an able ruler and his subjects were happy and prosperous during his reign. He is said to have spent his time in the society of the 'ulama? and Sufis. He was interested in architecture and built the famous Lai Darwaza Mosque in Dijawnpur, and adja-

cent to it a magnificent palace for his queen, Bibi Radyi. He also built a bridge and madrasas, and laid the foundations of another palace outside Dijawnpur.

Mahmud Khaldji advanced towards Erach on 2 Sha'ban 886/5 April 1481. He succeeded in per-

suading the boy-king to order the massacre of the Afak!s, or Ghar!b!s, comprising Turks, Persians and the natives and old settlers, and the Newcomers called

The result of Darya Khan's defection was that the Sharki army became demoralized and, although numerically superior, it was defeated by Bahlul's 7,000 troops. Fath Khan was put to death (859/1455). Udjdjayn was then annexed. Mahmud Khaldji advanced towards Dihl! with 170,000 cavalry and 1,400 war

Mahmud was an able ruler and his subjects were happy and prosperous during his reign. He is said to have spent his time in the society of the 'ulama? and Sufis. He was interested in architecture and built the famous Lai Darwaza Mosque in Dijawnpur, and adja-

cent to it a magnificent palace for his queen, Bibi Radyi. He also built a bridge and madrasas, and laid the foundations of another palace outside Dijawnpur.


MAHMOOD SHIHAB AL-DIN, the fourteenth ruler of the Bahmani dynasty [q.v.] in the Dakhan (Deccan). He ascended the throne at Muhammadabad-Sidar at the age of twelve on the death of his father, Shahs al-Din Muhammad Muhammadabad-Bidar at the age of twelve on the death of his father, Shahs al-Din Muhammad, at Shamsabad to Ray Karan. Mahmud hastened to the aid of Djawna Khan. Kub Khan and Dary Khan made a sally against the town on his behalf, but this proved abortive and Kub Khàn was taken prisoner. Greatly distressed on hearing of Kub Khan's imprisonment, Bahlul set out to attack Mahmud. But the latter fell ill and died in 862/1458. He was succeeded by his eldest son, Bihikam Khan, who ascended the throne of Dijawnpur as Sultan Muhammad Sharji.

Mahmud was an able ruler and his subjects were happy and prosperous during his reign. He is said to have spent his time in the society of the 'ulama? and Sufis. He was interested in architecture and built the famous Lai Darwaza Mosque in Dijawnpur, and adja-

cent to it a magnificent palace for his queen, Bibi Radyi. He also built a bridge and madrasas, and laid the foundations of another palace outside Dijawnpur.

Islam, as wazir and Mir Djumla as finance minister. Kasim...

In 891/1486, four years after his accession, Mahmud, anxious to assert his power, conspired with Kasim Barid and Dastur Dinár, the leader of the Abyssinians (Hababhis), to get rid of both Nizám al-Mulk and I màd al-Mulk. But the plot leaked out and the Sultán apologised to them. However, I màd al-Mulk, realising his life to be in danger, left for his own province of Bérat. Mahmud then returned again. Nizám al-

Mulk, who took no precaution, was strangled to death by his friend, Dilpasand Khán, at the instigation of Mahmúd.

Nizám al-Mulk’s removal from the scene led to the victory of the Afáiks. But the Dakhánis, alarmed and angry by the murder of their leader, plotted to assassinate the king with the support of the Hababhis; and on 21 Dhu ‘l-Ka’dá 892/8 November 1487, they entered the palace, locking the gate behind them so that no one else could enter. They killed the Turkish guards, but Kasim Barid, with a detachment of 12,000 men, scaled the walls of the palace and rescued the king. The next morning, Mahmúd ordered the massacre of the Dakhánis, and for three days this continued until it was stopped by the intercession of Shah Muhibb Alláh, son of the saint Khél. Taking advantage of these events, Kasim Barid raised the banner of revolt, and compelled Mahmúd to make him wakil or prime minister (897/1492).

Meanwhile, Malik Ahmad, Nizám al-Mulk’s son, who was at his dàjâr [q.v.] of Djunayr, on hearing of his father’s death, adopted the title of Nizám al-Mulk and without seeking the permission of the king, conquered all the forts in Mahráráshtra, including the whole of Konkón and the territory up to the river Godávári. He then came to Bídár, where he was received by Mahmúd and confirmed in his new possessions; but at the same time Mahmúd sent troops against Malik Ahmad and also ordered Yusús Údíd to march against him. The royal troops were defeated, while Yusús Údíd, in defiance of the king’s order, congratulated Malik Ahmad on his success. It was in 897/1492 that Malik Ahmad, Nizám al-Mulk’s son, with the help of Nizám al-Mulk, who took no precaution, was strangled to death by his friend, Dilpasand Khán, at the instigation of Mahmúd.

Yusús Údíd’s position became strong due to the betrothal of his daughter to the crown prince, Ahmad, early in 903/1497, which enabled him to secure the dàjâr of Gurbágha, Aland and Gangáváti which had been assigned to Dastur Dinár. Previously to this, Kasim Barid, being jealous of Yusús Údíd, had contrived his overthrow. He had suggested to Narasa Náyák, the prime minister of Vídajáñagar, to occupy Rayyúr and Mahmúd, which were in Yusús Údíd’s possession, and had also tried to win over Malik Ahmad against Yusús Údíd by offering him Panhála, Konkóñ and Goa, which were at the time in Bahádúr Gilání’s possession. But Yusús Údíd had succeeded in foiling Malik Ahmad’s plans. He had first marched towards Bídár, but Kasim Barid defeated Khán and Mahmúd, near the capital. He had then directed his attention towards the Vijdáñagar, which he had defeated on 1 Radjab 899/1 April 1493 and had reoccupied Rayyúr and Mudad, thus upsetting Kasim Barid’s plans.

Disenchanted with Kasim Barid, Mahmúd now invited Yusús Údíd and Kútb al-Mulk to his rescue at the end of Dhu ‘l-Hajj 900/4 August 1497. They came and besieged Kasim in his dàjîr of Asúra, but gained no success, for the minister was soon reconciled to the king. However, in 909/1503-4, Kasim Barid was replaced by Khán-i Díjahán, also a Turk, until Kasim Barid contrived his death. Thereupon, Yusús Údíd, Kútb al-Mulk and Dastur Dinár marched on Bídár to wrest power from Kasim. The latter was defeated and fled, but this did not improve things, because he once again won over Mahmúd. Frustrated in their attempts to rescue the king, the tarafdárs in disgust returned to their respective dàjârs, leaving Kasim Barid as powerful as before. When he died in 910/1504-5 he was succeeded by his son Amir ʿAli Barid, whose domination was even more effective than that of his father.

Taking advantage of these internecine conflicts, Krignádóvara contrived Yusús Údíd to evacuate the Dòáb. The Gangdís of Orrisa, on the other hand, occupied the whole east coast which had belonged to the Bahmáníds. In 923/1517, Mahmúd tried to recover the Dòáb from the Rádja of Vijdáñagar, but he was defeated and wounded and compelled to retreat.

Mahmúd’s last days were unhappy. In addition to these territorial losses, there were risings of his tarafdárs, who were engaged in carving out independent kingdoms for themselves, which he was helpless to prevent; soon his writ did not run beyond the walls of Bídár, and even there he was subject to the will of Amir ʿAli Barid.

Mahmúd died on 4 Dhu ‘l-Hijjá 924/7 December 1518. He was succeeded by four kings, one after the other, set up or set aside according to Amir Ahmad’s pleasure. Kallím Allah, Namíl’s son, was the last king. He wrote to Bábúr for help against Amir Barid, but as the last found this out, Kallím Allah fled to Bídjáúr and thence to Ahmadnagar, where he is supposed to have died in 945/1538.


MAHMÚD B. ISMÁ’ÍL. [See LU’LU’, BÁDR AL-DÍN.]

MAHMÚD B. MUHÁMMAD B. MALIK-SláH, MUHÁMMAD AL-DUNYÁ WA ’L-Díín Abú ’L-KÁSÍM, Great Sálídúj sultan in western Persia and Iraq 1375-1418.

The weakening of the Great Salídúj central power in the west, begun after Malik-Sláh’s death in the
period of the disputed succession between Berk-ya'rük and Muhammad [q. v.], but arrested somewhat once Muhammad had established his undisputed authority, proceeded apace during Mahmūd's fourteen-year reign to extend his influence from that initiative in his youthfulness (he came to the throne, at the age of 13, and as the eldest of his father's five sons, on 24 Dhū 'l-Hijjah 511/18 April 1118, through the support of Kamāl al-Mulk Simūrūmī, subsequently his vizier), but stemmed mainly from the continued vitality among the Saldjūks of a patrimonial concept of rule which made clear-cut father-eldest son succession difficult to enforce. Mahmūd's uncle, Toghrīl (q. v.) remained as undisputed ruler of the eastern Persian lands, and from his seniority and experience became, and was regarded as head of the Saldjūk family, even though since the time of Toghrīl Beg the holder of the seat of power in the western half of the sultanate had normally been regarded as supreme sultan. But what made Mahmūd's reign so full of strife were the pretensions of his four brothers, Mas'ūd, Toghrīl, Sulaymān Shāh and Saldjūk Shāh. All of these Seldjūk some degree of power in various parts of the western sultanate at different times, and the first three of them eventually achieved the title of sultan itself, though their reigns followed after the brief one of Mahmūd's son Dāwūd (525-6/1131-2) and were interspersed with those of two other sons, Malik-Shāh III (547-8/1152-3) and Mahmūd II (548-55/1153-60).

The claims of these fraternal rivals for power during Mahmūd's reign could not have been sustained without military support from their own Atabegs or guardians [see ATABAK] and other Turkish commanders, through whose control large sections of the sultanate were frequently abstracted from Mahmūd's direct rule, with deleterious effects on his finances, his ability to pay his troops and therefore his enforcing his authority. As lamented by Anūqīrīwān b. Khalīd [q. v.], who acted as Mahmūd's vizier 521-2/1127-8, "they [sc. Mahmūd's rivals] split up the kingdom's unity and destroyed its cohesion; they claimed a share with him in the power, and left him with only a bare subsistence" (Bundarī, 134). Mahmūd's sultanate also witnessed further steps in the process of the revival of the 'Abbāsid caliphate in Baghdād's temporal power, and the growing confidence of Mahmūd concerning temporary al-Mustarshīd (512-29/1118-35) was only held in check by the caliph's enemies in central 'Irāk, the Ṣhī'ī Arab dynasty of the Mazyadids [q. v.] under Dubays b. Ṣadakā. The ascendancy over the young sultan Mahmūd immediately established by the Chief Hācjī 'Ali Bār soon led to an invasion by Sandjar, who came westwards with a powerful army, defeated Mahmūd at Sāwā and dictated peace to him, but on a fairly amicable basis (513/1119), Sandjar secured control of the Caspian provinces and Ray, but gave Mahmūd one of his daughters in marriage and made him his heir. Meanwhile, Mahmūd was losing control of some parts of his dominions, for his brother Toghrīl's cause was espoused in northern Džībāl by the Atabeg Kūntoghdāl, and from a base at Karwīn, Toghrīl defied Mahmūd for the whole of his reign. Also, ʿAdharbāyjān and al-Dżāzirā had been granted to Mas'ūd b. Muhammad, with Ay-Aba Džuyūq Bāg as his Atabeg. The separatist tendencies of local Turkish and Kurdish chiefs, including 'Imād al-Dīn Zangī, encouraged Mas'ūd, and in 514/1120 he and Ay-Aba rebelled openly, but were defeated by Mahmūd's general ʿAk Sunkur Bursuḵī at Asadābād near Hamadān, and Mas'ūd's vizier al-Ḥasan b. ʿAli al-Toghrīl [q. v.], the famous poet and stylist, was executed. Ay-Aba had hoped to incite Dubays b. Ṣadakā against Mahmūd, and over the next few years the amir of Hilla's hopes of reducing Saldjuk influence in 'Irāk were raised. Fortunately for Mahmūd, fear of the Shi'i threat had the effect of forcing the caliph al-Mustarshīd into close cooperation with Mahmūd's own vizier Shams al-Mulk ʿUthmān b. Nizām al-Mulk, and in 520/1126 Mahmūd came with an army to Baghdād to enforce his rights and reinforce the authority of his ʿšhrāna or military governor there.

On the extreme northern fringes of the sultanate, a threat had arisen from the resurgent Georgians [see AL-KURJ] under David IV the Restorer (1089-1125), who had stopped paying tribute to the Saldjūks (see W. E. D. Allen, A history of the Georgian people, London 1932, 96-100). An army sent by Mahmūd in 515/1121, and including Toghrīl, Dubays and the Ar-tukid Il-Ghāzī, failed to halt the Georgians, who captured Tiflis and Ānā and dislodged the latter's Mustarshīd prince, and a further expedition to Shir-wān led personally by the sultan (517/1125) achieved nothing either. Toghrīl and dubays tried soon after this to stir up 'Irāk against Mahmūd and al-Mustarshīd, but failed and had to flee to Khūrāsān. They persuaded Sandjar to move westwards to Ray in 522/1128, but Mahmūd became reconciled to his uncle; Dubays had eventually to move to Syria, and in 524/1130 Mahmūd and Mas'ūd made peace, the latter being confirmed in his appanage centre on Gān:dža in Adharbāyjān.

Mahmūd died in Džībāl on 15 Shāwwal 525/10 September 1131 at the age of only 27, and his death was to plunge the western sultanate into sharp succession disputes. Despite an alleged love of luxury, Mahmūd achieved a favourable mention from historians for his justice and reasonableness and for his Arabic scholarship, rare among the Saldjūk rulers. He patronised many of the leading poets of his time, and both he and the caliph al-Mustarshīd were the mamādūs of Ḥayṣa Bayṣa [q. v.] (see 'All Dzhawād al-Ṭāhirī, al-Shī'ī al-'arabī fi ʿl-'Irāk wa-bi ʿl-ʿAafīmī, 198 ff. There is a biography in Ibn Khallikān, ed. Dżawzjī, and of the Saldjuk, sources, Bundarī, 203-6; Ibn al-Kalānisī, Dhāt al-sudr, 88-9, 96-9; Ibn al-Kalānisī, Dhājī Taʾrīkh Dimāșq, 198 ff. There is a biography in Ibn Khallikān, ed. Ihsān ʿAbbasī, v, 182-3, no. 174, tr. de Slane, iii, 337-8).

MAHMUD b. SEBUKTIGIN, sultan of the Ghaznawid dynasty [q.v.], reigned 388-421/998-1030 in the eastern Islamic lands.

Abu 'l-Kasim Mahmud was the eldest son of the Turkish commander Sebuktigin, who had risen from being one of the slave personal guards of the Iklhâl-i bâzûr or commander-in-chief Alptegin [see ALP TAKîN] under the Sâmâniids to become the virtually independent amir of a principality centred on Ghazna [q.v.], at that time on the far eastern fringe of the Sâmâniid empire. Mahmud was born in 361/971, his mother being from the local Iranian (?) gentry stock of Zabulistan [q.v.], a district around Ghazna in what is now eastern Afgânistân; hence in the eulogies of his court poets, Mahmud is sometimes called "Mahmûd-i Zâbulî".

Mahmud was involved at his father's side in the confused, internecine warfare which marked the last years of the Sâmâniid amirate. In 384/994 the two of them fought on behalf of the amir Nuh II b. Masûr against the rebels Abu 'l-Alî Simdûgûr and Fârîk Khâshâ, and Mahmud was rewarded with the honorific title Sayf al-Dawla and command of the army of Khorûsân in place of Abu 'l-Alî. Control of this powerful military force was of prime value to Mahmud when, in Shâhân 387/August 997, Sebuktigin died and Mahmud had to establish by force of arms his own claim to the amirate in Ghazna against that of Ismâ'îl, his younger brother, whom Sebuktigin had, by a decisive puzzling decision (387/998), appointed his successor (388/999) but who had no military experience or reputation comparable to that of Mahmud.

Once securely in power, the latter's first step was to re-establish the position in Khorûsân by ejecting the general Beguzûn, who had taken over the province whilst Mahmud was involved in civil war with Ismâ'îl. By securing a decisive victory over all his opponents in Khorûsân, Mahmud was able to turn against his old masters the Sâmâniids on pretext of seeking vengeance for the deposed amir Mansûr b. Nûh II; he then secured from the 'Abbâsîd caliph al-Kâdîr [q.v.] direct investiture of the governorships of Khorûsân and Ghazna and the idâkah of Yâmîn al-Dawla and Anis al-Mîlla (the former honorific being that by which Mahmud became most widely-known, to the point that the whole Ghaznawid dynasty was often referred to later as the Yâminîyân). With the final disintegration of the Sâmâniid state in the face of a fresh invasion from the north by the Karâkânids or Ilek Khâns [q.v.], it was a question for Mahmud of moving quickly to consolidate his hold over his own share of the former Sâmâniid dominions, those south of the Oxus, for the Ilek Khân Nasr b. 'Ali coveted Khorûsân also. Whilst Mahmud was pre-occupied in India in 396/1005-6, a Karâkânid army invaded Khorûsân, and the united forces of the Ilek and his kinsman Yusuf Kâdir Khân of Kâshghar were not finally driven out till 398/1008, after which Mahmud's grip on Khorûsân was never again threatened from that quarter.

Mahmud's 32 years of rule were filled with almost ceaseless campaigning over a vast expanse of southern Asia, so that by his death he had assembled an empire greater than any known in eastern Islam since the decline of the 'Abbâsîd caliphs. Continuance of his father's policy of raids into the Indian subcontinent enabled Mahmud to build up a great contemporary reputation as hammer of the heretical Ismâ'îlî Shi'îs in Mâhâm and the Hindu princes of the Sûfis above all, of the pagan Hindus. In retrospect, it appears to us that the prime motivation for Mahmud's raids was financial greed rather than religious zeal. The temple treasures of India were thereby tapped, and the proceeds used to beautify mosques and palaces in Ghazna and at places like Lashkâr-i Bâzûr [q.v.], but above all, to maintain a huge, but largely private, highly expensive, multi-national professional army which could not be stood down between campaigns. For the army, indeed, the manpower of India, in the form of infantrymen and elephant-drivers, was pressed into service, and it does not seem that Mahmud balked at employing these men whilst they were still pagan. The details of Mahmud's Indian campaigns, usually estimated at 17 in all, can conveniently be read in Nâzîm's Sulûk Mahmud [see Bâbîl.], 86-122.

Briefly, the Hindûshâhî [q.v.] dynasty of Whyhind, which had stood as a bulwark in northwestern India against Muslim expansion down the Indus valley and across to the Gangetic plains, was assaulted in several campaigns, and successive Râdas, Dîjâyâl [d. 395/1002-3], Anandânâpî, Trîlocaînâpî (d. 412/1021-2) and Bhîmpûrî (d. 417/1026), the last of his line humbled, despite their attempts at alliance with other threatened potentates such as the Râdjâs of Kulîngiâr, Kanâwâdî, Gwâlîyôr, Dîhî and Uddîjân. Expeditions against these latter rulers led Mahmud well into the Dô 'Aâb and into Central India, whilst a spectacular march across the Thar Desert in 416/1026 gained him fabulous plunder from the idol-temple at Sûmânhî in Kâthâwârîf, ancient Sûrâshfâra, an ethnically Muslim region throughout the Muslim world, and the fresh idâkah of Kahf al-Dawla wa-l-'Ilam. Nor were Muslim dissidents spared, and the Ismâ'îlî ruler of Mûlân, Abu 'l-Fath Dâwîd b. Nasr, one of the local Arab rulers in Sind who had acknowledged the distant suzerainty of the Fâtîmids, was subdued and finally deposed in two campaigns (396/1006 and 401/1010).

The raiding of India was thus a financial necessity for maintaining the momentum of the Ghaznawid military machine. A political annexation and the mass conversion of the Hindus were probably never envisaged, and could not have been maintained in face of the strenuous opposition offered by the Hindu princes except by an enormous army of occupation and the settlement of myriad of Muslim colonists. By the end of Mahmud's reign, Islam must have had a good hold in the lower and middle Indus valley, but Lahore remained for nearly two centuries essentially a frontier bastion for Muslim ghâtî activity against Hindu-held territory which lay not far to the east; it was to be the task of Mu'azzîr al-Dîn Mûhâmmad Ghi'rî and his commanders really to establish Islamic political control over northern India in the 7th/13th century [see GHURIDS and DIHLÎ SULTANATE].

The other aspect of Mahmud's imperialist policies concerned the Iranian world, where, as successor-state to the Sâmâniid, the sultan employed a mixture of direct conquest and the extension of tributary states over outlying regions. Thus the local Safârîd rulers of Sîstân were reduced to vassalage (393/1003), as had been already at Mahmud's accession the Farîghunîds [q.v. in Suppl.] in Gûzîn [q.v. and the Shîrs or princes of Gharîcâstân [q.v.]; whilst the rulers of Kûşdâr and Mâktrân [q.v.] in modern Bulûshîstân had to acknowledge Mahmud in 402/1011 and at the sultan's accession respectively. His forcible annexation of the ancient kingdom of Khârâzm [q.v.] on the lower Oxus and the extinguishing of the native Ma'mûnî dynasty of Khârâzm-Shâhîs [q.v.] in Gurândî in 408/1017, an isolated outpost of conquest which Mahmud's son Ma'sâ'î had to relinquish only five or six years after his father's death, nevertheless enabled the Ghaznawids to turn the flank of the
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western branch of the Karakhansids, who under ʿAlītigin had never ceased to show hostility to the sultan, and to achieve a position of dominant influence in the Caspian region. The death of Fakhir al-Dawla [q.v.] of Ray and Dibāl in 387/997 inaugurated a period of weaker rule for the northern Būyids under his son and successor Mustaq al-Dawla Rustam [q.v.] and his imperious mother and regent Sayyida. Mahmūd made the Ziyārīd ruler of Gurgan and Tāṣarāstān Manūzār b. Kābus [see zvānān] his vassal, but only towards the end of his life did he feel free from his other commitments to lead a full-scale expedition against the Būyids (an expedition into the Būyid province of Kirmān in 407/1016-17 in support of a Būyid claimant to the governorship there; had achieved no lasting result). Mahmūd al-Dawla was dethroned and his amirate annexed, and the Ghazzanwids pushed into northwestern Persia, temporarily subduing local Daylamī and Kurdish princes like the Kākuyids and Mūsāfīrīds [q.v.] (420/1029). The whole campaign was retrospectively justified by propaganda denouncing the Būyids for their Shīʿism, their encouragement of heretics and their tutelage of the caliphate in Baghādād, and grandiose plans for advancing on ʿIrāq and confronting the Fatimids on the Syrian Desert fringes envisaged. All these plans were cut short by the sultan’s death at the age of 59 on 23 Rabīʿ II 421/30 April 1030 and rendered impossible of execution for his son Masʿūd because of the growing menace from the Turkmen incursions, which were to lead eventually to the triumph of the Saljuqs at Dandānqān [q.v. in Suppl.] and the Ghazzanwids’ loss of Khurasān.

The contemporary image of Mahmūd was that of a Sunnī hero, sedulous in sending presents to the caliph in return for honorifics and investiture patents, and zealous to maintain orthodoxy within his dominions against all religious dissent and against odd pockets of paganism in regions of Afghanistan like Ghūr and Kāfīrīn. The centralised, despotic machinery of state with the sultan at its head, as created by Mahmūd and his Persian officials, typifies the Perso-Islamic “power-state” in which the ruling institution of officials and soldiers was clearly set apart from the masses of tax-paying subjects, the ṭaqāṣā. It was not for nothing that within half-a-century of Mahmūd’s death, the great vizier Nizām al-Mulk [q.v.] could hold the sultan up in his Siyāsat-nāma as an exemplar for his own Saldjūq masters, and the military state typified by that of the Ghazzanwids became the model for many later Islamic powers, a large proportion of them likewise directed by Turkish military castes. However, the figure of Mahmūd also exemplifies how speedily and successfully the Islamic cultural milieu could attract and mould in its own image an outsider whose father had been a barbarian from the pagan Turkish steppes; for amongst other things, the literary and intellectual circles at Mahmūd’s court, which nurtured several leading poets like ʿUnṣūrī, Farruḵkhi and, for a short time, Firdwāsi [q.v.] and provided a congenial centre of work for the scientist al-Bīrūnī [q.v.], show that the sultan conceived of himself as a full member of the comity of Islamic prince-patrns.

Bibliography: Primary sources. The main contemporary source is ‘Utbī’s al-Taʾrīḵ al-Yamāni, together with that of a generation or so later, Gardizi’s Zawārat al-ṣakhirār; this last plus Ibn al-Aḥīr contains valuable material from the lost Taʾrīḵ Wulīd Khurāsān of Sallāmī. Although the relevant volumes of Bayḥākī’s Muṣāfiʿlāt for Mahmūd’s reign have not survived, those subsequent ones forming the Taʾrīḵ-i Masʿūdī give important retrospective information, e.g. for the conquest of Khurāzām. The later biographies of viziers, such as Nāṣīr al-Dīn Munghī Kirmānī’s Nasīr al-ṣaḥār and Sayf al-Dīn ʿUṣaylī’s ʿAḥīr al-unzurān, are important, as are adab works and collections of anecdotes, including ʿAṣīrī’s Dīwān ʿAḥīrī and Fakhir-i Mudābbīrī’s Addāh al-bahr wa l-ṣaḥāraʾ.

2. Secondary sources. M. Nāẓīm’s The life and times of Sultan Mahmūd of Ghazna, Cambridge 1931, is a detailed, somewhat eulogistic, full-scale study; briefer, but more critical, is M. Habīb’s Sultan Mahmūd of Ghazna, Delhi 1951. Other studies containing important information include Barthold, Turkestān down to the Mongol invasions, London 1928; C. E. Bosworth, The Ghaznavids, their empire in Afghanistan and eastern Iran 994-1040, Edinburgh 1963; idem, in Camb. hist. of Iran, iv, ch. 5, v, ch. 1; and idem, The medieval history of Iran, Afghanistan and Central Asia, London 1977 (contains several reprinted relevant articles). For a survey of later historiography about Mahmūd, see P. Hardy, Mahmūd of Ghazna and the historians, in Jnl. of the Panjab Univ. Historical Soc., xiv (Dec. 1962), 1-36. (C. E. Bosworth)
policy. The regency lasted throughout the reign of Ahmad III and during the minority of the next sultan, Muhammad III (867/57-1463-82). The short reign of Ahmad III saw two major military conquests, namely, a war with Kālpīlghāwār of Ufīsā (Orissa), who took advantage of the sultan’s youth to invade the Deccan from the north-east, and the struggle with Mahmūd Khāldī of Mālāwā, who invaded it from the north; in both of these, Mahmūd Gāwān’s policy and strategy were successful. While Kālpīlghāwār had to retreat and pay a large indemnity, Mahmūd Khāldī, who menaced the very existence of the Deccan as an independent state, was defeated with the help of the sultan of Gudjārāt [q.v.]. This alliance of Gudjārāt with the Deccan was initiated at the instance of Mahmūd Gāwān and became the cornerstone of the foreign policy of the Bahmanī kingdom for many years to come.

Three years after the accession of Muhammad III in 867/1463, a palace intrigue caused the murder of one of the members of the council of regency, Khādja Djāhān Turk, followed later by the retirement of the dowager queen from the day-to-day affairs of state. Mahmūd Gāwān was now invested with the insignia of premiership and the title of Khādja Djāhān [q.v.] conferred on him. Mahmūd Khāldī was again repulsed by the help of Gudjārāt, and following the policy of conciliation already exercised effectively, the Deccan now entered into a treasured friendship with Mālāwā. Soon an opportunity arose for interference in the affairs of Ufīsā when in 875/1470-1 two factions came to grips at Djāḏāngār, the capital of the Gadjapatis, and one of them sought the help of the Bahmanī sultan (JāSB [1893], and Būrḥān-i mādthir). Mahmūd Gāwān thereupon sent Malik Hasan Bahārī (later Nizām al-Mulk and ancestor of the Nizām-Shāhi dynasty of Ahmadnagar [q.v.]) to Ufīsā. Malik Hasan not only succeeded in putting the rightful claimant on the Ufīsā throne, but also in annexing Rājdāmdrī and Kondavdu to the Bahmanī Kingdom.

It was now the turn of the lands beyond the Western Ghāfs to be pacified. Goa had already been reduced by the founder of the dynasty, Allārī dīn Bahman Shah (748-59/1347-58), but it was necessary to make sure that it had subsequently passed into Vidjayanagar’s orbit. Moreover, certain local chieftains were in the habit of waylaying Bahmanī ships plying in the Arabian Sea. By a series of brilliant campaigns which lasted three years from 873/1469 to 876/1472, Mahmūd Gāwān successfully negotiated the difficult terrain, captured the great fort of Sangameshwar and boldly marched to Goa, which he entered on 20 Sha’bān 876/1 February 1472.

The frontiers of the kingdom had now reached the Bay of Bengal in the east and the Arabian Sea in the west, and Mahmūd Gāwān rightly felt that it was time to reform the administration which had remained more or less static since the reign of Muhammad I (759-76/1358-75). He ordered that the whole land should be measured and a record of rights kept, thus forestalling the reforms of Akbar the Great and Rājdā Tōdar Mal by about a century. He re-divided the kingdom into eight instead of four provinces, brought certain tracts in each province under the direct rule of the sultan as royal domain, made khādaras or commanders of fortresses in each province directly responsible to the centre, and demanded accounts from military ḍābdīs or feudatories. He thus curtailed the power of the fiefholders and provincial magnates, who had exercised absolute power for several decades. Although himself an Afākī or “Newcomer”, he tried to keep the balance between the native Dakhnīs and the Afākīs in the matter of the distribution of high posts, and thus strove to solve a problem which had adversely affected the body-politic. Two significant events vastly increased the prestige of the kingdom, and with it that of the Khādja. One was the complete rout of Puruṣottam of Ufīsā, who had advanced to the banks of the Godāvāri to make common cause with the rebels of Kondavdu, and the other was the state visit of Adil Khān Fārītīk of Khandesh to Bīdar. Adil Khān’s visit is remarkable in that it resulted in the circulation of Bahmani coins in Khandesh as well as the mention of the Bahmani sultan’s name in the khaba at Burhānpur, the capital of the principality. Thus Khandesh, which was once at daggers drawn with the Deccan, became virtually a protectorate of the Bahmani at this time.

It was when Muhammad III was away on an expedition to Nellur and Kāndī (Konjivaram) in Shawwāl 885/December 1481 that a conspiracy was formed in the royal camp at Kondāppali (Muṣṭafānagar, now in the Kīrghāna district of André Pradesh) against Mahmūd Gāwān. The old feudal lords resented the loss of their power at the hands of the Khādja, while the Dakhnīs had never reconciled themselves to the rise of a mere “Newcomer” to such heights. Nizām al-Mulk Bahārī, who was the leader of the conspirators, persuaded Mahmūd Gāwān’s Hāshhi private secretary, under the influence of strong drink, to affix the Khādja’s seal to a piece of paper. The conspirators then forged a letter purporting to be from the Khādja to the Rājdā of Ufīsā and suggesting that the time was opportune for an invasion of the Deccan. This letter was shown to the sultan on his return from the south. He at once summoned the Khādja to his presence, and as his ears had been poisoned against him from time to time ever since he had been leading the western campaigns, he did not even enquire how the letter had come in the possession of Nizām al-Mulk. The old man was decapitated forthwith as a traitor, on the sultan’s orders, on 5 Safar 886/5 April 1481 when he was 73 lunar years old.

The Khādja was not merely the political and military leader of the Deccan, but was its cultural leader as well. He no doubt re-built a number of forts such as the one at Parenbā, but it is the noble edifice of the great madrasa at Bīdar which was to remain a permanent symbol of his concern for the public welfare. The college is a three-storeyed building, covering a site of 205 ft by 180 ft., and is surrounded by a large courtyard which was once fringed by a thousand cubicles where students lived and were provided not only with free education but with food and clothes as well. The library was the central feature of the institution, and it is related that no one could give the Khādja a more acceptable present than a rare manuscript. This and other works of utility such as water-works and numerous public buildings must have made Bīdar known far and wide. The Russian traveller, Afanasy Nikitin, who was in the Deccan from 1469 to 1474, says that this city was “the chief town of Hindustan” and was the centre of trade in horses, cloth, silk, pepper and many other species of merchandise.

Mahmūd Gāwān continued the policy of making the kingdom the resort of the learned which had been initiated by Fīrūz Shāh (800-25/1397-1422). He was himself a scholar of high repute and one of the most learned exponents of the Persian language. He has left us two important works, namely...
the 

the former, which was compiled in 880/1475, is a hand- 

book of Persian diction of the ornate type in fashion 

in those days, treating of the subject in a pro- 

legomenon, two discourses and an epilogue. The 

is a collection of his letters written to 

kings, ministers, princes and divines in practically all 

the states in India and the Middle East. It contains 

historical material of almost unsurpassed value, as it 

is the only contemporary record of many important 

events in which the 

was the chief actor. 

Mahmud Gawan's real character may be gleaned 

from the contrast between the image of the public 

ministerial levels. Under Muṣṭafā Nāʾīlī Pasha he was 

sandaret māštughrāt for three months from 23 Dījāmādī I 

1270/24 March 1854, and then māštughrāt of the 

Foreign Ministry from 29 Ramadan 1275/25 June 

1854. For 16 days he was detached to carry orders to 

the commander-in-chief Ekrem ʿOmer Pasha, in 

Bulgaria, during the war with Russia. On 7 Dījāmādī I 

1271/25 February 1855 Mahmud Nedim attained the 

rank of wāżīr with appointment as wāżīr of Sidon. 

He was transferred as wāżīr to Damascus in Rabiʿ II 

1272/December 1855 and to Izmir in Muharram 

1274/August 1857. He managed to return 

to the capital in Radjab 1274/February-March 1858 

as a member of the Tanzimat Council. Two months 

later he was acting Foreign Minister for a time while 

the minister, Fuʿād ʿAlī Pasha [q.v.], was at the Paris 

conference on the Danubian Principalities. He became 

a minister, finally, on 20 Muharram 1275/30 August 

1858 with the portfolio of commerce, from which he 

was dismissed in Dījāmādī I 1276/November- 

December 1859. For half a year he was unemployed. 

Till this point, Mahmud Nedim had a mixed 

reputation. He was thought to be able, but some con- 

sidered him a hypocritical and untrustworthy. Reşhd 

Pasha once compared him to mushy soap, suitable 

neither for washing hands nor for doing laundry. He 

knew the bureaucratic forms and language, but no 

foreign languages. 

On 19 Dhū ʿl-Hijja 1276/8 July 1860 Mahmud 

Nedim was named wāżīr of Tarābulus-i Ǧarb, a post 

not much sought-after, at his own request, and re- 

mained there for seven years. Toward the end of this 

period occurred the original conspiracy of the small 

group of New Ottomans [see ʿilāmiyāt] of which 

Mahmud Nedim's nephew Saḥḥār Ahmed-zāde 

Mehmed Bey was a member. Mehmed Bey proposed 

that the grand vizier ʿAlī Pasha, whom the con- 

spirators detested, be replaced by his uncle Mahmud 

Nedim. The plan was leaked to the authorities and 

known to ʿAlī Pasha. Therefore in Dhū ʿl-Hijja 

1283/April-May 1867 Mahmud Nedim returned to 

Istanbul to clear his name with the Grand Vizier. 

Although ʿAlī at first refused to see him, Mahmud 

Nedim eventually talked his way back into Sultan's 

graces. By 15 Saḥar 1284/18 June 1867 Mahmud 

Nedim was a member of the Medjlis-i wāżīr-i akhḫām-i 

ṣaltuṣuṣ, on 23 Rabiʿ II 1284/24 August 1867 he was 

declared dead, and on 11 Dhū ʿl-Kaʿa 1284/5 March 

1868 he was briefly sandaret māštughrāt for the second time. 

Eight days later he became Minister of Marine, a post 

which he held for more than three years, during 

ʿAlī Pasha's last grand vizierate. Mahmud Nedim 

cultivated relations with the Palace, catered to Sultan 

ʿAlī al-ʿĀzīz's interests, and emerged as the sultan's 

choice to succeed ʿAlī Pasha after ʿAlī's death. 

On 22 Dījāmād I 1288/8 September 1871 

Mahmud Nedim entered on his first grand vizierate, 

which lasted eleven months. His administration was 

chaotic, marked by a constant shifting of officials both 

in provincial posts and in the capital (in 11 months: 

five sevākurs, four navy ministers, four justice 

ministers, five finance ministers, six arsenal com- 

manders, etc.). He cut salaries in the name of 

economy, exiled important rivals, among them Hū- 

sain ʿAwnī [q.v.], to the provinces, hobbled the ṣāʿaṭa ṣalaṭa 

system and in general created new enemies for 

himself. He evidently took bribes from the Khedive 

Isāmī II of Egypt. Although the New Ottomans at first 

welcomed his appointment as an improvement over 

the "tiny minister," September 1871. In 1288/November 

Nâmik Kemal [q.v.] in his newspaper ʿIstebet began to 

criticise Mahmud Nedim, who then suspended the
paper and ordered Nâmi£ Kemaî out of Istanbul to the post of mucaait if tarif of Gelibolu. The Russian ambassador, Ignatyeiv, however, thought well of Mahmud Pasha's reputation. His opponents have stressed his Russophile views, his alleged venality, a character that included fickleness and deceitfulness, and his chaotic administrations. Yusuf Kemal Pasha thought him qualified only to be a chief secretary to a vizier. In each session of the Ottoman Chamber of Deputies, 1877 and 1878, there were votes to try him for crimes and incompetence. This was not done. Among Mahmud Nedim's writings are some unpublished poems, a published one (Has-i bâl) on his career, and an unpublished apologia pro vita sua, Midhat't-nâme or Reddiyye, much quoted in Pakalin and Inal.

In each session of the Ottoman Chamber of Deputies, 1877 and 1878, there were votes to try him for crimes and incompetence. This was not done. Among Mahmud Nedim's writings are some unpublished poems, a published one (Has-i bâl) on his career, and an unpublished apologia pro vita sua, Midhat't-nâme or Reddiyye, much quoted in Pakalin and Inal.


Mahmûd Nedîm Pasha (? - 879/1474), Ottoman Grand Vizier. Contemporary Ottoman historians tell us nothing of his origins. Authors of taqdîkiraps from the 10th/16th century down to ʿothmânî yazida Tâhib (Hadîk al-osâzâra, Istanbul 1271/1854-5, 9; facs. repr., Freiburg 1969) state that he was a native of Alâda Hisar (Krusevac) in Serbia, but this seems unlikely. According to T. Weitzel and G. A. C. Founder, the Serbian mother and a Greek father. Cha中科olyds makes his mother Bulgarian, while Kritovoulos (Turkish tr., Tâvîg-i Mehmed Khân-i thâbi, in TOEM, Suppl. 1328/1910, 192) makes him the descendant of a noble Greek family, whose father, Michael, was a descendant of Alexios III Philanthropenos. Accordingly to Martinus Crusius (Turcograecia, Basel 1584, 21), Mahmud Paşa was, on his mother's side, the Serbian-born grandson of the Byzantine nobleman Marko Yagari. He also tells us that Mahmud Paşa's cousin, George Amurites, the protossecuritas of the Comnene Emperor of Trebizond, David, was a grandson of the same Yagari. According to F. Babinger (Mehmed the Conqueror and his time, Eng. tr. R. Manheim, ed. W. Hickman, Princeton 1978, 115), based on Cha中科olyds (L'Histoire de la décadence de l'Empire Grec, Paris 1620, i, 229, 246), he was the son of Michael Angelus of Novo Brdo. He was in all probability a scion of the Angelis, i.e. the Thessalian branch of the Serbian despotate. It is uncertain when the Ottomans captured Mahmud Paşa. The accounts in Cha中科olyds (op. cit., i, 246), Taşkhoprûzâde (al-Sulak ib al-munawwiyâ, tr. M. Cemil, Istanbul 1269/1852-3, 176) and ʿAskîrân Celebi, ʿUlema-yi Şampa (Istanbul, Turkish ms. 2406, f. 215a) are identical in all but a few minor details. They each relate how the commander Mehmed Agha took Mahmud Paşa and his
mother prisoner on the road between Novo Brdo and Smederovo and, since Tashkopriizade (loc. cit.), it seems likely that Mehemmed Agha patronised all three, and it is undoubtedly through him that he was presented to Murâd II. Tashköprüzade's claim that Murâd II attached him to the suite of Prince Mehmedmehmed, later Mehmed II, is probably false (cf. ‘Ashîk Çelebi, op. cit., f. 214a).

He underwent a period of education in the Palace at Edirne and, after the accession of Memmed II 855/1451, began to receive royal favours. He attained the rank of qâglî agharî, and was in the sultan's company at the siege of Constantinople. According to some accounts, the sultan sent him to Constantinople at the beginning of the siege at the end of Rabî‘ I 857/beginning of April 1453 to demand the surrender of the city. During the siege, Mehmûd Paşa and the beglerbeğî of Anadolu, Ishak Paşa, received the command to attack the city wall between modern Edirne Kapı and Yedi Kule, and a section of the sea-walls in this area (Kritiovoules, op. cit., 48, 76). Those tarihârin which include a biography of Mehmûd Paşa and certain histories claim that Mehmûd Paşa participated in the siege as a vizier and beglerbeğî, but this information is almost certainly false. The most reliable source, agree that his promotion to the vizier on 865/1461, the city surrendered to the Ottomans (Ibn Kemâl, Ta’rikh-i Ebu ’l-Feth, i, 739), and despatched 1,000 Janissaries which the Sultan had allotted to his expense, Mehmûd Paşa added the troops of Anadolu, which makes it clear that he received Ali Emîri Library, Istanbul, Turkish ms. 806, f. 83a). Since his uncle Karadja Beg was beglerbeğî until his death at the siege of Belgrade in 860/1456 (Tewdrih-i Mehmûd Paşa, Tevârîkh-ı al-saltânî al-Oljânmîyya, ed. Mükrîmîn Haflî Yânîn, in Türk tarihî enjûmanî mejmû‘âtasi [1340/1921-2], 147). Mehmûd Paşa must have become beglerbeğî after his siege, as Orudj Beg (Tawdrikh-i Val-i Olymîn, ed. F. Rubin, ii, 272) and Istîrîfsî Bisâtî (Hâjî behgî, Ali Emîrî Library, Istanbul, Persian ms. 806, f. 83a) confirm (cf. also Ibn Kemâl, op. cit., 152; ‘Ashîk Çelebi, op. cit., f. 214b). The statement by Kûkûk Nishânjî Ramadânzâde Mehmed (Ta’rikh, Istanbul 1279/1862-3, 162), that he was at the same time kâdî ’usker, is probably based on a reference in the Menâkîb-nâmé (Menâkîb-i Mehmûd Paşa-yi Wâlî, Ali Emîrî Library, Istanbul, Turkish ms. 43, f. 50a), which makes it clear that he received his appointment temporarily while the kâdî ’usker ‘Alî Efendi performed the pilgrimage.

Mehmûd Paşa accompanied Memmed II on a number of campaigns, in all of which he achieved outstanding successes. The Sultan promoted him to the vizierate in recognition of his courageous exploits at the siege of Belgrade (Ibn Kemâl, op. cit., 122), after which he served as vizier and beglerbeğî with Rumelia. When, on 24 Djumâdâ I 863/30 May 1458, the Serbian Queen removed Mehmûd Paşa’s brother Michael Angâloviç and appointed a Catholic Bosnian in his stead, the Serbian boyars contacted Memmed II and offered him azerainty over Serbia (J. W. Zinkeisen, Geschichte des Osmanischen Reichs in Europa, Gotha 1845, ii, 116). The Sultan ordered Mehmûd Paşa to settle the Serbian question. To the Romanian troops which he had equipped at his own expense, Mehmûd Paşa added the troops of Anadolu and 1,000 Janissaries which the Sultan had allotted to him (Dursun Beg, Ta’rikh-i Ebu ’l-Fetî, in TOEM, Suppl. 1350/1912, 82; Sa’d al-Dîn, Tawdrikh-i Ta’rikhi mûmenî medjmu’asi, Istanbul 1279/1862-3, i, 463) and marched to Sofia. He succeeded, with numerous promises, in overcoming the objections of the troops, who refused to advance when the Serbs announced that they would observe the terms of the agreement only if the Sultan came in person, and that otherwise they would refuse to surrender the fortresses and join with the Hungarians. Continuing the advance, the Ottoman forces seized several fortified places, the most important being Reasava and Kuruca (for the other fortresses, see ‘Ashîk Çelebi, op. cit., Tawdrikh-i al-i Olymîn, ed. ‘Ali, Istanbul 1332/1913-14, 150; Dursun Beg, op. cit., 86). Mehmûd Paşa then unsuccessfully laid siege to Smederovo, before withdrawing to the fortress which the Sultan had built nearby. Shortly afterwards, he improved the fortifications, and captured the castles of Ostrovica and Rudnik (Dursun Beg, op. cit., 89; Enwerî, op. cit., 109; Ibn Kemâl, op. cit., 154; Bihârî, Tawdrikh-i al-i Olymîn, BL ms., Add. or. 7869, f. 168a).

After celebrating bayram at Yellû Yurt near Niğhî, Mehmûd Paşa appeared before Goâlucâc. He seized and repaired the fort before despatching Minnet Beg Oğlû Mehmîd Paşa with âkîdî troops to raid into Hungary. He then joined the Sultan in Skoplje. It was he who dissuaded the Sultan from demobilising the army when the Hungarians crossed the Danube. A number of sources state wrongly that Mehmûd Paşa commanded the Serbian expedition which resulted in the fall of Smederovo in 864/1460 (cf. J. von Hamer, GOR, i, 447), whereas Dursun Beg (op. cit., 90) and Istîrîfsî Bisâtî (op. cit.) make the Sultan himself the commander. (cf. also Zinkeisen, op. cit., i, 116).

In 864/1460, Mehmûd Paşa took part in Mehemmed II’s Morean campaign (see D. Zakynthinos, Le despotat grec de Morée, Paris 1932, ii, 285 ff.). On the Sultan’s command he led the siege of the fortress of Mistra which the Despot Demetrios held and, with the Sultan’s Greek secretary, Thomas Katavolos, acting as intermediary, he persuaded the Despot to surrender and sent him, on 9 Sa’dân/30 May, to the Sultan in Istanbul. Since the Despot had previously strongly opposed the Sultan’s invasion, the Sultan treated him well (Ducas, Historia Byzantina, Bonn 1834, 521; Kritiovoules, op. cit., 128; Dursun Beg, op. cit., 94; Ibn Kemâl, op. cit., 168).

In the following year, Mehmûd Paşa served with great distinction under the Sultan on the campaign against Sinop, Amâsa and Trebizond. Mehemmed II apparently attached great importance to the conquest of the Genoese-held Amastr, which earlier sultans had neglected to capture (‘Ashîk Paşa-zâde, op. cit., 153; Nezîri, op. cit., ii, 739), and despatched Mehmûd Paşa to blockade the city with a force of 150 ships, while he himself came overland. In 865/1461, the city surrendered to the Ottomans (Nezîri, loc. cit.; Ibn Kemâl, op. cit., 185; Haddîf, Tawdrikh-i Val-i Olymîn, University Library, Istanbul, Turkish ms. 1268, f. 126b). Mehmûd Paşa also mounted the operations which resulted in the fall of Sinop. Sending a fleet of 100 galleys from Istanbul, with a letter written by Dursun Beg, he himself went first to Edirne and then to Bursa with the assembled troops. In describing the campaign Nezîri (op. cit., ii, 743) wrote: “Mehmûd Paşa was now at the height of his glory. It was as though the sultan had renounced the sultanate and bestowed it on Mehmûd”. In describing the council held at Bursa in the Sultan’s presence, the Ottoman writers tell how Mehmûd Paşa influenced the other members by speaking
against the enemy of the Ottomans, Isfendiyâr-Oğlu Ismâ'îl Beg of Sinop, and attribute the preparations for the expedition to Mahmûd Pasha. According to an anonymous author who mentioned the campaign ahead of date (Library of the Topkapı Sarayî, ms. Revan 1099, 91), he spread the rumour that the expedition was aimed against Trebizond. At Ankara, the sultan announced the true goal of the campaign, and sent Mahmûd Pasha ahead to Sinop. Dispatching a letter composed by Dursun Beg, Mahmûd Pasha secured Ismâ'îl Beg's submission to the Sultan (Dursun Beg, op. cit., 98; ʿAbîk Pasha-zâde, op. cit. i, 156; Chalcocondylas, op. cit., i, 277). In the meantime, Ya'qûb Yûcel, Qandar of Gallata besieged, in Belleten, xxxiv/135 (1970), 373-407.

Before the Trebizond campaign, Mahmûd Pasha accompanied the sultan on his way to confront Uzun Hasan Aq Koyunlu, as far as Yassî Çimen, where, according to one account, a joint deputation from Uzun Hasan's mother Sara and Kûndân Şeyxân Hasan, the beg of Cennâgîc, secretly presented him with a petition for peace (Sa'd al-Dîn, op. cit., i, 479). Afterwards, he took part in the Trebizond campaign as commander of the troops of Rumelia. At the head of the left wing in the vanguard of the army, Mahmûd Pasha appeared before Trebizond, and persuaded first the townspeople, and then the Emperor David and his family to surrender (Chalcocondylas, op. cit., i, 277; Dursun Beg, op. cit., 21, 121). As David's fron tessariarius, Mahmûd Pasha's cousin, the philosopher George Amiruzes played an important role as intermediary, which had led a number of Greek writers to accuse him of treachery (Ducas, op. cit., 343; on the fall of Trebizond, see J. P. Fallmerayer, Geschichte des Kaisertums Trapezunt, Munich 1827; Heath Lowry, The Ottoman tahrir defters as a source for urban demographic history: the case study of Trabzon, Ph. D. thesis, UCLA 1977, unpublished, ch. i [in course of revision by the author]).

In 866-7/1462, Mahmûd Pasha participated in the Wallachian campaign, where he successfully prevented Vlad Drakul from routing Ewrenos Beg's atîngî troops and repulsed Vlad's night attack (Enwerti, op. cit., 104; Dursun Beg, op. cit., 106). Vlad sought refuge in Hungary, where he was imprisoned by Matthias Corvinus. According to S. Veretic (Magyarország a török hódítás korban, Budapest 1886, 41), Matthias' motive in imprisoning him was a letter which he had sent in the same year to Mehemed II and Mahmûd Pasha, offering Transylvania to the Ottomans (cf. Zinkeisen, op. cit., ii, 176). In 862/458, the Duke of Lesbos, Niccolò II Gattilusio, had strangled his brother Domenico, whom he accused of treachery (Ducas, op. cit., 346, 511; Kritovoulos, op. cit., 178). In 869-70/1465, Mahmûd Pasha conducted negotiations in vain with Venetian envoys who had given the sultan a false account of the Venetian campaigns in Albania under the command of the Sultan (Mangâ\'âtî, ms. Selîm Âğa Library, Istanbul 862; Kritovoulos, op. cit., 189; Ibn Kemâl, op. cit., 300).

In 872/1468, Mehemed II intervened in the troubles in Karaman following the death of Karaman oglu Ibrahim Beg. Accompanying the Sultan to Konya and Gevele, Mahmûd Pasha received orders to pursue the beg of Karaman, Piri Ahmed, who was, however, unable to capture. Mahmûd Pasha's rival, Rûm Mehmed Pasha, used this opportunity to win the Sultan and the army to his cause, by ascribing Mahmûd Pasha's failure to negligence. Although the event angered the sultan (Sa'd al-Dîn, op. cit., i, 311), he concealed his wrath and sent Mahmûd Pasha firstly in pursuit of the Turghudlu Turcomans and then, shortly afterwards, commanded him to deport all the master-craftsmen from Konya and Lârenda to İstanbul. Mahmûd Pasha could not, however, restrain himself from absorbing some of these from deportation, and offering his consolation to the_rest (Ibn Kemâl, op. cit., 291). To discredit him further, his rivals claimed that he had deported only the poor, and spared the rich in return for bribes (Hâsîdî, op. cit., f. 139b; ʿAbîk Pasha-zâde, op. cit., 170). It was not long before these accusations influenced the Sultan. Mahmûd Pasha's post went to Rûm Mehmed Pasha and, according to an unsubstantiated report (F. Babinger, op. cit., 272) the former Grand Vizier's tent was collapsed over his head when his army arrived at Alyon Karahisar. Through the misrepresentations of Rûm Mehmed Pasha, he had been dismissed from both the vizierate and the beylerbeglik of Rumelia.

Ibn Kemâl (op. cit., 293) and Hâsîdî (op. cit., f. 140a) state that, shortly after his dismissal, Mahmûd Pasha retired to his khas but, before long, he was appointed Admiral (kapudan) with the rank of sandjak beg of Gelibolu, with the task of restoring and equipping the Ottoman fleet (spring 873/1469 or 874/1470).

On 5 Dhu-l-Hijja 874/5 June 1470, he left Gelibolu at the head of a large fleet to attack the Venetian island of Euboea. (Ngegropontos, Egrithromatia). Mahmûd Pasha arrived off Euboea after capturing the island of Skiros and warding off the Venetian Ad-
MAHMUD PASHA — MAHMUD SHABISTARI

When Uzun Hasan’s troops began to advance into Anatolia, Mahmud Pasha, in recognition of his part in the conquest of Euboea, replaced Rüm Mehmed Paşa as Grand Vizier (Dursun Beg, op. cit., 148; Ibn Kemâl, op. cit., 350). In Istanbul, he attended the council which the Sultan had convened to consider what measures to take against Uzun Hasan. At Mahmud Pasha’s suggestion, the beylerbeyi of Anadolu, Dawud Paşa, serving nominally under Prince Mustafa, he imprisoned him in Yedi Kule. According to contemporary sources, Mahmud Pasha’s refusal of the leadership led to a breach between himself and the sultan.

On 13 Dhul-Qa‘da 877/11 April 1473, Mahmud Paşa left Istanbul with the sultan and marched to Sivas, where he encouraged Mehemmed to attack Karahisâr-i Sharîkh (Şehbînkarâşî) [see Karâ 895]. The Sultan rejected his advice and, at the battle of Otluk Beli, cast him in a secondary role by positioning him with the beylerbeyi of Rumelia, Khâş Murâd Paşa. Mahmud Paşa acted with great perspicacity and, perceiving Uzun Hasan’s strategy, warned Khâş Murâd not to cross the Euphrates. Khâş Murâd ignored him and, after his death, Mahmud Paşa fought with Uzun Hasan’s son, Ughurlu Muhammad (Maâli, 141). At the battle of Başkent on 19 Rabî‘ I 878/11 August 1473 (Ibn Kemâl, op. cit., i, 154), he fought among Dâwûd Paşa’s forces (R. R. Arat, Fatih Sultan Mehmed’in yarısı, in Türkayt memcaus, vi [1936-9], 285-322). Popular opinion attributed the victory to Mahmud Paşa (Maâli, op. cit., 154); but Mahmud Paşa’s enemies disgraced him in the sultan’s eyes and caused his downfall (Bihishti, op. cit.).

He retired to his estates at Khâşkoy, but returned to Istanbul on the death of Prince Mustafa and, against the advice of hisâyî Kûrt Hâfiz, appeared before the sultan. The sultan received him coldly. Suspecting him of taking pleasure in the death of Prince Mustafa, he imprisoned him in Yedi Kule. He was executed shortly afterwards on 3 Rabî‘ I 879/18 July 1474 (Ibn Kemâl, op. cit., 396-7; Sa’d al-Dîn, op. cit., i, 553 gives the month as Rabî‘ II) and buried in the türbe near the mosque in Istanbul which he had endowed (built 867/1462).

Bibliography: for further references see IA art. Mahmud Paşa (M. Şehabeddin Tekindag) of which this article is an abridged and slightly emended translation. See also Konstantin Mihaliovic, Memoirs of a Janissary, tr. B. Stolz, with historical commentary by S. Soucek, Michigan 1975; Selahettin Tansel, Osmanli kaynaklarina göre Fatih Sultan Mehmed’in siyasi ve askeri faaliyeti, Ankara 1953. (C. H. Imber)

MAHMÜD PASHA, an Ottoman governor or beylerbeyi of Yemen and of Egypt in the 16th/17th century, whose avarice and devotion to self-promotion led to a breach between himself and the sultan.

When Mahmud Pasha’s enemies disgraced him in the sultan’s eyes and caused his downfall (Bihishti, op. cit.), the Sultan rejected his advice and, at the battle of Başkent on 19 Rabî‘ I 878/11 August 1473 (Ibn Kemâl, op. cit., i, 154), he fought among Dâwûd Paşa’s forces (R. R. Arat, Fatih Sultan Mehmed’in yarısı, in Türkayt memcaus, vi [1936-9], 285-322). Popular opinion attributed the victory to Mahmud Paşa (Maâli, op. cit., 154); but Mahmud Paşa’s enemies disgraced him in the sultan’s eyes and caused his downfall (Bihishti, op. cit.).

He retired to his estates at Khâşkoy, but returned to Istanbul on the death of Prince Mustafa and, against the advice of hisâyî Kûrt Hâfiz, appeared before the sultan. The sultan received him coldly. Suspecting him of taking pleasure in the death of Prince Mustafa, he imprisoned him in Yedi Kule. He was executed shortly afterwards on 3 Rabî‘ I 879/18 July 1474 (Ibn Kemâl, op. cit., 396-7; Sa’d al-Dîn, op. cit., i, 553 gives the month as Rabî‘ II) and buried in the türbe near the mosque in Istanbul which he had endowed (built 867/1462).

Bibliography: for further references see IA art. Mahmud Paşa (M. Şehabeddin Tekindag) of which this article is an abridged and slightly emended translation. See also Konstantin Mihaliovic, Memoirs of a Janissary, tr. B. Stolz, with historical commentary by S. Soucek, Michigan 1975; Selahettin Tansel, Osmanli kaynaklarina göre Fatih Sultan Mehmed’in siyasi ve askeri faaliyeti, Ankara 1953. (C. H. Imber)

MAHMÜD PASHA, an Ottoman governor or beylerbeyi of Yemen and of Egypt in the 16th/17th century, whose avarice and devotion to self-promotion led to a breach between himself and the sultan.

When Mahmud Pasha’s enemies disgraced him in the sultan’s eyes and caused his downfall (Bihishti, op. cit.), the Sultan rejected his advice and, at the battle of Başkent on 19 Rabî‘ I 878/11 August 1473 (Ibn Kemâl, op. cit., i, 154), he fought among Dâwûd Paşa’s forces (R. R. Arat, Fatih Sultan Mehmed’in yarısı, in Türkayt memcaus, vi [1936-9], 285-322). Popular opinion attributed the victory to Mahmud Paşa (Maâli, op. cit., 154); but Mahmud Paşa’s enemies disgraced him in the sultan’s eyes and caused his downfall (Bihishti, op. cit.).

He retired to his estates at Khâşkoy, but returned to Istanbul on the death of Prince Mustafa and, against the advice of hisâyî Kûrt Hâfiz, appeared before the sultan. The sultan received him coldly. Suspecting him of taking pleasure in the death of Prince Mustafa, he imprisoned him in Yedi Kule. He was executed shortly afterwards on 3 Rabî‘ I 879/18 July 1474 (Ibn Kemâl, op. cit., 396-7; Sa’d al-Dîn, op. cit., i, 553 gives the month as Rabî‘ II) and buried in the türbe near the mosque in Istanbul which he had endowed (built 867/1462).

Bibliography: for further references see IA art. Mahmud Paşa (M. Şehabeddin Tekindag) of which this article is an abridged and slightly emended translation. See also Konstantin Mihaliovic, Memoirs of a Janissary, tr. B. Stolz, with historical commentary by S. Soucek, Michigan 1975; Selahettin Tansel, Osmanli kaynaklarina göre Fatih Sultan Mehmed’in siyasi ve askeri faaliyeti, Ankara 1953. (C. H. Imber)

MAHMÜD PASHA, an Ottoman governor or beylerbeyi of Yemen and of Egypt in the 16th/17th century, whose avarice and devotion to self-promotion led to a breach between himself and the sultan.

When Mahmud Pasha’s enemies disgraced him in the sultan’s eyes and caused his downfall (Bihishti, op. cit.), the Sultan rejected his advice and, at the battle of Başkent on 19 Rabî‘ I 878/11 August 1473 (Ibn Kemâl, op. cit., i, 154), he fought among Dâwûd Paşa’s forces (R. R. Arat, Fatih Sultan Mehmed’in yarısı, in Türkayt memcaus, vi [1936-9], 285-322). Popular opinion attributed the victory to Mahmud Paşa (Maâli, op. cit., 154); but Mahmud Paşa’s enemies disgraced him in the sultan’s eyes and caused his downfall (Bihishti, op. cit.).

He retired to his estates at Khâşkoy, but returned to Istanbul on the death of Prince Mustafa and, against the advice of hisâyî Kûrt Hâfiz, appeared before the sultan. The sultan received him coldly. Suspecting him of taking pleasure in the death of Prince Mustafa, he imprisoned him in Yedi Kule. He was executed shortly afterwards on 3 Rabî‘ I 879/18 July 1474 (Ibn Kemâl, op. cit., 396-7; Sa’d al-Dîn, op. cit., i, 553 gives the month as Rabî‘ II) and buried in the türbe near the mosque in Istanbul which he had endowed (built 867/1462).

Bibliography: for further references see IA art. Mahmud Paşa (M. Şehabeddin Tekindag) of which this article is an abridged and slightly emended translation. See also Konstantin Mihaliovic, Memoirs of a Janissary, tr. B. Stolz, with historical commentary by S. Soucek, Michigan 1975; Selahettin Tansel, Osmanli kaynaklarina göre Fatih Sultan Mehmed’in siyasi ve askeri faaliyeti, Ankara 1953. (C. H. Imber)
In the Persian tadhkiras, dates varying between 718/1318 and 729/1330 are given for his death. The tomb at Shabistari, where he was buried next to his teacher Bahá’ al-Din Ya’qub Tabrizi, has become a place of pilgrimage. It has been restored several times during the last century.

The fame of Mahmūd rests entirely on a short mathnawī (1,008 bayāts in the most recent edition), the Gulshan-i rāz (“The rose garden of the secret”). According to the poet’s introduction, it was written in the month of Shawwal 717/December 1317-January 1318 in a versetext (text sent by a “well-known notable” (buzzurgi muhfiq) from Khorāsān. A generally accepted tradition, appearing for the first time at the end of the 9th/15th century in Dāmmī’s Nafshadāt al-uns (ed. Tehran 1337/1958, 605), specifies that the letter contained questions on difficult points of mystical doctrine and was composed by Ḥusayn Sādāt Amīr (q.v.), who was an expert writer on the subject in his own right. These details are not con-

firmed by the text of the poem. The text of the letter, which is extant in some manuscripts of the Gulshan-i rāz, was probably only put together afterwards with lines taken from the title of the poem itself, which precede each of the fifteen main divisions under the heading su’al (“question”). The answers given by the poets are subdivided into theoretical parts (kā ḫīda) and illustrative passages (qasīda). The subject-matter of the poem is the doctrine of man’s perfection through gnosia. This involves a number of cosmological, psychological and metaphysical themes as well as topics proper to the Sūfī traditions, such as the problem posed by expressions of identification with the Divine Being. The influence of Ibn al-ʿArabī, acknowledged by Mahmūd in his Saʿīdat-nāma, is quite obvious. He also continues, however, the older tradition of Persian religious poetry as it appears from his treatment of poetical images as mystical symbols in the last sections of the Gulshan-i rāz, and from a reference to ʿAṭṭār (q.v.) as his example.

The great value attached to the poem is reflected, especially, in the many commentaries which were written on it throughout the centuries. The diversity of its contents, in spite of its concision, made it a standard and important text for elaborate expositions of mystical doctrine, like the celebrated Mafdtih al-iʿadżd, ascribed to “Asisi”) and his anthology of mystical poetry in German translation (Blütensammlung aus dem morgenländischen Mystik, Berlin 1825). The text, with a full translation, was published by J. von Hammer-Purgstall (Rosenhof des Geheimnisses, Pesth-Leipzig 1838) and by E. H. Whinfield (The mystic rose garden, London 1880; repr. 1978). Several other editions were published in Russian and in the Indian subcontinent. A critical edition was prepared by Gurban-eli Memmedzade (Baku 1973).

Of the other works ascribed to Mahmūd Shabistāri, the most likely to be authentic are the mathnawī called the Ṣaʿīdat-nāma, on mystical theology, containing also valuable data for the biography of the author (cf. Rieu, ii, 877; Ateṣ, no. 351/2; Munzawi, iv, 2909-10) and Ḥakk al-yākin fi maʿraj ratb al-ʿilmān, a prose work which was repeatedly printed (cf. Browne iii, 149-50; Munzawi, ii/1, 1129-30). The Mirʿāt al-muhakātīn, also in prose, is in some manuscripts ascribed to Ibn Sinā or others (cf. Munzawi, ii/1, 842-4 and 1374-5). No longer extant are the ʿShāhid-nāma, mentioned in Ḥakk al-yākin as well as in Gāzūrgānī’s Muqātūs al-saḥḥāk, and a translation of Muḥammad b. Ṣaʿīd al-Dīn Kurbālī’s Manākat al-muḥaddith, 1337/1958; pp. Ixxvii ff; Tahsin Yazici, in IA, s.v. ʿṢebisteri; H. Corbin, Trilogie ismaïlienne, Tehran-Paris 1961; E. E. Bertel’s, Izbrannye trudy. Sufizm i sufyskaya literatura, Moscow 1965, 109-25; A. Ateṣ, Istanbul Kitabhanerinde farsça manzum eserler, i, Istanbul 1968; A. Munzawi, Fīristi-n nazḵāba-yi farsī, ii/1, Tehran 1349/1970 and iv, Tehran 1351/1972; Shaq Ismailov, Filosofiya Makhmuda Shabistari, Baku 1976.


MAHMŪD SHEWKAT PASHA

(Mahmūd shewkot pasha) (1856-1913), Ottoman general, war minister and Grand Vizier (1913), was born in Baghdad. He came from a Georgian family long settled in Iraq and thoroughly Arabised, so that he was known as an Arab Mahmūd at the War Academy. His father Kethkhdāzade Süleymn was a former mutasarrif of Basra, and his mother an Arab lady of the ancient house of al-Farūkhī. After completing his early education in Baghdad he entered the War Academy in Istanbul, graduating in 1882 at the head of his class. He was appointed to the General Staff with the rank of captain and thereafter promotions came with regularity. He was made a major in 1886, colonel (1891), brigadier-general (1894), and divisional general or ferik (1901). In 1905 he became army com-
mandor or binası for and was appointed governor of Kosovo, one of the most troublesome provinces in Ottoman Macedonia. He soon established a reputation as a tough, efficient, and fair-minded administrator who did not bow to the Hamidian clique in Istanbul. As a result, immediately after the constitution was proclaimed in July 1908, Shewkat Pasha was appointed commander of the Third Army at Salonica and in November, acting Inspector-General of Rumelia, succeeding Huseyn Hilmi [q.v.].

In April 1909 when military insurrection and counter-Revolution broke out in Istanbul, Shewkat Pasha marched with his Third Army from Salonica and crushed it with ruthlessness determination. He soon emerged as the most powerful political-military figure in the Empire. Though he permitted the creation of a civilian government, Shewkat Pasha, as martial law commander and Inspector-General of the first three army corps, refused to accept its authority, especially its attempts to control the military budget. For a time there was even tension between the Pasha and the Committee of Union and Progress (Ittihâd we Terakki Dîmiyâyeti [q.v.]), whose fortune he had saved in April 1909, but which resented the Pasha's independence of cabinet control. When İbrahim Hâkı Pasha [q.v.] became Grand Vizier in 1910, he tried to bring Mahmud Shewkat under cabinet control by appointing him Minister of War. But the Pasha did not work either and the Pasha even resigned (October 1910) when the Finance Minister attempted to inspect military spending. The ministerial crisis that followed was resolved on the Pasha's terms: the audit law was not to be applied to the War Ministry.

By the beginning of 1911, as the government faced rebellion in the Yemen, Albania and Macedonia, as well as political disintegration at home, there were murmurs in the press that Shewkat Pasha intended to seize power and set up a military dictatorship. Despite his independence of and contempt for the civilians, Shewkat Pasha had no such intentions. He denied these charges in the Assembly, claiming that he had not availed of such an opportunity when it had presented itself in April 1909. His position—and that of the CUP—declined following the outbreak of an unsuccessful war with Italy in September 1911. By the spring of 1912 an anti-CUP opposition had emerged in the army, reminiscent of the movement of 1908. Shewkat Pasha introduced legislation to curb this movement, but with no effect. The rebellion continued unabated, and he was forced to resign as War Minister on 9 July 1912 though he retained his military command.

Shewkat Pasha remained in political eclipse until 23 January 1913 when the CUP seized power. Again, the Unionists turned to the Pasha because of his popularity with the army and the people, and had him appointed Grand Vizier and War Minister. But now the Unionists were in control, and used Shewkat Pasha's talents to reorganise the Ottoman army after the disasters of the Balkan Wars. It was under Mahmud Shewkat's influence that the decision to invite a German military mission under Liman von Sanders was taken. Meanwhile, in the turmoil following the fall of Edirne (26 March 1913), the Liberal opposition began to conspire to overthrow the CUP. As a part of that conspiracy, Shewkat Pasha was assassinated on 11 June as he drove to the Sublime Porte.

Mahmud Shewkat Pasha was one of the most important military-political figures of the Young Turk period, whose fortune he had saved in April 1909, when military insurrection and counter-Revolution broke out in Istanbul. Shewkat Pasha's influence was based on the shared goal of an independent and strong Ottoman state. While Turkish sources do not deal adequately with his alleged financial corruption, German sources, quoted by George Hallgarten, find him "hardly less corrupt than other Turks" (Imparliamsus vor 1914, ii, Munich 1951, 139). Yet it is worth noting that he did present the Unionists from the beginning of the war with Serbia with the Yıldız Palace treasure by martial law authorities after April 1909. He was always considered pro-German, and there can be little doubt that his ten years in Germany and the influence that Field Marshal von der Goltz had upon him inclined him in that direction. But there was no question of his seizing power in order to set up a military regime devoted to German interests, as a Unionist paper claimed, even in 1909. Mahmud Shewkat Pasha was primarily a professional soldier and a cautious statesman devoted entirely to the Ottoman state, and unwilling to involve it in any rash adventure. While he was alive there was little danger that he would take any risks that would threaten the Empire's very existence. Had he lived, he might have provided the stalwart leadership to prevent the war party in the CUP from dragging Turkey into the World War at a time not of its choosing.


MAHMUD TARDJUMAN, interpreter and diplomat for the Ottomans. Born in Bavaria of a noble family, he was taken captive (probably at the age of 16) by the Turks at the battle of Mohacs (1526) while serving as page to Louis II. Sent to the Palace School in Istanbul, he became famous for his extraordinary knowledge of languages. From 1550 at the latest, he served as interpreter to the Porte, with the title âgha, and in 1573 he was promoted to chief interpreter, with the title bey. As Turkish ambassador he played an important role in the diplomatic relations of the Porte with the Hungarian king John Sigismund and the latter's widow Isabella (1533-4). In 1569 a diplomatic mission brought him to France, and in 1570 he was sent as ambassador to Venice in order to summon the Republic to withdraw from Cyprus. The negotiations remained inconclusive, war broke out...
and Mahmūd was kept back in Verona. Only in 1573 did he return to Istanbul. In 1574 he was sent to Vienna and in 1575 to Prague, where he died. His body was brought to Gran (Esztergom), then on the border of the Hungarian region, which had been conquered by the Turks. Mahmūd was described by his contemporaries as a learned and capable diplomat. Although it cannot be proved unequivocally, it is assumed that Mahmūd can be identified with the author of the same name who wrote the Ta'rikh-i Üngūrū, chronicle of the history of Hungary in Turkish, the unique manuscript of which is in the collection of the Library of the Hungarian Academy of Science (Török. F. 57).

Bibliography: J. Matuz, Die Pferdentolmetscher zur Herrschaftszeit Suleymans des Prächtigen, in Südostforschungen, xxiv (1975), 26-60. (G. Hazai)

MAHMÚD TAYMÚR (born in Cairo 16 June 1894, died in Lausanne 25 April 1973), Egyptian writer whose prolific output includes novels and short stories, theatrical pieces, accounts of journeys, articles and various studies, in particular relating to Arabic language and literature. He is beyond doubt the best known of the Taymūr family, although his brother Muhammad (1892-1921) was a talented short-story writer and dramatist.

Hagiography has claimed the most remote origins for this family. Henceforward, the most reliable source for information on these origins is "the story of the Taymūrs", from the pen of the learned adîb Ahmad Taymūr, father of Muhammad and of Mahmūd, which figures as supplement to his work Lu-šab al-Ārab "The games of the Arabs", 1st ed., Lajnūq al-mu′alla'fāt al-Taymūriyya, Cairo 1936/1948.

The first known ancestor of the Taymūrs, Muhammad b. ʿAli Kurd Taymūr, was a Kurd from the region of Mawsīl who arrived in Egypt with the troops sent by the Porte after the departure of the French forces of Bonaparte (1801). Rising through the military echelons he became a general, then a senior official—the title of kādshīf is also attached to his name. Having been the confidant of Muhammad ʿAli, he was to become that of his son Ibrahim. Their family was installed in Egypt from the beginning of the 19th century. The devotion of these foreigners to the Arabic language and the people of Egypt intrigued and delighted the Egyptians, whether foreigners to the Arabic language and the people of Egypt or not. And, in his[murta, the unique manuscript of which is in the collection of the Library of the Hungarian Academy of Science (Török. F. 57).
reviews, short stories which count among the first realist Egyptian publications to mark an epoch. His untimely death persuaded Mahmūd to engage repeatedly with the death which his brother had traced out and as a first step he published, one year after his death, an edition of his collected works in three volumes (1922).

However, the stories indicating that Mahmūd had really taken up the mantle of Muhammad seem to have been slow in coming. The first narrative to reflect his move towards realism, al-Shaykh Djamʿa, dates from 1921, but it was in 1925 that his Utṣā Shabḥātu yuṭālu bi-adjrihi “The coachman Shabha claims his due”, drew attention to him. The al-Fādīr review of avant-garde literature in which the text was published, saw its author as “the Egyptian Maupassant”, and the critics stressed, not necessarily as a compliment, the audacious nature of this little tableau of manners. One of them reckoned that Oriental society was still too hypocritical to allow itself to be stripped bare by a Zola.

This was the real departure. Henceforth, his production became more prolific and he began publishing compilations: two for the one year 1925, each containing a dozen short stories, and another appearing in the following year. These first three compilations had particular importance for him because about ten years later (1937) he published a selection from them under the title Wābaḥu bi-adjrihi “Shelter no. 13”, play, 1942); social questions (the condition of woman is the basis of Hawwāʾ al-Khālidīa “Eternal Eve”, play, 1945, and of Iḥā al-likd “Farewell, love”, novel, 1959); and historico-legendary evocations tending towards fantasy and humour (Kāyẖānu ṣī Khan al-Khālidī “Cleopatra in Khan al-Khālidī”, novel, 1946, and Ibn Dīnāl (“al-Hadījdījādī, play, 1951). There are, however, particular features: only full-length fiction gave him the opportunity to develop the kind of psychological analysis to which he had always aspired (Salwa ṣī mahubb al-rīh “Salwa to the four winds”, novel, 1944).

The fact remains that Mahmūd Taymūr was before all else a short story writer—in the course of his life he published a total of some thirty compilations. From the start, he aimed to produce an Egyptian oeuvre. Much attention is therefore given to the local colour in his writing, and it is taken as evidence of his patriotism. In fact, if he locates the majority of his tales in a context familiar to the Egyptians, he does so out of concern for authenticity and writes with such sobriety, with such mastery of ellipsis, that the predominant impression gained from his work is one of technical virtuosity. In addition his plots could be less banal than the plots and the characters that he presents. The futuwwa, that is the bad boy, leader of a gang of ruffians, is indeed a familiar type among the common folk of Egypt; making him a mahbūb is not consistent with natural logic, but bestowing upon him this title and the dignity which accompanies it by having him serve as a hairdresser to a group of pilgrims travelling by train to Mecca, is something which departs totally from traditional norms and reveals the mischievous attitude of the author (al-Hadījdī Shalābī, in the collection bearing this title, 1930). Realism requires thus! In the quest for the desired effect, the writer leaves nothing to chance. He begins with an existing situation, a character who may be of any kind but is easily recognisable and, without any unnecessary delay, he brings out the weakness of the character, the incident which, breaking the daily routine, will prepare the way for catastrophe. In other cases, pathology plays a part from the outset; inspired and possessed persons abound in his work, as well as beings beset by obsessive beliefs and those whom misery, frustration or sickness have unbalanced. But all of this would be incapable of holding the attention of the reader were it not for the interplay of artistic qualities: narration which is clear yet precise, judicious choice of eloquent detail or of striking formula, sense of suspense and, essential to all the preceding, firmness of writing.

The question of language was central, in fact, in the art and the literary career of Mahmūd Taymūr. Out of concern for realism, he opted first for the spoken language which he employed in his early stories and theatrical pieces. Taking part in a Congress of Orientalists held in 1932 in Leiden, he expressed the opinion that classical Arabic language should be simplified and relieved of certain cumbersome grammatical forms in order to meet the needs of hitherto unknown literary genres, e. c. novel and drama. This being the case, his recourse to dialect, the natural language of conversation, is clearly explicable. But subsequently he was to take a different view. No doubt he felt himself obliged to employ a more polished, more “academic” language when official recognition was accorded to him: in 1947 the Puʿād I Academy awarded him the short story prize for the first time. The corpus of his works written in the classical language, in 1950 he was elected a member of this Academy; and in 1952 he received the State Prize, which he shared with Tawfīk al-Hakīm.

It would, however, be a mistake to overstress this aspect and to forget that on his own account, for reasons of taste and also out of concern for efficacy and appeal, he had taken the side of the fāṣīḥa. That which he lost in Egyptian parochialism, he gained in universality, but above all he was capable of expressing himself in a language simultaneously pure and adapted to the objectives that he imposed upon himself: a narrative, living language, freed from the traditional rhetorical tinsel which would in fact be totally out of place. On the other hand, those expressive classical idioms which had been unjustly abandoned are restored and rehabilitated in his work.

This style which is both functional and mildly anachronistic gives to Taymūr’s stories their distinguishing mark, their peculiar flavour. Most often the phrase is brief, but the syntax and vocabulary recall and embellish the technique of the prose masters of antiquity.

It may be that he attached too much importance to these questions of language. Not only did he eschew dialect completely in his later works but he systematically set about correcting the earlier ones, or at least those of them closest to his heart. Dramatic
pieces and stories received their definitive version, revised and corrected to an extent that would satisfy the most rigorous academic standards. A lengthy text dating from 1934 (Abū 'Ali 'Āmil ārist), which had been revised twenty years later, becoming Abu ‘Ali al-fanndn (1954). Of course, the removal of dialect was not always the only reason for the revision, which could be influenced equally by considerations of composition (lengthy passages are abbreviated, the profound sense of history is modified, etc.). However, it is impossible not to regret this perfectionism which drove a great writer to the rewriting of works which had been published many years before. To a certain extent, these sculps are a credit to a craftsman anxious to produce fine work, but they also have the effect of preventing the artist from developing truly original creations. In the end, it is certainly true that the art of Taymūr, too cultivated, too polished, could no longer, at a given moment, respond to the curiosities and dissatisfactions of new generations, in Egypt and in other Arab countries. It has come about that his successors, many of them his disciples, denounce his romantic or theatrical style of writing but furthermore, question the realism and the rationalism of which he was a resolute partisan.

Bibliography:

MAHMUD YALAWAC, minister in Central Asia and China of the Mongol Khān in the 13th century A.D.

Barthold surmised (Turkestana, 296 n. 3) that Mahmūd Yalawac was identical with Mahmūd the Khārzamshī mentioned by Nasawi as one of the leaders of Cingis’s embassy of 1218 to the Khārazm-Shāh ‘Alā’ al-Dīn Muhammad [see Khārazm-Shāhs]. It is true that the Secret history of the Mongols (tr. E. Haenisch, Die Geheime Geschichte der Mongolen, Leipzig 1948, 132) refers to Mahmūd Yalawac and his son Mas’dūd Beg [q.v.] as Khārzamshīns (Kūrumgū) and that yulawal/yulawar means ‘envoy’ in Turkish (Clauson, Eynymological dictionary, 921: perhaps of Iranian origin?). He was clearly from the merchant class, and must have rendered services to the Mongols, for under the Great Khān Ogdey (1227-41) he achieved high office, being appointed over all the sedentary population of Transoxania and Mogholistan [q.v.] (i.e. the steppelands to the north of Transoxania) and ruling these from Khudjand [q.v.]. During his governorship, a serious popular revolt aimed against the Mongol overlords and the local nobility broke out in Bukhărā under the leadership of the “great” Wujūl, Fuzūl (1238), and it was only Mahmūd Yalawac’s interventions which saved the city from savage Mongol reprisals. Soon after this, he fell into dispute with Čaghatay, to whom part of Transoxania and Mogholistan had been apportioned in the partition of the spoils of the Battle of Ain Jalut. This conflict ended with the negotiation of the Treaty of Sarayn (1267). The wealth of the Mahmūdābād estate provided the basis on which the descendants of Nāwāb ‘Alī Khān were able to play leading roles in Indian and Muslim affairs under the British. Rādā’ī Amir Ḥasan Khān’s (d. 1903) activities were those of a cultivated landed gentleman. He followed literary pursuits, in particular, as a long-time member of the imperial Jangalak-Ḥusayn, when he was a great public benefactor in Awadh, support-
leading role in the League, as treasurer, chairman of the Working Committee and a major benefactor. In particular, he operated as the link between the League and Muslim youth; he was president of the All-India Muslim Students Federation and devoted himself especially to organising the student forces which played such a considerable role in the League's campaigns for support. But Amir Ahmad Khan did not follow League policy in all things. A deeply religious man, in the early 1940s he became involved in the Islamic Djanat ul-Umda and advocated, against Djinnah, that Pakistan should be a single state.

After the partition of India, Amir Ahmad Khan lived for a time in Irak and in Pakistan. He played little part in Pakistani politics, and rejected Ayyub Khan's demand that he refund the Muslim League on the grounds that Pakistan needed a 'party with socialist aims wedded to Islamic justice'; see Daew (Karachi) for 15 October 1973. From 1986 until his death he was Director of the Islamic Cultural Centre in London, where his principal achievements were to bring to fruition plans to complete the London Mosque and to establish an Islamic Science Foundation. His life was distinguished by his faith, his simplicity, his generosity and a high level of cultivation in Urdu, Arabic, Persian and English, a level of scholarship which had been the hallmark of his ancestors in the previous three generations.


**Mähpaykar.** [see kōsem].

**Mahr (A.), Hebrew mokar, Syriac mahra, 'bridal gift', originally 'purchase-money', synonymous with sādāk which properly means 'friendship', then 'present', a gift given voluntarily and not as a result of a contract, is in Muslim law the gift which the bridegroom has to give to the bride when the contract of marriage is made and which becomes the property of the wife.

1. Among the pagan Arabs, the mahr was an essential condition for a legal marriage, and only when a mahr had been given did a proper legal relationship arise. A marriage without a mahr was regarded as shameful and looked upon as concubinage. In the romance of Antar, the Arab women, who are being forced to marry without a mahr, indignantly reject such a marriage and brought about the tragic end of the daughters of the conquered without giving them a mahr.

In the pre-Islamic period, the mahr was handed over...
to the wa'if, i.e. the father, or brother or relative in whose guardianship (wal'd) the girl was. Here the original character of the marriage by purchase is more apparent. In those times the bride received none of the mahr. What was usually given to the woman at the betrothal was the sādāk; the mahr, being the purchase price of the bride, was given to the wa'if.

But in the period shortly before Muhammad, the mahr, or at least a part of it, seems already to be given to the woman. According to the Kur'an, this is already the prevailing custom. By this amalgamation of mahr and sādāk, the original significance of the mahr as the purchase price was weakened and became quite lost in the natural course of events. There can be no doubt that the mahr was originally the purchase price. But the transaction of purchasing, in course of long development, had become a mere form. The remains, however, as they survived in the law of marriage in Islam, still bear clear traces of a former marriage by purchase.

2. Muhammad took over the old Arab patriarchal ceremony of marriage as it stood and developed it in several points. The Kur'an no longer contains the conception of the purchase of the wife and the mahr as the price, but the mahr is in a way a reward, a legitimate compensation which the woman has to claim in all cases. The Kur'an thus demands a bridal gift to be given at the legal marriage, and it gives them whom ye have enjoyed their reward as a wedding-gift" (lit. farîda "allotment of property", IV, 24) and again: "And give the women their dowries voluntarily" (IV, 3); cf. also IV, 25, 34; V, 5; IX, 10.

The bridal gift is the property of the wife; it therefore remains her own if the marriage is dissolved. "And if ye wish to exchange one wife for another and have given one a talent, take nothing of it back" (IV, 20). Even if the man divorces the wife before he has cohabited with her, he must leave half the mahr with her (II, 236-7).

Up to the Muslim period, the wife was considered after the death of the husband as part of his estate; the heir simply continued the marriage of the deceased. Such levirate marriages are found in the Old Testament also. Muhammad abolished this custom, which still remained in his time, by sûra IV, 19: "O ye who are believers, it is not permitted to you to inherit women against their will". In his social reforms, Muhammad made the mahr into a settlement in the wife's favour.

3. There was an ample store of traditions about the mahr, and these pave the way for the theories laid down by the jurists in the fiqh books. From all the traditions, it is clear that the mahr was an essential part of the contract of marriage. According to a tradition in Bukhârî, the mahr is an essential condition for the legality of the marriage: "every marriage without mahr is null and void". Even if this tradition, so brief and to the point, is not genuine, a number of traditions point to the fact that the mahr was necessary for the marriage, even if it only consisted of some trifling thing. Thus in Ibn Mâdâ and al-Bukhârî, traditions are given according to which the Prophet permitted a marriage with only a pair of shoes as mahr and approved of a poor man, who did not even possess an iron ring, giving his wife instruction in the Kur'an as mahr.

A few hadîths endeavour to show that the mahr must be neither too high nor too low. From the traditions we also learn what mahr was given in particular cases in the Prophet's time: for example, the bridal gift of 'Abd al-Râhîm b. 'Awf was an ounce of gold, that of 'Abû Hurayra 10 ikûs and a dish, that of Sahîh b. Sa'd an iron ring.

In the hadîths we again frequently find the Kur'an regulation that in a divorce after cohabitation the woman has the right to the whole of the mahr. What was usually given to the woman at the betrothal was the sādāk; the mahr, being the purchase price of the bride, was given to the wa'if.

According to Muslim fiqh-books, marriage is a contract ('adâ) made between the bridegroom and the wa'if of the bride. An essential element in it is the mahr or sādāk, which the bridegroom binds himself to give to the bride. The marriage is null without a mahr. The jurists themselves are not quite agreed as to the nature of the mahr. Some regard it practically as purchase-money (e.g. Khalil: "the mahr is like the purchase-money") or as equivalent ('iswâd) to the possession of the woman and the right over her, so that it is like the price paid in a contract of sale; while other jurists see in the mahr a symbol, a mark of honour or a proper legal security of property for the woman.

All things can be given as mahr that are things (ma'n) in the legal sense and therefore are possible to deal in, that is, can be the object of an agreement. The mahr may also—but opinions differ on the point—consist in a pledge to do something or in doing something, e.g. instructing the woman in the Kur'an or allowing her to make the pilgrimage. The whole of the mahr can either be given at or shortly after the marriage or it may be paid in instalments. When the latter is the case, it is recommended to give the woman a half or two-thirds of the mahr immediately, and the rest afterwards. The woman may refuse to allow consummation of the marriage before a part is given.

Two kinds of mahr are distinguished:

a. Mahr musammâm, "specified mahr", the amount of which is exactly laid down in the wedding contract.
b. Mahr al-mîthîl 'mahr of the like', i.e. unspecified dowry, in which the amount is not exactly laid down, but the bridegroom gives a brid gift before consummation, which is exactly laid down in the wedding contract.

The mahr becomes the property of the wife and she has full right to dispose of it as she likes. In the case of any dispute afterwards as to whether certain things belonged to the mahr, or not, the madhâbs differ. The Shafi'is lays down no maximum. There is also no upper limit to the mahr: whatever is agreed upon in the contract must be paid. The mahr generally is adjusted to what other women of equal status (sister, daughter, aunt) have received. As regards the minimum for the amount of the mahr, limitations were introduced by the various law-schools; the Hanafis and Shafi'is insist upon 10 dirhams as a minimum and the Mâlikis three dirhams. The difference in the amount fixed depends on the economic conditions in the different countries where the madhab in question prevail.

If the man pronounces a divorce, the mahr must be paid in every case if cohabitation has taken place; but the bridegroom may withdraw from the marriage before it is consummated; in this case he is bound to give the woman half the mahr.

MAHRA, a tribe living in the south-eastern part of the Arabian peninsula, in a stretch of land along the coast of the Indian Ocean between Hadramawt and Ṣumān, and in the hinterland belonging to that region.

More accurately, the boundaries of Mahra-land run in the west from the coast along Wāḍī Maslīla, a continuation of Wāḍī Ḥadramawt, in the north-west along Wāḍī Rāma as far as Šanāw, from there east-north-east, and reach via Andawr the north-eastern coast at Ras Ḥāṣik, to the north of Ḥāṣik, the ancient Mahra settlement. These boundaries enclose also the territories of other tribes, namely of the Ṣāḥīra, the Kāra and the Bāṯāhira in Zufar. At the present time, Mahra-land comes within the People’s Democratic Republic of Yemen in the west and in the Sultanate of Ṣumān in the east. Until very recently, the Mahra of the Zufar province in the Sultanate of Ṣumān, living mainly on the highlands between the desert and the mountains, led a Bedouin life; but those living on the coast have always been sedentary. The present-day sixth governorate (muhāfazā) of South Yemen, with its chief town Kīnān (q.v.), corresponds more or less with the former Mahra sultanate, with the same centre.

The Mahra can be considered not only as a tribe but as a separate people, since they speak a language of their own, Mahrī (q.v.), and have until very recently retained a high degree of autonomy. That the Mahra are mentioned by classical Arabic authors is mainly due to this fact that they have their own language, not understood by anybody else (Ibn al-Mudjawir, 271, l. 17).

A member of the Mahra tribe is indicated in their proper name by mahrī or mehre, pl. mahē or mehe (A. Jahn, Mehri-Sprache, 130, l. 14); the corresponding feminine forms are mehriit (Hein, Mehri-Texte, 137, l. 2), plural mehreighton (Jahn, 210). They indicate Mahra-land as rakhē mahēr (cf. Jahn’s map, op. cit., 211).

According to Yākūt (Muṣqām, iv, 700, l. 8), the correct form is Mahara, not Mahra, but he stands alone in this opinion, which is moreover uncorroborated by any proof. Mahara is perhaps an incorrect reconstruction of an alleged plural Mahārat, a place name in the Nadīd of Mahra land (Muṣqām, iv, 697, l. 2). Ibn Durayd (Kītāb al-Iṣbāḥād, ed. A. M. Hārūn, 2nd ed. Bagdad 1979, 531 f.) gives in the name Mahra from Arabic mahrī “skilful, experienced.” Ibn al-Mudjawir (271, 11, 8-14) relates an aetiological story, according to which the Mahra are descendants of three hundred virgins who, having escaped a massacre in a place called al-Dāḥabīd, were given as mahrī (mahr) by the people of the surrounding mountains and then married by them.

The most important of the still-existing sub-tribes of the Mahra (their orthography not being always consistent in the sources) are: Bayt Ḫaḥāh, Bayt Samūdāt, Bayt Ḩuwar, Bayt Ṣaḥbānāt, Bāṭ Harāwī, Bāṭ Zayād, Bāṭ Bārā’īfī, Bāṭ Kāmīṣīt and Bayt Bahāf (see the charts and lists of the Mahra tribes in Dostal, Beduinen, 77 ff.; H. A. L. Kurtz, Ta’āyib al-qādir al-ismiya, Beirut 1922, 47-50; Ka’il al-mahī fi Ḥadramawt, Carter, Tribal structures, 46-8). W. Dostal (Beduinen, 34) estimates the number of their able-bodied, weapon-carrying men at 8,000. J. Carter (Tribal structures, 37) supposes that there are 5,000 members of this tribe in Ṣumān, and T. M. Johnstone (The Modern South Arabian languages, Malibu 1975, 2) is of the opinion that the individuals of all Mahra groups taken together amount to some 15,000. According to the Gazetteer of Arabia. A geographical and tribal history of the Arabian peninsula, ed. Sh. A. Scoville, i, Graz 1979, 80, the number of the Mahra on the mainland, the Bedouin included, amounted to 50,000 in the then Aden Protectorate at the time of the First World War. A census carried out in 1983 numbers the population of the sixth governorate of the People’s Democratic Republic of Yemen of the Mahra to 7,777; it takes into account that on the one side people from Ḥadramawt and elsewhere have immigrated into the country of the Mahra and that on the other hand members of the Mahra tribes have emigrated to other provinces and to the Gulf Emirates the total number of the Mahra, i.e. the people speaking Mahri, can be estimated at about 60,000 (A. L. Scoville, The Modern South Arabian Languages in the P.D.R. of Yemen. Proceedings of the Seminar for Arabian Studies, xv [1985], 51).

It cannot be maintained any longer that Mahra-land was already known to the ancient Greek writers, nor that Mamali, with the variant Mali, named by Theophrastus (Historia plantarum, ix, 4,2) as the fourth South Arabian land next to Saba’, Ḥadramawt and Kataba (q.v.), is probably a corruption of Mahra and shāhārī (Hein, M. R. 236, l. 22; Dostal, Be- duinen, 5, 3) estimates the number of the Mahra (their orthography not being always understood) at 60,000. If one proceeds of the Mahra, i.e. the people speaking Mahī, are apparently found in the Hadramite inscription RES 4877 from al-ʿUkla, a pre-Islamic stronghold to the west of the capital Ṣabā. Text, presumably dating from the beginning of the 3rd century A.D., runs as follows: (1) ghrmbr (2) w.tb/kh (3) r.mbrn, “Ṣabāhīr (or Ṣabāḥār), son of Wāţīlum, chief of the Mahrīt”. It is true that A. F. L. Beeston (The Philby collection of old South-Arabian inscriptions, in Le Museon, ii, [1938], 324) translates kbr/mbrn “as chief of the artificers”, and A. Jämme (The Al-Uqlah texts, Washington 1963, 50) as “leader of the specialised workers”. But in the inscriptions, khabīr almost always indicates the leader or the chief of a tribe, and is followed by the name of the tribe or by the nisba plural in the form ḥā’īn, ḥā’ītan, usual in ancient South Arabian, e.g. khrīyiḥm (RES 3913,1) “khabīr (of the tribe) of Fayhān”, khrīyfrūṣ (RES 3951, l. 1) khabīr (of the city-tribe) of Sirwāb”, khrīyiḥm (RES 4895, l. 1) “khabīr of the Mahī tribe of the Raymānītes”, khrīyhrm (Ja 816,2) “khabīr (of the tribe) of the Ṣaḥīrān”, etc.; the “leader of the Bedouin of the king of Saba’” (kbk’t rbn/mlk/ḥb’t. Ja
665, 1 f.) is indicated in the same way. Thus *mhrn is the nisba of an unattested * mhryn "Mahrite", i.e. Amhurian, or perhaps Amharan, since the place-name Bhih is occasionally later, is confirmed by inscription RES 4877. A further evidence for the country and the tribe of Mahra has been found in the Sabaean rockinscription from Wadi āʿAbadān from the middle of the fourth century A.D., in which military campaigns "towards the country of Mahra" (line 7: qḥl/mḥrt) and "against the Mahra" (line 21: ḳḥy/mḥrt) are mentioned (cf. the reproduction of the text in J. Pirenne, Deux prospections historiques au Sud-Yemen, in Raydān. Journal of Ancient Yemeni Antiquities and Epigraphy, iv [1981], 235). F. Hommel's assumption (Süd-arabisches Chronomathie, Munich 1893, 45) that the form Amhār is still alive in the name of Amhara people, who allegedly have migrated from Mahra land to Ethiopia, is wrong. Already A. Sprenger (Alle Geographie, 268) had already pointed out that the South Arabian Mahra-land it is clearly a nisba of a group of Mahra origin. An alleged true form mḥrt, found in the late Sabaean inscription RES 4069,5 from Niṣāb, has nothing to do with the Mahra; the passage should rather be read as wḥry/qḥly/wḥr/qylwkbwr/shbn/sybn, and translated as "and the administrators and the leaders of the Saybān tribe".

The Yemenite authors al-Ḥamdānī and Ibn al-Mudjādwir excepted, the classical Arabic geographers who localised Mahra-land in the region between Hadramawt and ʿUmrān (al-Īṣṭakhri, 12, 1: 20; al-Mukaddasī, 53, 11: 9-11), had only a superficial knowledge of it; the interior in particular was almost completely unknown to them. Al-Ḥamdānī (Ṣafā, 45, 11: 18 f.; see also Iklīl, i, 72, 1: 19) names al-Asʾā3 as the centre of the Mahra. C. de Landberg (Hadramōt, Leiden 1901, 138) wanted to correct this name into Aš-ʿĀl āhā, but there is nothing necessary for this, for the amount al-Asʾā3, apparently mentioned any more since the early Islamic period, is now verified as ḳḥy/Asʾāʾyān (Yanbuq, 47, 1: 7) in a late Sabaean inscription from Yanbūk in Hadramawt (M. A. Balāqīf, New light on the Yazanite dynasty, in Proceedings of the Seminar for Arabian Studies, ix [1979], 7; M. Bālāqīf et Chr. Robin, Inscriptions inédites de Yanbug, in Raydān. Journal of Ancient Yemeni Antiquities and Epigraphy ii [1979] 49 f.). According to E. Glaser (Die Abessinier in Arabien und Afrika, Munich 1895, 87), the co-ordinates given by al-Ḥamdānī for the position of al-Asʾā3 point to the region of Damkōt and Rās Darbat ʿĀlī, thus rather precisely to the middle of the coastal strand which was, moreover, at a later time still inhabited by the Mahra. This conclusion corresponds with al-Ḥamdānī's indication, given in another passage (Ṣafā, 87, 11: 21 f.), that al-Asʾā3 is a port. Elsewhere (Ṣafā, 127, 1: 4), al-Ḥamdānī counts Mahra among the coastal lands of the Arabian Sea. According to him, the Wādī al-Āḫkāf (for the term al-Āḥkāf [q. v.], see also L. Forrer, Südarabien nach al-Ḥamdānī's "Beschreibung der Arabischen Halbinsel", Leipzig 1942, 220, n. 4) flows for several days' journeys from the land of Ḥadramawt into Mahra-land (Ṣafā, 87, 1: 10), and likewise to the left of the great coast, which extends to the north of the Prophet Hud is to be found (Ṣafā, 87, 1: 8). Mahra-land is considered to belong to the farthest part of Yemen (Yākūt, Muṣaʿjam, i, 280, 11: 1 f.; ii, 510, 1: 13; etc.) and is named as one of its mihliḥāf (Yākūt, Muṣaʿjam, iv, 700, 11 f.). The steppe region between the coast in the south and the desert in the north is called Nāḍjd, as was already done by al-Ṭabarānī (Taḥrīr, i, 1980, 1: 12). Yākūt (Muṣaʿjam, iii, 681, 1: 11; iv, 697, 1: 2; etc.) and others; and from that region originates also the nāḍjud, a highly-appreciated kind of frankincense (A. Grohmann, Südarabien als Wirtschaftsgebiet, i, Vienna 1922, 137 f.). Al-Šihr is also mentioned as a main centre of Mahra-land (al-Īṣṭakhri, 25, 11: 10 f.; al-Khulālī, Mukāṭasār, 132, 1: 2). Muḥammad b. Ḥabīb (Kīṭāb al-Muḥabbār, ed. I. Lichtenstaedter, Haydarbād 1942, 266, 11: 4-6) counts al-Šihr in Mahra as one of the markets of the Arabs in pre-Islamic times; it is said to lie at the foot of the mountains in which the tomb of the Prophet Hud is found, and said further that no tide is levied on that market because the town does not belong to any kingdom. Al-Šihr is occasionally even identified with Mahra-land (Ibn Ḥaladīn, Mukāṭasār, 132, 1: 4 f.), as can also be concluded from Nashwān b. Saʿīd al-Ḥimyārī, Shams al-ʿalam, when he (under the root r-ṣ-y) defines al-Asʾā3 (in) as a place in al-Šihr, i.e. in Mahra-land. This is also the case when, for the year 694/1294-5, during the zenith of the power of the Rashīlīs [q. v.] under al-Qasim as-Sārī is said that the latter's dominion was already firmly established in the Yemen, in al-Šihr (i.e. in Mahra-land) and in Ḥadramawt (Yahyā b. al-Husayn, Ḍhayyāt al-ʿamānī fī al-khāṭr al-ṣuṣ-ṣuṣ, Cairo 1968, 477, 11: 6 f.). Thereafter, for long al-Šihr, once the residence of a Mahra sultan, did not belong any more to Mahra-land; it passed into the possession of the Kuʿayyī sultans of al-Šihr and Mukllā. Only families like the Al-ʿIṣrāyānī live there in isolation, testify to the former presence of the Mahra in al-Šihr.

The Mahra trace their genealogy back to their ancestor Mahra b. Ḥaydān b. ʿAmr b. al-Ḥāf. Already A. Sprenger (Alle Geographie, 266) recognized in these names some geographical and ethnographical names of places on the South Arabian coast, e.g. in Ibn al-Ḥāf the port of Bal-Ḥāf, lying to the west of Bir ʿAlī. Early Arabic authors (Ibn al-Hāf, Kusayr, 132, 1: 4 f.) correctly pointed out that these Arab groups and those who claim descent from Mahra exist until today. Of these two groups which...
differ genealogically, the one, whose members are considered to be "pure" Mahra, claim descent from the Banu Sharâwîh; the others who are said to be of Arabic origin, are brought together in the Banû Sâr. Each of these two great confederacies is sub-divided again into several patrilineal groups (see the tables of the classification of the Mahra tribes and their attribution to these two groups in Dostal, Beduinen, 77). The greater part of the Mahra coastal area is in the hands of the Banû Sâr, while the inland zone belongs to the Banû Sharâwîh, who have access to the coast only between Kishn and Dabot and possess a small enclave further north (for a general outline of the region where both of the Mahra confederacies are at present dwelling and roaming, see the map in Dostal, Beduinen, 125). This spread of the Mahra over two areas is perhaps reflected already in al-Tabarî (Ta^rnkh, i, 1980, 11. 9-1981, 1. 3), who mentions two groups of the Mahra under two different leaders, one dwelling in the plain around Djayrut (this form is also found in Ibn al-Mudjâwîr 260, 1. 9), the other in Na'dij, i.e. in the highland zone. According to Ibn al-Mudjâwîr (271, 11. 15 f.), the origin of the Mahra is to be sought in the remains of the people of ʿAd; when God destroyed the greater part of them, this group of people was saved and went to live in the mountains of Za'far and the islands of Sukutra (Socotra) and al-Masira. Ibn Khaldun (Mukhtasar, 132, 11. 11 f.) also says that the land, afterwards inhabited by the Mahra, in prehistoric times belonged to the ʿAd mentioned in the Qurʾân.

The first Khâbjând to settle in this area is said to have been Mâlik b. Ḥimyar, who was succeeded by his son Kuḍâʾa. The latter's possessions, however, became restricted to the land which later was named after his great-grandson Yaḥyâ Muḥâmmad, iv, 700. 1. 10; Ibn Khâljûn, Mukhtasar, 132, 11. 13-17). Ibn Khâljûn goes on to say that the Mahra have come to their later dwelling-places from Hadramawt or from the Kuḍâʾa, but this certainly does not correspond with reality. The derivation of the Mahra from the Khâbjân through Kuḍâʾa and Ḥimyar is a mere construction of Arabic genealogists which does not withstand examination. Immigration from further west is also out of the question. Although the Mahra do not have written historical traditions, yet in their oral transmission the memory survives of large parts of Uman having belonged in earlier times to the regions where they were living and roaming and of their being expelled from there by the Arabs. The pressure of their eastern neighbours must have caused the Mahra to withdraw to the west and brought about their great loss of fertile regions. W. Dostal (Beduinen, 184-8) supports this tradition of the Mahra by collating non-Arabic place-names in south-east Arabia ending in -â, -â, and -â. He also illustrates this tradition with the aid of a map showing the spread of Mahri place-names (Beduinen, 133, Pl. 19). Further criteria for Mahri place-names in this region are: the ending -â occurring as a variant of -â, the feminine plural endings -â- and -â, the relative frequency of place-names with the prefixes ya- and ya-, and finally the etymology which in many cases indicates a place-name as being clearly Mahri. The majority of these place-names, mostly names of wâdîs, lies in the interior. On the coast they are only found in the area which is traditionally Mahri. Their greatest density occurs between long. 51° and 55° and lat. 16° and 18°. Since more than half of these non-Arabic place-names lie in regions now inhabited by Arabic-speaking tribes, this finding shows at the same time the present limitations of the Mahri living space. Al-Hamdânî (Ṣîfâ, 52, 11. 5 ff.; Ikîlî, i, 73, 1. 15) still attests that the Banû Riyân, a group of the Mahra tribe of the Kamar, were settled in ʿUmân; other tribes, too, he remarks, have their dwelling places in the region of ʿUmân (Ikîlî, i, 73, 1. 5) or on the sea-coast of ʿUmân (Ikîlî, i, 73, 1. 4). Other groups, like the Banû Khânjizîr (Ṣîfâ, 51, 11. 25 ff.) and the Thughârâ (Ṣîfâ, 52, 11. 2 ff.) were entangled in warlike altercations with Arabs who pressed forward along the coast into Mahra-land. Al-Hamdânî (Ṣîfâ, 51, 11. 16 ff.) still includes in his description of the "Green Yemen" the territory of the Mahra tribes of the Ghayth, Kamar and Ṭâkîr. On the island of Sukutra [q.v.] (Socotra), the Mahra are also to be found living (al-Hamdânî, Ṣîfâ, 53, 1. 1), i.e. members of all Mahra tribes (Ikîlî, i, 74, 1. 9). Ibn Ruzayyûk attests that even in the year 884/1479-80, part of ʿUmân was in the possession of the Mahra, since in that year the Bâdji Ḳumîd compelled the departure of the Mahra from ʿUmân.

After 608/1211-12, the Mahra tribe of the Banû Zanna pushed forward into the eastern part of Hadramawt, where they exercised control over the town of Tarîm for some time after 673/1274-5. In 945/1538-9 serious danger was brought to the Mahra by the Banû Kâḥîr under sultan Baḍr b. Tuwayrîk. The latter occupied great parts of the Mahra territory, and in 952/1545-6 conquered even the Mahra port of Kishn, where they murdered almost all the members of the family of the sultan of the Banû ʿAfrâr, the makhâyîkh of the Mahra. But in 955/1548-9 sultan Ṣârîd b. ʿAbî Allâh of the Banû ʿAfrâr succeeded in reconquering the town of Kishn from the Banû Kâḥîr. He started from the island of Sukûtrâ, where the Mahra had constructed a fortress after the retreat of the Portuguese in 917/1511-12. Since the Kâḥîr had joined the Ottomans, the Mahra were supported by the Portuguese. In 1876 the Mahra sultan of Sukûtrâ and Kishn guaranteed not to surrender any of his possessions except to the British Government and in 1886 he agreed to a Treaty of Protectorate with Great Britain.

The Mahra also participated in the Islamic campaigns of conquest. Togethers with other South Arabians, they settled in ʿIraḳ and the Mahra had great numbers in Egypt. In Kûfâ and in Old Cairo they lived in their own quarters (cf. the Ḹâjitat Mahra of al-Fustâṭ in al-Kalâlahî, Ṣulh al-aṭâ, iii, 327, 1. 12). There were also communications between the coast of Mahra-land and the island of Sukûtrâ. The latter occupied great parts of the Mahra territory, and the Mahra may have had settlements. Thus on Vasco da Gama's first journey, the Mahri Ibn Mâdîjî [q.v.] guided the Portuguese as a pilot from Malindi to India. As well as Sulaymân Mahra [q.v.], he left behind nautical texts. In 923/1517 the Mâlûkî Sultan Barsbâh enlisted Mahra as soldiers for his undertaking in the Yemen (see L. O. Schuman, Political history of the Yemen at the beginning of the 16th century, Abû Bakhrâmah's account of the years 906-927 h. (1500-1522 A.D.) with annotations, Groningen 1960, 27 ff.). The Mahra are attested in Zayla' during the years 944-5/1537-9, and a group of about seventy Mahra with their chiefs (mahkaddams) are repeatedly mentioned in the Futâh al-Habashâ (see Serjeant, Portuguese, 81, n. 5). The Comoro Islands [see KUMR] allegedly owe their name to the Kamar or Moon mountains of Mahra-land (see L. O. Schuman, Political history of the Yemen at the beginning of the 16th century, 1960, 64). For Mahra immigrants to Somalia, see E. Cerulli, Un gruppo Mahra nella Somalia Italiana, in RSO, xi (1926-8), 25-6.

The Mahra are "all handsome people" (Ibn al-
Mahra

Mugjawiwr, 271, 1. 17) of brown complexion with black, often curly, hair. Because of these physical characteristics they have been considered as not belonging to the Mediterranean race but related rather to the Veddas in South India. Until circumcision, boys have their hair shaven at both sides, so that only a tuft remains in the middle of the head. Circumcision of boys takes place at the age of twelve or also, as was usual in earlier days, only immediately before the wedding. After circumcision the hair grows long, either tied into a knot or falling down loosely and only kept together with a long braid, either plaited or made of leather; growing a beard is forbidden. Sedentary Mahra wear an indigo-coloured loin cloth and a skirt, the Bedouin generally only a loin cloth, an extremity of which can be thrown over the shoulder. Boys' ornaments consist of amulets and occasionally also necklaces; men adorn themselves with a leather belt equipped with characteristic ornamentation and sometimes stitched with pearls. Many Bedouin also wear an earing in the right ear and an amulet above the right elbow. Tattooing scars are also found, and all men carry the curved dagger (qamhajiya), more as an ornament than as a weapon. Nowadays, rifle and cartridge-belt are carried as weapons; formerly they were used the spear and the throwing stick terminating almost in a point, together with a sword which, in the Mahra, is a kind of scimitar and in the Bedouin a shield and a spear used as a weapon. They greet each other with a three-fold kiss on the cheek, starting with the right cheek, then the left and the right again. Girls are circumcised immediately after birth. Mahra women wear the hair braided and go unveiled. Women's dress is preferably also indigo-coloured and has an open square or round neck. Women like to wear many silver ornaments like chains at the forehead, rings at nose, ears, fingers and ankles, and amulets (Ibn al-Mugjawiwr, 271, 1. 12, describes Mahra virgins as muskhalkalat mudmamladat "provided with amulets and ankle rings"), and occasionally wearing head or neck ornament hanging down to the belt, single parts of which are adorned with geometrical embellishments and cornellians (akht). At the neck, an amulet of leather, silver or gold is fastened to one of the ends of the amulets, which are plaited and forerat in order to wear a precious stone as ornament. The breast ornament is an indication of the social status of the wearer. Women also use face-painting.

The nomads among the Mahra make do with modest shelters. They live mainly in caves, seek refuge under protruding rocks or make a roof against the sun amongst trees and shrubs. Remarks that the Mahra in these dwelling-places resemble animals (Ibn al-Mugjawiwr, 272, 1. 2), and are like wild animals (swubjik) in those lands (Ibn Khaldun, Mukhtarar, 132, 1. 12), may allude to their modest way of life and their familiarity with the surrounding nature. In their land, the Mahra do not know the cultivation of date-palms or agriculture (al-Istakhri, 25, 1. 12); this information refers of course to the Bedouin and not to the sedentary Mahra who, in the western part of their land, at the edge of Wadi Masila, practice a well-developed farming and lay out palm plantations. The riches of the Mahra consist of camels and goats, while they live on meat, milk and a kind of small fish on which they also feed the animals (Ibn Khaldun, Mukhtarar, 132, 11. 3 ff.). This fish is the sardine-like 'ayd, found in great numbers along the coast and which, after having been dried, is given to the animals, especially when other food is lacking. Goats are still predominant among the Mahra, in contrast to the Bedouin, who have more sheep. Camels bred by the Mahra (sing. nabiyyaas, pl. maharâ, mahariis and mahariyyas) were considered from ancient times as a particularly good breed (al-Hamdani, Sifa 100, 1. 1 ff.). Among these were valued as noble the 'idite camels, named after 'idi (vocalisation according to al-Hamdani, Hid, 173, 1. 11), a Mahra tribe (Sifa, 201, 1. 14). Already in the biography of the Prophet (Ibn Hisam, Sira, ed. F. Wüstenfeld, 695, 1. 9) Mahra camels are mentioned; they were valued by the caliphs (al-Kazwini, 'Adgâh, i, 41, 11. 3 ff.) and repeatedly celebrated by the ancient poets (e.g. Abu Tamânâm, Dânân, ed. M. 'A. 'Azzâm, ii, 129, 1. 4 = Aghdan, xv, 106, 1. 16). They spread as far as North Africa, where the form mahâra (pl. mahârâ) made its way into French as mchâri "riding camel" (pl. mchârâ) from which term was derived mchâriste to indicate a member of the camel riders. Besides making use of their herds, the Mahra provide the transport of merchandise by procuring caravan service, convey pilgrims to the places of pilgrimage and supply local markets with camels. If they do not possess their own incense trees, a supplementary source of livelihood consists in employment as seasonal workers in Zufar at the time of the incense harvest in order to scrape the gum off the trees; The Karâ leave their incense trees to the Bedouin to take half of the harvest. The Mahra living on the coast are mostly fishermen; a few are also merchants and seafarers. With the rise of the oil industry in the Arab countries of the Gulf, many Mahras have departed thither as labourers.

Among the Mahra exists a patrilinear system of kinship; however, still-remaining traces of matrilineal point to an earlier matrilineal social structure. Monogamy is the prevailing form of marriage; if polygamy occurs, it is in fact mainly a multi-local polygamy based on uxorilocal marriage.

The Mahra settle their social and political affairs almost exclusively inside their tribe. The sultanate of the Banû 'Afrâr exercised authority only in name, and thus had only a limited influence on the political situation of the mainland, the more so because the sultan used to reside on Suku'tra, with another member of the 'Afrâr family acting as his representative in Kâjsân. The real power over the individual tribes is in the hands of their chiefs, the mukaddams, who have always enjoyed great esteem. Feuds exist between the Mahra and almost all of their neighbouring tribes (see the charts on inter-tribal relations in Dostal, Beduinen, 109); lasting hostility exists especially with the Manâhil. Friendly relations exist only with the Banû Khâjîr and the Banû Râgâhid, bringing about also marriages between members of these tribes and the Mahra.

Al-Hamdâni (Sifa, 87, 1. 11) relates that the Mahra visit at all times the tomb of the Prophet Hûd. Besides this pilgrimage place, the Mahra also venerate other holy places like the tomb of Bin 'Ali in Mirbât, of Shaykh 'Abî Sîr in Tâka or of Bin 'Arîbat in Raysût. Oath-taking and vows play an important rôle among them (see T. M. Johnstone, The Bedouin, 1. 2); it is usual to swear on the tombs of the saints and invoke divine judgement by way of ordeal by fire. They practise all kinds of charms, especially against malevolent djinn or against the evil eye. Ibn al-Mugjawiwr (271, 11. 17-272, 1. 1) even wanted to derive from sbr "witchcraft" the term Sahâra, another name for the Mahra which has not as yet been satisfactorily explained. He attributes (272, 1. 1) to the Mahra ignorance (gdâh) and reason ('uḏ) and some other features of the Mahra. Ibn Khaldun (Sifa, 87, 1. 11) continues (272, 1. 2) by saying that they benefit from God's blessings without giving praise and thanks, and
that they worship not Him but someone else. The first statement probably refers to the indifference in religious matters and to the non-performance of the prescribed worship, which can be observed especially among the nomadic Mahra. The last statement, on the other hand, may be attributed to the fact that the Mahri language does not know either the word Allāh or the word rabū, but speaks of God as bābī (literally "my Lord"), so that an Arab, not understanding this word might infer that they serve another deity. Ibn Khaldūn (Muḥammad, 192, 11. 12 ft.), however, rightly remarks that, so far as religious confession is concerned, the Mahra are ḫādirījīn, in fact Ibādīs [q.v.]. Information about the Mahra’s conversion to Islam is given by Ibn ʿAbd, Tabakāt, i/2, Leiden 1917, 83, 11. 13-26. After the Prophet’s death, Mahra-land also formed part of the areas the ridda movement; but ʿIrīm, one of Abū Bakr’s commanders, succeeded in reconquering Mahra-land for Islam (al-Tabari, Taʾrīkh, i, 1980, 1. 5-1982, 1. 2).

**Bibliography:** Apart from the works quoted in the text, only the more frequently quoted and most important sources are mentioned here: Tabarī, Taʾrīkh; Hamdānī, Sīrat ʿalāma al-ʿArab, i, ed. D. H. Müller, 1884; Hamdānī, al-ʾIlī, i/2, ed. O. Lōfgrén, Upsala 1965; ʾĪṣākhirī; Mukaddasī, Yākūt, Muṣāfīg al-buldhān; Ibn al-Muṣāfīr, Taʾrīkh al-Maḥri al-Maghribī, ed. O. Lōfgrén, Proceedings of the Seminar for Arabian Studies, 1 (1971), 103-53; Ibn ʿAbd, Taʾrīkh; with H. C. Kay, Arabic, its early medieval history, London 1892, 90-103-58 of the Arabic text; A. Sprenger, Die alte Geographie Arabiens, Bern 1875; A. Jahn, Die Mahri-Sprache in Sudan, Vienna 1902; W. Hein, Mehrī und Hadīthi-Texte, Vienna 1909; J. Tktatsch, art. Mahra, in EL (contains numerous further details on the history of the exploration of Mahra-land and the Mahri language); R. B. Serjeant, The Portuguese off the South Arabian coast, Oxford 1963; W. Dostal, Die Beduinen in Sudan, Vienna 1967 (this is the most important work on the Mahra, based on field-studies; it has been much utilised for the present article), cf. the review of W. W. Müller, in ZDMG, cxviii (1968), 399-402; T. M. Johnstone, Folklore and History of the Mahra, in Arab and South Arabian Studies, (i) (1974), 7-23; J. Carter, Tribal Structures in Oman, in Proceedings of the Seminar for Arabian Studies, vii (1977), 68-11, esp. 37-49. (W. W. MÜLLER) MAHRAM BİLKİŞ. [see MAHİR]. MAHRATTAS. [see MARATHA].

MAHİR. The Mahri language, called by its speakers Mahrayat, is spoken by many thousands, both Bedouin and settled people, over a large area of South Arabia extending in a great half-circle from Mukallā in South Yemen to the small coastal towns of Zufar or Dhofar. In South Yemen, the speakers are Bedouin, merchants, fishermen and seamen, but many Mahra of the more prosperous classes are now definitively western dialect of Djibbali). The Mahra, who are mostly located in the desert area of Zufar behind the fertile part of the coastal towns of Shuwaymiyya and Shirābīyat, at or near where they are now mainly settled. It seems likely that they learnt their language from the invaders, unlike the Karā which would seem to have learnt their language from the original inhabitants of the fertile area they conquered. In the desert between the Zufar province and the Shirakiyya province of ʿūmān, in the area between Ḥaymā and the Ṣādī Ḥaḥayn, is the small tribe of the Ḥarāsī, apparently of Arab origin. Harsūsī, which is fairly easily understood by Mahra, shows signs of having been acquired by them on the borders of Zufar and South Yemen. In the same border area is the last of the groups speaking a Mahri-related language, namely Hoboyt. Hoboyt is spoken by a small number of people in little settlements on both sides of the border. It shares a few features with Harsūsī, like the use of the verb ʿašār, "I want", in Harsūsī and ʿom in Hoboyt, as against Mahri ʾaḥām and Ḥaḥārīm. Nadjī Mahri (NM) appears to be a more conservative dialect than the South Yemen dialect (SM). Thus NM retains the interdentals t, d, and d which, in (most dialects of SM are replaced by t, d, and t.

The Austrian expedition (SAE) publications give no indication that SM has a definite article, a passive voice, or conditional verbal forms. This does not conclusively prove that they do not occur in SM, however, since the SAE publications also give no indication that glottalised consonants occur in SM, though they do occur in SM texts recorded by the present writer.

The principal features of interest in the phonology of Mahri (M) are, firstly, the occurrence of the glottalised and the emphatic consonants, which are not against the series of emphatic/velarised consonants in Arabic), the occurrence of the laterals ī and ī which probably occurred in early pre-literary Arabic and finally (the virtual non-occurrence of the voiced pharyngal (Ar. ʾghr). The syllabification of M is also of considerable historical and comparative interest. In M all forms with a final ĕv (C) syllable (other than -CaC) have final stress. This stress results in a lengthening of the vowel of the final syllable where it was not already long, and the reduction to ĕ of the short (or lengthened) vowels of the non-final syllables. Thus consider katāb ("he wrote", from earlier *katāḥ(aj)), katāā ("the wrote" from *katābd), and katāā ("he wrote it", f., from *katāa-a-o). Non-final stress occurs in many earlier monosyllables. Thus bād, "seed" has become bāḏr, but in affixed forms it remains bāḏr-, as, e.g., abāḏrīkh, "his seed", where the a-element is a definite article. It is a puzzling feature of phonology that the vowel of the stressed syllable of nominal forms is not always of the same quality as that of the comparable verbal forms. Thus contrast saʿār, "he went", with sahbī, "cause"; and bāḏr, "seed" with bāḏr, "it got broken". Even if it is likely that the nouns lost their final vowels before the verbs (though some plural nouns like ḥādītun, "hands", still have a final nunciation which is elided on affixation), this does not throw much light on the problem. Fern.

The Mahra also continuously penetrate the šāhār, the fertile part of the Zufar mountain which gets the monsoon rains, not without some resistance from the Karā, so far as the Karā-speaking Mahri are concerned. Many of these immigrants lose their Mahri language also, and come to speak only Djibbali and Arabic. The western dialect is not confined entirely to South Yemen, and is spoken in the coastal area of Zufar nearest to South Yemen (where there is also a definably western dialect of Djibbālī). A number of non-Mahri groups within this area speak what may be defined as dialects of Mahri, or as languages closely related to Mahri. Within Zufar, a small group of people, the Batājīrīb, speak a language or dialect closely related to Mahri. Now fishermen, formerly of humble status, they were apparently driven from their homes in the fertile hinterland of the coastal towns of Shuwaymiyya and Shirābīyat, at or near where they are now mainly settled. It seems likely that they learnt their language from the invaders, unlike the Karā which would seem to have learnt their language from the original inhabitants of the fertile area they conquered. In the desert between the Zufar province and the Shirakiyya province of ʿūmān, in the area between Ḥaymā and the Ṣādī Ḥaḥayn, is the small tribe of the Ḥarāsī, apparently of Arab origin. Harsūsī, which is fairly easily understood by Mahra, shows signs of having been acquired by them on the borders of Zufar and South Yemen. In the same border area is the last of the groups speaking a Mahri-related language, namely Hoboyt. Hoboyt is spoken by a small number of people in little settlements on both sides of the border. It shares a few features with Harsūsī, like the use of the verb ʿašār, "I want", in Harsūsī and ʿom in Hoboyt, as against Mahri ʾaḥām and Ḥaḥārīm. Nadjī Mahri (NM) appears to be a more conservative dialect than the South Yemen dialect (SM). Thus NM retains the interdentals t, d, and d which, in (most dialects of SM are replaced by t, d, and t. The Austrian expedition (SAE) publications give no indication that SM has a definite article, a passive voice, or conditional verbal forms. This does not conclusively prove that they do not occur in SM, however, since the SAE publications also give no indication that glottalised consonants occur in SM, though they do occur in SM texts recorded by the present writer.

The principal features of interest in the phonology of Mahri (M) are, firstly, the occurrence of the glottalised and the emphatic consonants, which are not against the series of emphatic/velarised consonants in Arabic), the occurrence of the laterals ī and ī which probably occurred in early pre-literary Arabic and finally (the virtual non-occurrence of the voiced pharyngal (Ar. ʾghr). The syllabification of M is also of considerable historical and comparative interest. In M all forms with a final ĕv (C) syllable (other than -CaC) have final stress. This stress results in a lengthening of the vowel of the final syllable where it was not already long, and the reduction to ĕ of the short (or lengthened) vowels of the non-final syllables. Thus consider katāb ("he wrote", from earlier *katāḥ(aj)), katāā ("the wrote" from *katābd), and katāā ("he wrote it", f., from *katāa-a-o). Non-final stress occurs in many earlier monosyllables. Thus bād, "seed" has become bāḏr, but in affixed forms it remains bāḏr-, as, e.g., abāḏrīkh, "his seed", where the a-element is a definite article. It is a puzzling feature of phonology that the vowel of the stressed syllable of nominal forms is not always of the same quality as that of the comparable verbal forms. Thus contrast saʿār, "he went", with sahbī, "cause"; and bāḏr, "seed" with bāḏr, "it got broken". Even if it is likely that the nouns lost their final vowels before the verbs (though some plural nouns like ḥādītun, "hands", still have a final nunciation which is elided on affixation), this does not throw much light on the problem. Fern.
nouns, for example, may be characterised by an -et, -it, -dt, or -ut ending.

The noun in M is not inflected for case but has two genders, masc. and fem., and three numbers, sing., dual and pl. Some common nouns, such as hāy, "house" and nakhā, "day", are fem. in M (and in- deed, in all the Modern South Arabian languages).

The dual in M ends in -i, thus gaagi, "two men" and fakhtī, "[two] halves". It rarely occurs without a following numeral prō (masc.) or ṣawri (fem.), "two" and, unlike dual verb forms, can be considered to be obsolescent. Thus speakers clearly believe when they say "two boys" that they are saying gāgēn irū, and not gōgēnī prō.

Nouns have sound or broken plurals. Masc. nouns for the most part have broken plurals, while fem. nouns mostly have sound pls. in -ām, ām, -āt, etc. The noun in NM can be defined by the prefixation of a. This can, however, be affixed only to words with an initial voiced or glottalised consonant. Thus kāhtī, "a/the book", ʿadhīrī, "the seed", and āyādī, "the fish".

The verb in M has two main simple themes and six derived themes, namely:

Simple
CaGaC (a) and CiGaC (b)
Intensive-conative (a)CGaCaC
Causative
haCCaC
Reflexive
CaCaC (a) and aCaCaC (b)
Causative-reflexive aCaCaC (a) and laGeCaC (b)

The reflexive types (a) and (b) often overlap in their conjugation.

The verb has a perfective and an imperfective aspect. The imperf. indic. and subj. patterns are markedly different from Arabic. Thus consider kātīb (perf.) yakhtīb (indic.) yākhtīb (subj.) yākhtīn (cond.). Conditional forms occur relatively rarely, mainly in sentences involving hypothetical conditions. All dependent verbs are subj., and the subj. also functions as a jussive and occasionally as a kind of future. Imperative forms are subj. in syllable structure but lack the personal prefixes, so, e.g. kīxēkī, "write!".

The verb has the following persons: 3 m.s., 3 f.s., 2 m.s., 2 f.s., 1 c.s.; 3 m.d., 3 f.d., 2 c.d., 1 c.d.; 3 m.3.3, 2 m.3, 2 f.3, 2 f.1, 1 c.3. The verb has also verbal nouns, and active and passive participles. The active participle (a.e.g., m.s. kāḥīna, i.s. kāḥīta, etc.) functions as a future.

Mahrī (or at least NM) has a large vocabulary relatively little affected by Arabic, and there is a good deal of resistance to borrowings from Arabic. Lexical items may be considered to be for comparative purposes in a number of categories: words which have no cognates in literary or colloquial Arabic (as e.g., swsuwīli, "he sat"); words which have Ar. cognates but cannot, for phonological or morphological reasons, be borrowings (as e.g., ṣāfīr, Dhofar/Zafār); words which have the same radicals as the equivalent Ar. words (as e.g., ʿadīr, Dhofar/Ζaflār); words which have been borrowed and modified to become completely Mahrī in terms of phonology and morphology (such as, perhaps, ṣābīdī, "he began"); and borrowings from Ar. which have been left virtually unchange- ed (as e.g., mafṣū, "key"). There is a large area of the vocabulary, which is not possible to categorise with any degree of certainty. Since M and Ar. have lived side by side for many centuries, it is difficult to say in many cases which language has borrowed from the other. Thus suyār, "he went", is paralleled by sār in most Ar. dialects of the South. It is just as likely, however, that such Ar. dialects are influenced by Mahrī as that Mahrī has been influenced by Arabic.

Bibliography: All references up to his date of publication are collected in W. Leslau, Modern South Arabian languages—a bibliography, New York 1946; for later references, see E. Wagner, Syntax der Mehrī-Sprache, Berlin 1953. The most important of these earlier sources are the following (all published in Vienna) by the Austrian South Ar- abian Expedition (SAE) associates: (grammar) A. Jahn, Grammatik der Mehrī-Sprache in Südarabien, in SB AK. Wien, Phil.-Hist. Kl., Bd. 150, Abb. 6, 1903; M. Bittner, Studien zur Laut- und Formenlehre der Mehrī-Sprache in Südarabien, in SB AK. Wien, Phil.-Hist. Kl., Bd. 162, Abb. 5; Bd. 168, Abb. 2, 172, Abb. 5; Bd. 174, Abb. 4; Bd. 178, Abb. 2, 5, 1909-15; (texts) A. Jahn, SAE 3, 1902 (with vocabulary); W. Hein, SAE 9, 1909 (ed. D. H. Müller); D. H. Müller, SAE 7, 1907. For more recent work, see the following publications of T. M. Johnstone: Harṣīsī lexicon, Oxford 1977; A definite article in the Modern South Arabian languages, in BSOAS, xxxii/2 (1970); Dual forms in Mehrī and Harṣīsī, in BSOAS, xxxiii/3 (1970); Diminutive patterns in the Modern South Arabian languages, in JSS, xviii (1973); Folklore and folk-literature in Oman and Socotra, in Arabian Studies, i (1973); Contrasting articulations in the Modern South Arabian languages, in Hamito-Semitic, Leiden 1975; Oath-taking and vows in Oman, in AR. St., ii (1973); Knots and curses, in Ar. St., iii (1976); A.S. George of Dhofar, in Ar. St. (1977); Jibbālī lexicon, 1981; Mehrī lexicon, 1984.

MAHSATI (the most probable interpretation of the consonants msxy, for which other forms, like Mahisti, Mahsati or Mihhisti, have been proposed as well; cf. Meier, 43 ff.) a Persian female poet whose historical personality is difficult to ascertain. She must have lived at some time between the early 5th/11th and the middle of the 6th/12th century. The earliest sources situate her alternatively in the environment of Mahmūd of Ghazna, of the Saldījk Sultan Sandjar, or of a legendary king of Gandja in Adharbaydjan. The qualification dabīr or dabīra is often attached to her name, but it is uncertain whether she actually worked as a professional scribe, the function designated by this term locally; she was represented as a singer and a musician as well as a poet of the court, though not as a panegyrist. The poems attributed to her name are almost without excep- tion quatrains. Their dominating theme is the lover’s complaint about the absence, the lack of attention or the cruelty of his or her beloved. Several poems belong to the genre of abahabab in poetry in which the beloved is presented as a young craftsman. Mahsati has acquired a reputation as a writer of bawdy verse. Mystical and fatalistic thoughts, often expressed in Persian quatrains, are absent and the animism of the kalandarbayyāt can only seldom be found. The authenticity of these poems remains in each case ques- tionable. An original collection is not known to exist. The current dīvāns of Mahsati are modern compila- tions from many different sources.

Mahsati became already at an early date the heroine of romantic tales. The oldest specimen is contained in ʿĀṭār’s Ilāhī-nāma (Meier, 53-6; tr. J. A. Boyle, Manchester 1976, 218-20). A similar story, embellished by inserted quatrains, was used by ʿAbd Allāh Dāwhāri in a commentary on the kasīda-yi haǔdīya, a poem about alchemy, towards the end of the 7th/13th century. It is, however, not derived from ʿĀṭār’s story (Meier, 63-7). The Dāsān-i Amīr Ahmad- u Mahsati is a popular romance, built upon an ex- tensive cycle of quatrains, dealing with the love between two poets, of whom the former is sometimes referred
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to as "the son of the preacher of Gandja" (pur-i khatib-i Gandja). It is extant in two versions of different lengths (Meier, 123 and passim; E. E. Bertelt’s, Nizami i Fuzuli, 78, n. 12).


**MAHSUD, the name of a Pathan tribe on the north-west frontier of Pakistan, in British India the fiercest opponents there of British rule. The Mahsuds inhabit the heart of Waziristan around Kānīgurām and are shut off from Pakistan territory by the Bhittanni country. On all other sides they are flanked by Darwsh Khel Wazirs. It is now generally accepted that they left their original home in the Birlam hills of modern Afghanistan sometime towards the close of the 8th/14th century and gradually extending eastwards occupied the country in which they now reside. The tribe has three main branches: the Bahlōlzāy, Shāman Khel, and the ‘Alīzāy.

The Mahsuds have always been the scourge of the Bānnī and Dērdājāt borders. This was the case in the days of Sikh rule and, after the annexation of the Pan-djāb in 1849, they still continued to plunder and devastate the borders of British India. And the fact that their rocky mountain fastnesses command the Gōmāl and Toci, two of the five main passes connecting India with Afghanistan, compelled the British to resort to reprisals. On three occasions, in 1860, 1881 and 1894, the Mahsuds became so troublesome that punitive expeditions had to be undertaken against them. On the conclusion of the 1860 expedition, a temporary peace was patched up by which each of the tribes agreed to hold the country between British India and Pakistan in search of work. In 1897, this peace was broken by the formation of the Mahsud Hills, a temporary peace was patched up by which each of the Mahsud groups agreed to hold the country between British India and Afghanistan, and in 1898 the Mahsuds were rendered assistance in the survey of Afghanistan by exploiting the marauding proclivities of the tribesmen. From 1914 to 1917 the history of the Dērā Ismā‘īl Khān district was one long tale of rapine and outrage. Eventually, in 1917, troops marched into the Mahsud country, but were able to effect only a temporary settlement. British preoccupations elsewhere where delayed the day of retribution, and during 1919 and 1920, the wind-swept raghāz of Waziristan witnessed the severest fighting in the annals of the Indian frontier.

During the disturbances in Afghanistan following on the abdication of Āman Allāh (q. v. in Suppl.) and the brief assumption of power by the adventurer Bāčcha-yi Sākā (1928), Mahsuds and Wazirs joined in the returning Nādīr Khān in his march on Kābul, and were the spearhead of his successful bid for the throne. But they were disappointed at not receiving a licence to loot indiscriminately, and were subsequently stirred up by the partisans of Āman Allāh, so that in 1933 a Mahsud and Wazir lashkar crossed the Durand Line and besieged Matun in the Khost district till repulsed by Nādīr’s brother Hāǧīm Khān.

From 1936 onwards, the Mahsuds were further inflamed by the presence amongst them of the virulently anti-British “Fākīr of Ipal” (q. v. in Suppl.), Hāḏūḏī Miṟzā ‘Alī Khān, and in 1938 they and the Wazirs were stirred up by the “Shāmī Pir”, Sa‘īd al-Dīlānī from Syria, who established himself at Kānīgurām with the object of furthering a restoration in Afghanistan of Āman Allāh, until the Pir was bought off by a large subsidy from the Government of India. Mahsuds and Wazirs took part enthusiastically in the Kashmirī ʿāshad against India in 1948; since Partition, considerable numbers of Mahsuds have migrated down to the Indus valley and other parts of Pakistan in search of work.

**Bibliography:** C. U. Aitchison, Treaties, engagements and sanads, xi, Bombay 1909; R. I. Bruce, The Forward Policy and its results, London 1900; C. C. Davies, The problem of the North-West Frontier, Cambridge 1932; idem, Coercive measures on the Indian borderland, in Army Quarterly Review, April 1928; R. H. Davies, Report showing relations of British Government with tribes on N.W.F. of the Punjab, 1853-1864, 1864; Frontier and overseas expeditions from India (confidential), ii, 1908; North-West Frontier Province administration reports (published annually in British Indian times); Operations in Waziristan, 1919-1920, 1921; W. H. Paget and A. H. Mason, Record of expeditions against the N.W.F. Tribes since the annexation of the Punjab, London 1884; Punjab administration reports, 1850-1900; Parliamentary papers, lxvi, Cd. 1177, 1902; H. Priestley, Haydā-yi Āfghān, 1874; H. A. Rose, Glossary of tribes and castes of the Punjab and North-West Frontier Province, iii, s.v. Wazīr; H. C. Wyllie, From the Black Mountain to Waziristan, 1912; reprisals. From December 1900 to March 1902, the Mahsuds were subjected to a stringent blockade, but it was only after the blockade had been varied by sudden punitive sallies into the Mahsud hills that they were forced to conciliate. During this period, there were two factions in the country, the one headed by the maliks, the other by their enemy, the Mullā Powinda (to whom also, in an effort at conciliation, a monthly allowance had been granted in 1900); and from 1902 onwards the Mullā’s influence was paramount. After 1908 the Mahsud question became acute again, and a series of raids into British territory were traced to him. On his death in 1913, his place was taken by Mullā ‘Abd al-Ḥākim, who continued the policy of attempting to preserve the independence of the Mahsud country between British India and Afghanistan by exploiting the marauding proclivities of the tribesmen. From 1914 to 1917 the history of the Dērā Ismā‘īl Khān district was one long tale of rapine and outrage. Eventually, in 1917, troops marched into the Mahsud country, but were able to effect only a temporary settlement. British preoccupations elsewhere where delayed the day of retribution, and during 1919 and 1920, the wind-swept raghāz of Waziristan witnessed the severest fighting in the annals of the Indian frontier.

During the disturbances in Afghanistan following on the abdication of Āman Allāh (q. v. in Suppl.) and the brief assumption of power by the adventurer Bāčcha-yi Sākā (1928), Mahsuds and Wazirs joined in the returning Nādīr Khān in his march on Kābul, and were the spearhead of his successful bid for the throne. But they were disappointed at not receiving a licence to loot indiscriminately, and were subsequently stirred up by the partisans of Āman Allāh, so that in 1933 a Mahsud and Wazir lashkar crossed the Durand Line and besieged Matun in the Khost district till repulsed by Nādīr’s brother Hāǧīm Khān.

From 1936 onwards, the Mahsuds were further inflamed by the presence amongst them of the virulently anti-British “Fākīr of Ipal” (q. v. in Suppl.), Hāḏūḏī Miṟzā ‘Alī Khān, and in 1938 they and the Wazirs were stirred up by the “Shāmī Pir”, Sa‘īd al-Dīlānī from Syria, who established himself at Kānīgurām with the object of furthering a restoration in Afghanistan of Āman Allāh, until the Pir was bought off by a large subsidy from the Government of India. Mahsuds and Wazirs took part enthusiastically in the Kashmirī ʿāshad against India in 1948; since Partition, considerable numbers of Mahsuds have migrated down to the Indus valley and other parts of Pakistan in search of work.

**Bibliography:** C. U. Aitchison, Treaties, engagements and sanads, xi, Bombay 1909; R. I. Bruce, The Forward Policy and its results, London 1900; C. C. Davies, The problem of the North-West Frontier, Cambridge 1932; idem, Coercive measures on the Indian borderland, in Army Quarterly Review, April 1928; R. H. Davies, Report showing relations of British Government with tribes on N.W.F. of the Punjab, 1853-1864, 1864; Frontier and overseas expeditions from India (confidential), ii, 1908; North-West Frontier Province administration reports (published annually in British Indian times); Operations in Waziristan, 1919-1920, 1921; W. H. Paget and A. H. Mason, Record of expeditions against the N.W.F. Tribes since the annexation of the Punjab, London 1884; Punjab administration reports, 1850-1900; Parliamentary papers, lxvi, Cd. 1177, 1902; H. Priestley, Haydā-yi Āfghān, 1874; H. A. Rose, Glossary of tribes and castes of the Punjab and North-West Frontier Province, iii, s.v. Wazīr; H. C. Wyllie, From the Black Mountain to Waziristan, 1912;
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MAHSÚT (A.), "sensibilia". For the theories of sense-perception held by the principal falsafa of Islam, see HISS. In addition to these, it should be mentioned that Ibn Bāḍajīq is perhaps the philosopher who most closely follows Aristotle’s view on this subject, and that his Kitāb al-Nafs (Karachi n.d.), while undoubtedly an original work, may be regarded as almost a paraphrase of Aristotle’s De anima. In particular, he differs from other Islamic philosophers in not referring to "internal" and "external" senses or to akhwa al-mushāraka.

In falsafa, mahsisat are frequently contrasted with maškūlit, "intelligibilia". In tasawwuf, however, both are regarded as equally unreliable as means of arriving at the truth and are contrasted with dhawk. For a clear statement of this position, see al-Ghazālī, al-Munkidh min al-dalāl (where akhyāt is used rather than maškūlit). In spite of the Sūfīs’ avowed rejection of falsafa, such views as these may, to some degree, be considered to represent less a complete abandonment of it than a turning away from Aristotelianism towards Platoism (in neo-Platonic guise). That falsafa continued to exercise an influence may be seen from Djalal al-Din Ruml’s references in the Mathnawi to the "internal" and "external" senses and to the "common sense".

Bibliography: Given in the article and in HISS. (J. N. MATTOCK)

MĀHĪR, a small town of medieval India in the extreme north of the former Hyderabad State of British India. It is situated in lat. 19° 49′ N. and long. 77° 58′ E. just to the south of the Penganga river, a left-bank affluent of the Godavari, where it forms the boundary between the former regions of northern Hyderabad [see HYDARABĀD] and Berar [q. v.] in Central India.

In pre-Muslim times, Māhūr had the shrine of Šrī-Dattāreyā. In the middle years of the 8th/14th century, the territory up to Māhūr was conquered by the Deccani power of the Bahmanī [q. v.]. In 857/1453 Ahmad b. Muḥammad al-Kasīlānī conquered Māhūr and also Patna. The district being described in the District gazetteers. Nanded, Bombay 1971; Description Hyderabad, 1327 F./1917-18, 6-8; G. Yazdani, Hyderabad Archaeol. Report Calcutta 1909; G. Yazdani, ‘On the Mahur region after the year 1057/1647-8 are mentioned by Muḥammad al-Muḥibbī, Khulāsat al-aflat fi ‘ayn al-khan al-bādhī ‘āshar, Cairo 1284, i, 266, iii, 382 f. (see also ‘Abd al-Wahhāb al-Sha’rānī, al-Tabākāt al-sughr, Cairo 1970, 88 f. for data concerning al-Shūnī’s khīṣa, Shihāb al-Dīn al-Bukhārī, d. 960/1553).

By the year 1300, the district was placed within Maharashtra State, and is now in Nanded District and Kīnvat tašlāk. Māhūr village had in 1971 a population of 380.

Māhūr has an important fortress, which may have been in existence in pre-Bahmanid times. It stands on a steep hill 360 feet/120 m. above the valley of the Penganga, and is irregularly shaped since it occupies the edges of two adjacent spurs (the intermediate valley is converted into a large tank through the construction of a massive connecting wall); the hill is precipitous on the east, south and west, its northern angle being defended by multiple gateways. The main northern gateway (known as Činī Darwāza, from the panels of Bahmanid tilework on its façade) encloses a defended entry with guard rooms along each side, and the Kil‘adār’s residence is set in an upper storey.


MAHYĀ, a communal nightly liturgical ritual in which the recital of supplications for divine grace for the Prophet [see ṢĀLĀWĀT] is central.

Such sessions were originally introduced as a mystical method [see TĀRIKĀ] by Nūr al-Dīn al-Shūnī (d. 944/1537; cf. Brockelmann, II, 438, for the titles and additional details about the sālāwat composed by him), a shaykh of ‘Abd al-Wahhāb al-Sha’rānī [q. v.] at the mosque of Ahmad al-Badawī in Tantā and at al-Azhār mosque in Cairo in the year 897/1491-2 (‘Abd al-Wahhāb al-Sha’rānī, al-Tabākāt al-kubrā, Cairo 1954, ii, 172-3; cf. Nāждīn al-Dīn b. Muḥammad al-Ghazālī, al-Kawdākib al-sā’ira fi ‘ayn al-ma’ṣūr al-aqhd, Beirut 1945-59, ii, 216-19). The meetings were held after the magrib prayer on Thursday night until the adhān for the Friday prayer the following noon. Later, the mahīyā became an influence may be seen from Djālāl al-Dīn Ruml’s references in the Mathnawi to the "internal" and "external" senses and to the "common sense".

Bibliography: Given in the article and in HISS. (J. N. MATTOCK)
and became synonymous with dhikr [q.v.]; cf. Abu 'l-Fayd Muhammad Murtaḍa al-Zabīlī, Tadhār us-saḥāsir al-Karnāwī, Cairo 1306-7, x, 110.

*MAKHADUNYA* — the Ottoman Turkish name for Minaean folk who, to judge from Pliny's remark that they disappeared from the records.

In addition, the term *salwaśit* as part of the *hadra*, and the rise of al-Shaddīliyya [q.v. as an institution independent from the main stream of Islamic mysticism.

Before the middle of the 10th/16th century, the *mahṣā* had also become institutionalised in Mecca, as is testified by a faţūd given by Ibn Ḥadjar al-Yahmāni [q.v.], al-Fādawi al-ḥadīthis, Cairo 1305, 41; 89, for a description of the ritual. For the texts recited during the *hadra*, see also Husayn Amin al-Sayyād, al-Fuyūdī al-nurānīyya fi mahṣā al-tarīk al-Demirdāği, Cairo n.d., 12 ff. In Egypt, the increasing institutionalisation of Islamic mysticism, in particular in the 9th/15th century, in tāris̲, some of which, like the Şahādīliyya [q.v.], recited the *salwaśit* after the death of ʿAbd al-Wahhab al-Shaṭṭārī (d. 975/1565), who had been *ṣayḥ al-mahṣā* in al-Qāhmarī mosque (cf. al-Ghazzārī, ii, 217). No data on the *mahṣā* in this part of the Islamic world have come down to us.

In Damascus, the *mahṣā* was introduced by ʿAbd al-Kādir b. Muhammad b. Suwār (921-1015/1515-1605). The first *mahṣā* in this city was held in al-Buzūrī mosque in Radjāb 970/March 1565. Shortly afterwards, a weekly *mahṣā* was started in the Umayyad mosque (cf. al-Muḥibbī, i, 454; iii, 276; Muhammad Khalīl al-Murādī, Silh al-Durur fi ʿašr al-karn al-thānī al-taṣawwūr, Būlāk, 1301, i, 112 ff.; ii, 160; iii, 179; and al-Ghazzārī, ii, 218). In Damascus, as in Cairo, organisation and supervision of the *mahṣā* sessions was given in the following way which has however some afinities with the language of Sābā [q.v.]. The widespread nature of their trade is evidenced by Minaean inscriptions from the island of Delos and from the Egyptian Fayyūm, but apart from such scattered examples, all the texts in this language come from in and around their main centre Karnāw (Khirbet Maḥrīn) in the eastern part of the Southern Arabian Dāqiq, from the area of Yathīl (Barākīqah) a little south of there (both these places still show impressive town walls), and from their trading settlement at Dedan (al-ʿUlā in the northern Ḥīdżārā). But they certainly had other similar trading posts elsewhere, and a Katabanian language text from Timnā (in the Wādī Bayhān [see KATABAN] mentions a 'magistrate of the Minaeans in Timnā'.

In effect, the term Minaeans seems to have had a double application. There must have been an original Minaean folk who, to judge from Pliny's remark that 'they possessed palmgroves, but their main wealth lay in cattle', may perhaps most plausibly be sited in the steppe country north of Karnāw. But considered as a trading organisation, they were subdivided in a number of aḥāl or 'folks', of whom the most significant in the texts are the al-GBN. Earlier scholars did not hesitate to identify these with Pliny's Gebbanitae, and although in recent years there has been a tendency to equate them with the Katabanians, the earlier view still seems more probable, since Pliny's Gebbanitae (and also Strabo's Gabaloi) figure as principally concerned with the frankincense trade up the west coast of Arabia. The Minaean language texts all belong within the Ptolemaic period, and after Pliny (whose information may well be already a little out-of-date when he wrote), they disappear from the records. Evidently, therefore, their trading monopoly had broken up by about the turn of he Christian era, the west coast trade having been taken over by Nabataeans and other northern Arabian peoples, while the Minaeans seem to have sunk back into obscurity.

Given in the article.

(A. F. L. BEESTON)
Macedonia, a region which occupies the centre of the Balkan Peninsula. Despite its historically mixed population of Slavs, Ottoman Turks, Greeks, Albanians, Vlachs, Sephardic Jews and others, Macedonia forms a geographical unit. Its boundaries are sometimes disputed, but may be said to follow the line of peaks which stretches from the Šar Planina in the north to the Rhodope range and the river Mesta in the east, and to the Albanian mountains and the Pindus in the west. On the southern side it is naturally limited by the Gulf of Salonica. Macedonia was visited by the early Arab traveller Harīr ibn Yaḥyā, and is mentioned in the form *Makadunia* by the Abbasid geographer Ibn Khurradadhbih (257/870) and by the anonymous *Hudud al-ʿālam* (372/982).

1. Ottoman Macedonia. Immediately before the Ottoman conquest, Macedonia was loosely divided between the Byzantine and various local potentates. In 784/1383, during the reign of Murād I, Ottoman forces penetrated as far as Seres, and in 787/1385 captured Ḩīṭṭūp (Štip), Manastir, (Monastir, Bitola) and Pirlepe (Prilep). Uskiib (Skopje) fell in 794/1391. Selanik (Salonica) was briefly held by the Gulf of Salonica. Macedonia was visited by the early Arab traveller Harun b. Yahya, and is mentioned in the form *Makadunia* by the Abbasid geographer Ibn Khurradadhbih (257/870) and by the anonymous *Hudud al-ʿālam* (372/982).

Ibn Khurradadhbih (257/870) and by the anonymous *Hudud al-ʿālam* (372/982).

The geography and...
vols., Oxford 1929. The question of isams a-
tion is broached in B. Cvetkova, op. cit. ... fictitious
existence of a recipient (sc. the one to whom the text
is dedicated). Henceforward, the original sense of

typhical hundred pages of text from the classical period,
etymologically the sense of "statement", "ut-

1. In Arabic

This maṣṣār mīnī from the root ḥ-w-l "to say", has
eycologically the sense of "statement", "ut-
tance", etc. It will be noted, however, that in a
typical Arabic page, the text from the classical period,
it is found only once with this "oral" sense (Ch. Vial,
Al-Ghīzb, quatre essais, ii, Cairo 1979, 132). On
the other hand, its usage in contemporary Arabic is
remarkably frequent, all the more so in that its sense is
ehenceforward almost exclusively related to the writ-
ten rather than the spoken text. The modern user
designates by the word maḳāla that which we call "article", and doubtless there would be nothing
further to add in this context were it not that the
history of the word impinges upon the recent history of
Arabic literature.

It being unnecessary to dwell in detail on an evolu-
tion which is now well-known, it will simply be recall-
ne that modern Arabic prose has been forged through
the intermediary of the press. It was a result of the
creation and development of Arab journals and
reviews at the end of the 19th century that the
affected and inflated language which had hitherto prevailed
rapidly gave way to a convenient and direct means of
expression. In avoiding the conventional attractions of
hackneyed rhythm and rhyme (sadf), the writer
simultaneously freed himself from the mould of en-
trenched ideas which had hitherto been imposed on
a variety of subjects. The liberation of the language was
accompanied to a certain extent by a liberation of
thought. This fundamental change was effected by
departure from the domain of the classical Arabic
humanities and by contact with European languages.
There were genuine grounds for fearing that a move-
iment of such magnitude might compromise the con-
nature of the Arabic language. There was much
concern that, by dint of inspiration from foreign press
agencies and the desire to imitate the style of Euro-
pean periodicals, the grammatical correctness of ar-
ticles appearing in the Arabic press would be severely
impaired. Authoritative voices—linguists, professors
and writers—were raised to engage in often impas-
sioned debate on the most common defects and on the
means of preventing the corruption of the Arabic
language. The development of education, the visceral
attachment of the Arabs to their language, the fre-
cent criticism brought to bear on the linguistic cor-
rectness of texts of all kinds, the painstaking work of
academies of the Arabic language [see MA'AM° (ỉlmî,
1.), all these elements have enabled "the language of
press" to maintain a thoroughly respectable stan-
card, even though—in Arabic as elsewhere—a
number of eminent individuals protest at the liberties
taken by the press, and more recently by radio and
television, with the rules of the language (cf. in par-
cular the arguments between linguists at the end of
the last and the beginning of the present century;
among them, the Lebanese Brāhīm al-Yāzīdī and his
Lugat al-ajḏūd, Cairo 1901).

But the maḳāla does not represent only the testing
bench or laboratory of that which, more elaborated
and better adapted, has become the contemporary
literary prose. It represents a mode of expression
regarded as special, and some would go as far to see
it as a whole literary genre in its own right. In the
brief account of the fate of the Turkish
population of Macedonia since 1913;
R. Grulich, Die türkische Volksgruppe in Jugoslawien,
in Materiala Turcica, i, Bochum 1975, the Yugoslav
Turkish periodicals Salar, Çevre, and Birlik may
also be consulted. (F. A. K. YASAMEER)

MAKĀLA (A.), article.

1. In Arabic

This maṣṣār mīnī from the root ḥ-w-l "to say", has
eycologically the sense of "statement", "ut-
tance", etc. It will be noted, however, that in a
typical Arabic page, the text from the classical period,
it is found only once with this "oral" sense (Ch. Vial,
genre in itself, since if it were so, it would risk confusion with the "diverse" category, those variae which defy classification by any reputable catalogue.

Bibliography: Mainly given in the text, but see also "Abd al-Djabbar Dawud al-Hasiri, Ruwwad al-
makalat al-adabiyya fi 'l-adab al-iraki al-adabiyya, Baghdad n.d.; Muhammad Yusuf Nadjin, Fann al-
makalat, Beirut 1957; 'Abd al-La'if Hamza, Adab al-


2. In Persian.

Makalat has been used in Persian to denote a collection of discourses, spoken or written, on a given subject (e.g. Cahar makalat by Nizami-yi 'Arudi, ed. M. Mu'in, 135; Khajani Muntazam, ed. M. Rawghaan, 174; Hamdili Makalat, ed. G. Ahani, 5, 17, 38; Baha Afdal's Writings, ed. Y. Mahlawi and M. Minowi, ii, 393; Dibwayihi of Tabarsi, ed. M. Kazwini, i, 32; and also the poems of Nasiir-i Khusrav and Sa'di). Makalat was used in reference to spoken discourses and sermons up to the late 19th century (see Muhammad-Hasan Timad al-Saltana, al-
Makalat wa 'l-dhikir, under the biography of Burhan al-
Wizgini of Gilan, 1306 A.H., 201 col. 1).

Makalat has also been used to designate a book's inner divisions, synonymously with such other terms as jad, had, nisht, or matlab. Nisht-i 'Arudi, op. cit., 19, writes that the book, therefore, comprises four makalat ..., in each makalat whatever was found befitting in the domain of philosophy was included." The title of his work, Cahar makala, was not bestowed upon it by its author. The book was found to contain four discourses, and so it became popularly known as Cahar makalat, and Haidri Khalifa appears to be the first person to have recorded down its title as such (see Kazf al-zanan, under Cahar makala).

The term makalat has been also used for the utterances, statements and dictations of Sufi shaykhs, the best-known of these being the Makalat-i Shams; to the same category also belongs the Makalati-i A'la by Daula Sinnani.

Makalat in contemporary Persian is synonymous with article in English and article or essay in French. It started with the practice of modern journalism in 19th century Iran, and was applied to almost any kind of writing produced for the printed page (even a news story, short story or play was often referred to as makala in place of nishiga or matlab), and the person who engaged in such writing would be called makalani-nisi or equally matlab-nisi (see Afdal al-Mulk Zandi, Afdal al-tawarikh, ed. M. Itthikjudiya and S. Sa'dwandiyan, Tehran 1361 A.H.).

The leading article of a newspaper, or its editorial, would be called sar-makala in Persian, and a series that would be carried over several issues would be makalati-i musalsal or silista makalat.

Scholarly papers, which usually get published in academic journals, are also referred to as makala (see Zarrin khi's Nadi-adah, i, 640), and a volume containing a collection of such papers would be called makalat or magdini'a makalat, e.g. the Makalati-i Tazkiyad or Makalat-i Kazusi. Sometimes the number of papers contained in such a volume will provide an appropriate title for it, e.g. Bist (20) makala-yi Kazwini, Bist makala-yi Tazkiyad, Chih (40) makala-yi Husayn Nakinterpret'ayin and Cand [several] makala-yi Nasr Allah Falsafi.

The practice of indexing published articles and papers does not go back a long time. For a listing of selected writings of the Iranian studies, Afghar's Fohrist-i makalati-i Forsi is available. Three
volumes have been published so far, containing references to some 16,000 makdâl that have appeared between 1915 and 1971 in Iran. The fourth volume, unpublished as yet, deals with the writings of the past decade. Some other fields for which indexes are already available are geography, social sciences, economics, and law.

3. In Turkey

In the majority of Turkish dictionaries of the 19th century, the term makâla figures with the primary sense of "discourse", of "monograph" or of "thing said or written regarding any given subject" (Shams al-Dîn Sâmî, Kâmaâs-i Türkî). In this period it is usually encountered, often in the plural (makâlât), in the titles of collected editions of the "sayings" or "writings" of a certain writer or eminent person. However, since the middle of the 19th century, with the development of the Turkish language press, it has appeared more and more frequently as a designation of an article published in a periodical, progressively displacing from current usage other words such as bend or bahâth.

Although a noun of Arabic origin, makâla has resisted quite well the various trends towards turkification of vocabulary which have characterised the history of the written language in the 20th century. At the present time, this term is still in current use in the sense of an article in a journal or review (its primary sense of "thing said" having been forgotten), even though the word yazî "writing") which some would seek to substitute for it is gradually gaining ground, in spite of its inaccuracy.

Specialists in Turkish literature readily present makâla as a specific literary genre, distinct from the essay (deneme) or the anecdotal account (fikra). It is thus, for example, that Cevdet Kudret defines it as a "writing composed with the object of exposing, defending or supporting a point of view on a certain subject" and states specifically that this type of work should not be confused with the essay (C. Kudret, Örnekleri edebiât bilgileri, Istanbul 1980, ii, 372). In practice, however, it seems very difficult to assign precise limits to the makâla genre, this term being applied in fact, in customary usage, to every kind of article, ranging from the editorial of a daily newspaper to the learned study published in a specialist review, and including the article of literary criticism (generally classed in the category of "essays"), the "paper" of the historian or the political pamphlet. While not constituting a major genre, the makâla is clearly a means of expression particularly valued by Turkish writers. The majority have written them while some, among the most eminent, have published nothing other than journalistic articles, promoting this type of production to the status of genuine artistic creation.

If the makâla has thus become the literary genre probably most widely practised in Turkey, this fact is to be explained in terms of the spectacular rise enjoyed by the periodical press in this country, beginning in the second half of the 19th century (see çarîa. iii).

The first Turkish language journals—the Taçkâm-i wakî', founded in 1832, and the ûçeride-yi hawâdih launched by the Englishman William Churchill in 1840—accorded only limited space for "articles", and essentially offered their readers short stories and official bulletins. However, with the appearance in 1860 of Taçkâm-i abadî, published by Ağîh Efendi in collaboration with Şâhîrât [q.v.], one of the most talented literary figures of the period, matters were to change in a radical manner. In fact, under the influence of Şihînâ and of all those writers who were soon to become active in the same field, the nascent Turkish press rapidly acquired the objective not only of informing the public but also of working for the reform of society, and the journalistic article, in particular the editorial (soon to be designated by the term bahâ makâla), henceforward became a licensed instrument of education.

In the Turkish periodicals of the 1860s and 1870s, the majority of the leading contemporary literary figures are encountered. Besides Şihînâ, who launched in 1861 his own journal, the Taçkâm-i efkâr, writers of renown including Ziyâ (Dîyâ') Paşa, Ali Şü'âwî, Nâmîk Kemâl, Şâms al-Dîn Sâmî and Ebat-i Zîyâ (Abû 'l-Dîyâ') Tewfîk, contributed to making the makâla one of the most flourishing genres. It was to a great extent through their articles, published in increasingly numerous intellectual journals, that ideas of reform began to spread at an accelerated pace. Neither political institutions, nor social structures, nor traditional culture escaped the criticism of these intellectuals of liberal tendency, most of whom belonged to the "Society of Young Ottomans" (Yêni Otömânîlîlar Djemîyyeti), which sought to transform Turkey into a modern country based on the model of the West, a state endowed with a constitutional regime, devoted towards new manners of thought, life and action.

During this period of genesis, the newspaper article did not constitute only a means for the propagation of ideas received from elsewhere. It also played the role of a spear-head in the elaboration of a new literary language, closer to spoken Turkish. Şihînâ and Dîyâ' Paşa were among the first advocates of this simplification of the written language. They were soon followed by Nâmîk Kemâl—who was not always capable of putting into practice his own precepts on the matter—Şâhîrât al-Dîn Sâmî and numerous others.

While the makâla genre thus flourished in the context of the intellectual press, there also came into being in Turkey in the same period of time, a specialised press—the periodical press—scientific reviews, women's magazines, professional organs, literary journals, etc.—in which there were to be found, alongside numerous translations, scholarly studies, articles of literary criticism and historical pieces comparable, in their professionalism, to writings of the same type promulgated by the Western press. Among these periodicals, one of the most notable was the Muğma'a-yi funun, founded in 1861 by Munif Paşa. This monthly, which was presented as the organ of the "Ottoman Society of Sciences" (Djemîyyeti-i ilmîye-yi Otömânîye [q.v.]) and which included articles dealing with such diverse disciplines as geography, history, geology, philosophy or natural sciences, was distinguished, during the few years of its existence, by the quality of its presentation and it played in Turkey of the mid-19th century a role similar to that of the Grande Encylopédie in France of the Enlightenment.

Conscious of the danger which could be posed by these periodicals, which were continually growing in number, the Ottoman government had, since 1864, enacted various measures aimed at limiting the freedom of the press. With the accession to power of Abd al-Hamîd II in 1876, the weight of bureaucratic interference was to become even more oppressive. But censorship, while preventing for several decades the publication of articles judged subversive, did not halt the development of Turkish journalistic production.
Indeed, on the contrary, as has been noted by Niyazi Berkes (The development of secularism in Turkey, Montreal 1964, 277), the prohibition, beginning at the end of the 1870s, of subjects of political nature, was largely balanced by the proliferation of writings on scientific or cultural themes, which led to the accelerated diffusion of new ideas and knowledge.

Ahmed Midhat Efendi is definitely the most representative publicist of the Hamidian period. Becoming a fervent supporter of Abd al-Hamid II, after having flirted for some time with the adversaries of absolutism, he was very careful to write nothing which could have been interpreted as a criticism of this régime. This did not prevent him publishing an innumerable number of articles on the most diverse subjects, using the press, and in particular his own journal, the Terijumdn-i hakikat, founded in 1878, as a veritable instrument of popular instruction.

The same encyclopaedic, somewhat disorderly curiosity is encountered in the case of Abu 'l-Dira Tewfik who, for almost thirty years, was practically the sole contributor to the Mejmula-z-i bakhsh, founded in 1878, as the best cultural periodicals of the reign of Abd al-Hamid.

Among other great names of the Turkish press in this period, it is appropriate to mention also Ahmed Ihsan Bey, founder of the Therueet-i finan, a scientific and literary magazine which brought together, until ca. 1900, the best writers of the time, notably the poet Tewfik Fikret and the essayist Djanab Shihab al-Din, thus opening the way to the development of a whole literary school, subject to diverse influences but especially interested in symbolism and realism as then practised in France.

This having been said, although makdals on scientific or cultural themes represented, in these last years of the 19th century, the essence of Turkish journalistic production, political literature was also being developed. In fact, while within Turkey the periodical press employed its best efforts to avoid the attention of the Hamidian censorship, abroad there was a proliferation of opposition journals, entirely devoted to anti-government diatribe. The Young Turk leader Ahmed Rida Bey, who in 1895 had founded Medjum'a-yi Abu 'l-Diyd, the sole contributor to the Committee for Union and Progress. According to the survey made by Ahmed Emin, makdals of all kinds (editorials, points of view) covered between 30 and 52% of the space of the six journals in circulation when the survey was conducted in 1913. The editorial alone occupied 11.74% of the space in Sabh, an independent pro-government journal, 11.20% in Tanzimatl, an organ of the left, 1017% in Yeri Gazette, favourable to the opposition and between 6 and 10% in Tanin, official organ of the government, Alemddr (opposition) and Ikddm (moderate). These by no means negligible percentages testify in fact to the fidelity of the Turkish publicists to the tradition of the preceding decades where the bahk makdala, the "leading article", constituted the essential and indispensable element of the newspaper, sometimes occupying as much as a quarter of the space available.

When this prolific production of articles is considered in total, the constant recurrence of certain themes cannot be other than striking. Among the questions of greatest interest to Turkish intellectuals in these years, the most prominent was the long-standing debate over the simplification and modernisation of the written language. The publication, in the review Gene Kalemier of Salonica, of a series of articles by Omer Seyf al-Din and Ali Djanab proposing the adoption of the spoken Turkish of Istanbul as the official language. The publication, in the review Gene Kalemier of Salonica, of a series of articles by Omer Seyf al-Din and Ali Djanab proposing the adoption of the spoken Turkish of Istanbul as the official language. The publication, in the review Gene Kalemier of Salonica, of a series of articles by Omer Seyf al-Din and Ali Djanab proposing the adoption of the spoken Turkish of Istanbul as the official language. The publication, in the review Gene Kalemier of Salonica, of a series of articles by Omer Seyf al-Din and Ali Djanab proposing the adoption of the spoken Turkish of Istanbul as the official language. The publication, in the review Gene Kalemier of Salonica, of a series of articles by Omer Seyf al-Din and Ali Djanab proposing the adoption of the spoken Turkish of Istanbul as the official language. The publication, in the review Gene Kalemier of Salonica, of a series of articles by Omer Seyf al-Din and Ali Djanab proposing the adoption of the spoken Turkish of Istanbul as the official language. The publication, in the review Gene Kalemier of Salonica, of a series of articles by Omer Seyf al-Din and Ali Djanab proposing the adoption of the spoken Turkish of Istanbul as the official language. The publication, in the review Gene Kalemier of Salonica, of a series of articles by Omer Seyf al-Din and Ali Djanab proposing the adoption of the spoken Turkish of Istanbul as the official language. The publication, in the review Gene Kalemier of Salonica, of a series of articles by Omer Seyf al-Din and Ali Djanab proposing the adoption of the spoken Turkish of Istanbul as the official language. The publication, in the review Gene Kalemier of Salonica, of a series of articles by Omer Seyf al-Din and Ali Djanab proposing the adoption of the spoken Turkish of Istanbul as the official language. The publication, in the review Gene Kalemier of Salonica, of a series of articles by Omer Seyf al-Din and Ali Djanab proposing the adoption of the spoken Turkish of Istanbul as the official language. The publication, in the review Gene Kalemier of Salonica, of a series of articles by Omer Seyf al-Din and Ali Djanab proposing the adoption of the spoken Turkish of Istanbul as the official language. The publication, in the review Gene Kalemier of Salonica, of a series of articles by Omer Seyf al-Din and Ali Djanab proposing the adoption of the spoken Turkish of Istanbul as the official language. The publication, in the review Gene Kalemier of Salonica, of a series of articles by Omer Seyf al-Din and Ali Djanab proposing the adoption of the spoken Turkish of Istanbul as the official language. The publication, in the review Gene Kalemier of Salonica, of a series of articles by Omer Seyf al-Din and Ali Djanab proposing the adoption of the spoken Turkish of Istanbul as the official language. The publication, in the review Gene Kalemier of Salonica, of a series of articles by Omer Seyf al-Din and Ali Djanab proposing the adoption of the spoken Turkish of Istanbul as the official language. The publication, in the review Gene Kalemier of Salonica, of a series of articles by Omer Seyf al-Din and Ali Djanab proposing the adoption of the spoken Turkish of Istanbul as the official language. The publication, in the review Gene Kalemier of Salonica, of a series of articles by Omer Seyf al-Din and Ali Djanab proposing the adoption of the spoken Turkish of Istanbul as the official language. The publication, in the review Gene Kalemier of Salonica, of a series of articles by Omer Seyf al-Din and Ali Djanab proposing the adoption of the spoken Turkish of Istanbul as the official language. The publication, in the review Gene Kalemier of Salonica, of a series of articles by Omer Seyf al-Din and Ali Djanab proposing the adoption of the spoken Turkish of Istanbul as the official language. The publication, in the review Gene Kalemier of Salonica, of a series of articles by Omer Seyf al-Din and Ali Djanab proposing the adoption of the spoken Turkish of Istanbul as the official language. The publication, in the review Gene Kalemier of Salonica, of a series of articles by Omer Seyf al-Din and Ali Djanab proposing the adoption of the spoken Turkish of Istanbul as the official language. The publication, in the review Gene Kalemier of Salonica, of a series of articles by Omer Seyf al-Din and Ali Djanab proposing the adoption of the spoken Turkish of Istanbul as the official language. The publication, in the review Gene Kalemier of Salonica, of a series of articles by Omer Seyf al-Din and Ali Djanab proposing the adoption of the spoken Turkish of Istanbul as the official language. The publication, in the review Gene Kalemier of Salonica, of a series of articles by Omer Seyf al-Din and Ali Djanab proposing the adoption of the spoken Turkish of Istanbul as the official language. The publication, in the review Gene Kalemier of Salonica, of a series of articles by Omer Seyf al-Din and Ali Djanab proposing the adoption of the spoken Turkish of Istanbul as the official language.
"enlightened amateurs" such as Diva' Gökalp and Mustafa Şubeli, or to genuine specialists such as Alexander Israel Helphand, alias Parvus (one of the leading figures of German Social Democracy who lived in Turkey from 1910 to 1915), and Ahmet Ağaç, supported by Ottoman intellectuals including the novelist Khâlid Edib, the poet Djêlal Sâhir, the historian Körprülüâze Mehmed Fu'âd and the literary critic 'Ali Dânîb, skilfully exalted the prestigious past of the "Turkish race" and pleaded unceasingly for a reunification, if only cultural, of the peoples derived from the primal Central Asian stem. Among the periodicals contributing to this exploration of the literary and historical foundations of Turkish nationalism, also worthy of mention are the monthly Bilgi and the weekly Hâlaka Dûgûnu, both published by Djêlal Sâhir, and, in particular, the Ta'rikh-i Othamdni Endjumemin Medjmu'âsi, organ of the Ottoman Historical Society which, through the medium of the works of scholars such as Ahmed Refik and 'Abd al-Rahmân Şheref, the last official chronicle of the Imperial Court, was to give decisive encouragement to the development of a "national" Turkish historiography.

To the range of themes which caused the greatest amount of ink to flow in the Young Turk decade, it is appropriate to add, finally, the religious question. In this domain, the controversies were particularly impassioned. While Muslim periodicals such as Volkan, Beyân al-haqq or Sâbit ul-ulüjâtâd pressed for various forms of Islamic revival, advocating the teaching of the Kur'ân as the effective response to the evils of the age, certain nationalists and the "westernists" who had as their principal mouth-piece the review İljîshâd of the doctor 'Abd Allah Dûtêdat, published numerous articles which, if not overtly anti-religious, were at least insufficiently "rationalisation" of Islam and went so far as to demand a strict secularisation of Ottoman institutions which would free civil society from all religious domination.

The entry of the Ottoman Empire into war in 1914 did not bring about a fundamental change in the subject-matter of the makâlas published by Turkish men of letters. In fact, a large proportion of the work produced in the preceding years had already constituted a literature of propaganda, intended principally to equip public opinion with ideological weapons in readiness for the approaching conflict, signalled in advance by a succession of regular crises. However, with the outbreak of hostilities there was witnessed a sharp radicalisation of the points of view expressed in the periodical press. Learned controversies were replaced by slogans, the exaltation of the national identity was transformed into belligerence and the eulogy of "Turkish" cultural values became systematic the ideas propounded by the theorists of the Young Turk régime, leaving the opposition to theories of "national economy". It was also during the war years that Têkin Alp and some others put the finishing touches to theories of "national economy". It was also during the war years that Diva' Gökalp, who had become the foremost ideologue of the régime, promoted in the most excessive terms the cause of "Turkish". Naturally, the circumstances were hardly favourable to freedom of expression. Literary men were obliged to take into account not only the imperatives of the war but also the increasingly marked authoritarianism of the Committee for Union and Progress, whose capital could be blazoned forth in Anatolia, where Mustafa Kemal was leading the struggle for Turkish independence, and conversely, writings which would not be tolerated by the Anatolian government could be published without difficulty in the regions controlled by the Entente.

In Istanbul, a large number of journalists and writers took advantage of this situation to oppose systematically the ideas propagated by the nationalists, and to campaign with equally fervent propaganda against those who still supported the Committee of Union and Progress in opposition to Mustafa Kemal and his partisans. The most virulent among them was 'Ali Kemal Bey, editor-in-chief of Pesdîn-i Sâbitâ, whose editorials bore witness to a particularly incisive polemical talent. For their part, literary men who supported the nationalist movement undertook as their primary task to put a stop to defeatism, using their writings to stimulate Turkish patriotism. But some also pondered over the future of Turkey and indulged in speculation as to the form which would be taken by the future Turkish state. No reader of the journalism dating from the beginning of the War of Independence can fail to notice, in particular, to what an extent the nationalists were fascinated by the Soviet experience. In Yâhiî Gân, editorials favourite to the Soviets—most of them ow-ing to Yûnus Nâdî, the proprietor of the newspaper, or to Mahmûd Es'âd—could be counted by the score. Articles of similar type, though fewer in number, were also published by Hâkimiyet-i miliyye, the official organ of the Kemalist government. It is, however, ap- parent that this imitation of Russian natio-nary Russia was short-lived. At a very early stage, the ideologues of the national movement—prominent among whom was Mustafa Kemal himself, who did not hesitate to take to the pen to express his point of view—were putting forward concepts very similar to those championed some years previously by the theorists of the Young Turk régime, leaving the defence of the Soviets to genuine Communists such as Şefik Hüsnû and Şadi al-Dîn Dîlêl, the two leading contributors to the review Aydîhlâh. Undoubtedly the most remarkable phenomenon in these years was the emergence of a genre closely related to that of the makâla, the fikra, a kind of short news item generally of entertaining nature, combin-ing anecdote with comment on some matter of contemporary importance. The first major practitioner of this literary genre, Ahmed Râsim, has begun to publish his articles towards the end of the 19th cen-tury. Subsequently, numerous other writers, in par-ticular the poet Ahmed Hâkim and the journalist Huseyîn Dânîb Yafkân, made names for themselves as eminent authors of fikras. But it was especially after the First World War, with the appearance of new specialists such as Refik Khâlid Karay and Fâtih Rîfî Atay, that this type of news-item came to occupy a position of major importance in newspapers and reviews, possibly because the anecdotal tone which
was its distinguishing feature enabled it to discuss political questions in a manner unlikely to alarm the censors, possibly also because the public expressed an ever-increasing interest in this form of expression.

Extremely sensitive to the fluctuations of political circumstance, the Turkish periodical press was obliged once again to change its complexion in the mid-1920s, with the establishment in Turkey, shortly after the proclamation of the Republic, of a single-party régime. In fact, although this did not lead to the total disappearance of opposition newspapers and reviews, the monopoly exercised by Mustafa Kemal’s creation, the Republican People’s Party, over the conduct of public affairs was accompanied by a spectacular inflation—especially noticeable after 1930—in the press entrusted with the defence of the official line. This development of a republican press was made possible only by means of a vast mobilisation of intellectuals. Journalists, writers, historians, economists, sociologists, all were called upon to make their contribution to the building of the new Turkey. Those who responded to this appeal—and there were many of them—did so by producing for the Kemalist periodicals makalas remarkable, whatever the subject tackled, for the eagerness of their commitment.

It is probably in the monthly Kadro, published between 1932 and 1934, that there appeared the most remarkable articles of the period. Motivated by a relatively limited team of writers including in particular Yakup Kadri Karaosmanoğlu, Vedat Nedim Tür, Şevket Süreyya Aydemir, Ismail Huseyv and Burhan Asaf, this review was especially concerned with economic and social questions, and it contributed in a significant manner to the refinement of Kemalist theses in these domains. Writers involved with this magazine were responsible for the most convincing arguments in favour of the state control policy adopted by the régime in economic matters, from the beginning of the 1930s.

The articles published in Kadro, often relatively long and technical, were addressed to an educated public of bureaucrats and intellectuals. Makalas of a more accessible type were to be found for example in the numerous organs of the “People’s House” [see KHALKEVI], kinds of public forums established by the Republican People’s Party to propagate Kemalist values throughout the country. The reviews, of which the best was İlkü, the monthly magazine of the People’s House of Ankara, provided an impressive collection of works, generally modest in scale but sometimes of very high quality, concerning the folklore, the history, the arts and the social life of Turkey all of which had the aim, often in explicit manner, to stimulate the national pride of the population and to lay the foundations of a new culture compatible with republican ideas.

With the spread of universities, high schools and research institutions, Kemalist Turkey was also soon to be endowed with various specialised reviews, among which it is appropriate to mention in particular Türkçe Mecmuaıı, organ of the Institute of Turcology of the University of Istanbul, and Belleten, review of the Foundation for Turkish History. The scientific makalas published in these periodicals were generally of a quality comparable to that of articles of similar type produced in countries with a long university tradition. However, some writers willingly took account of the directives and principles of the régime, eager to construct from all their work hypotheses and theories capable of supporting them.

This said, even though writings inspired by official doctrines constituted until the end of the Second World War the major portion of the material appearing in the Turkish periodical press, dissidents were not deprived of the opportunity for self-expression, provided that they did not overstep certain limits. It was thus for example that one of the most talented journalists of the period, Peyami Safa, was responsible for a large number of subtly reactionary makalas and fikras of which some were even published in government journals such as Yunus Nadi’s Çinkırıyat and Ulus, the official organ of the Republican Party. Similarly, persons suspected of Communist sympathies such as Zafer İnci, Sertel, Sahahattin Ali, Aziz Nesin, Sadrettin Celal and numerous others, were able for many years to write in periodicals known for their progressive ideas—in particular the daily Tan and the monthly Yurt ve Dünya—without being unduly molested. It was only in 1945, in the wake of violent polemical struggle with Pan-Turkist organs, that they were obliged to put an end to their activities, some of them even being forced into exile.

After the Second World War, with the establishment of a pluralist régime and the emergence of new political parties, the various constituents of Turkish opinion were able to make their points of view known with greater ease than in the past, on condition however of exercising a degree of self-censorship. Only extremist factions, in particular all those considered to be Communist in character, as well as ultra-nationalist groups, found themselves deprived for rather more than a decade of freedom of expression. This was however gradually restored to them in the wake of the coup d’état of 1960 which inaugurated in Turkey a period characterised by a growing liberalisation of political life and ideological debate.

This was a climate eminently favourable to the development of the press, as the statistics demonstrate. In 1951, there was a total of 551 periodicals in Turkey; by the end of the 1970s, the number had risen to more than 1,400. In such circumstances, the makala genre could not but prosper.

The political makala in particular flourished remarkably, especially in the period beginning in the mid-1960s. Among the outstanding specialists in this genre, mention should be made of the left of Rıza Avcioglu, who in 1961 launched the weekly Yın, the first of a whole series of increasingly subversive periodicals which were to come into existence in succeeding years, as well as journalists of great talent including Çetin Altan, Abdi İpekçi and İhhamı Soysal. As for the conservative camp, besides Peyami Safa, who continued to produce extremely corrosive makalas until his death in 1961, worthy of mention, among many other polemists of great virulence, are the poet Necip Fazıl Kısakürek, founder of the Islamic and nationalist review Büyük Değilı, Ahmet Kabakli, author of a large number of news-items of fundamentalist tone published in various journals, and Nazli İlicak, editor-in-chief of the daily Terותan.

During the same period, literary criticism and the related genre of the essay (deneme) also developed in a remarkable manner. Nurullah Ataç, who died in 1957, had dominated the preceding decades with his refined sensibility and literary talent, leaving to posterity thousands of articles dispersed among scores of periodicals. Slightly younger than him, Suat Kemal Yetkin, Sahahattin Eyüboğlu, Azra Erhat and Tahir Alangau had also contributed to the enrichment of modern Turkish letters in these two domains. In their wake, with the proliferation of literary reviews from 1950 onwards, there appeared a host of new talents, of whom there is space here to mention only a few such as Asım Bezirici and Fethi Naci, very productive
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literary critics; Mahmut Makal, the pioneer in Turkey of the essay on rural themes; Salah Ebrashi, who was responsible in particular for numerous theoretical writings on poetry; and most of all Atilla Ilhan, author of news-items of a very personal tone on problems of contemporary Turkish society.

Finally, it is appropriate to note the remarkable proliferation of works of academic type published in reviews intended for a limited audience. Until recently, only establishments of higher education had at their disposal organs capable of accommodating such production. Several reviews of wider circulations, designed with the aim of laying the results of scientific research before an educated public, have begun to appear since the mid-1970s, at the initiative of private individuals or associations. The most characteristic example which may be cited in this context is the quarterly Toplum ve Bilim, founded by Sencer Divit-çioğlu which, since its inception, has given a new impetus to works in the domain of economic and social history.

If the makala appears as a whole to be an ever-expanding genre, it should nevertheless be noted that, in the daily press, the tradition of the bash makala has tended, for its part, to disappear. An essential element of the newspaper in the 19th century and during the Young Turk period, from the end of the 1930s the tendency to adopt the formulae operated by the mass-circulation dailies: development of photographic reportage, expansion of space reserved for sport, for humorous cartoons, for entertainments, multiplication of short stories at the expense of serious articles. Such a fairly broad meaning of the word, compos-

If the bash makala is perhaps a result of the proliferation, in newspapers, of particular rubrics—fikra, news of foreign politics, economic news, etc.—enabling different members of the staff to express their point of view on matters of the moment. It is explained, above all, by the radical transformation experienced by the Turkish daily press after 1960. The appearance of non-political newspapers of mass-circulation—in 1982 Güneydin had a readership of more than 800,000 and Harriet approximately 600,000—and the competition provided by television have had a drastic effect on the ideological press which, to survive, has found itself in many cases obliged to adopt the formulae operated by the mass-circulation dailies: development of photographic reportage, expansion of space reserved for sport, for humorous cartoons, for entertainments, multiplication of short stories at the expense of serious articles. The most successful example of this adaptation to the new circumstances of journalism is provided by the conservative daily Terciman which in 1982 drew a readership of almost 400,000. However, as has been seen, these structural changes have not prevented the makala on political themes from prospering. The traditional bash makala has been replaced not only by the news-items and diverse ‘points of view’ published on the inside pages of daily newspapers, but also by the widespread production of weekly or bi-monthly periodicals of all shades of opinion, whose proliferation, in newspapers, of particular rubrics—fikra, news of foreign politics, economic news, etc.—enabling different members of the staff to express their point of view on matters of the moment. It is explained, above all, by the radical transformation experienced by the Turkish daily press after 1960. The appearance of non-political newspapers of mass-circulation—in 1982 Güneydin had a readership of more than 800,000 and Harriet approximately 600,000—and the competition provided by television have had a drastic effect on the ideological press which, to survive, has found itself in many cases obliged to adopt the formulae operated by the mass-circulation dailies: development of photographic reportage, expansion of space reserved for sport, for humorous cartoons, for entertainments, multiplication of short stories at the expense of serious articles. The most successful example of this adaptation to the new circumstances of journalism is provided by the conservative daily Terciman which in 1982 drew a readership of almost 400,000. However, as has been seen, these structural changes have not prevented the makala on political themes from prospering. The traditional bash makala has been replaced not only by the news-items and diverse ‘points of view’ published on the inside pages of daily newspapers, but also by the widespread production of weekly or bi-monthly periodicals of all shades of opinion, whose proliferation has only been temporarily halted by the measures taken to restrict the freedom of the press in the aftermath of the military intervention of 1980.

one another at present the partisans of the makām-system and the partisans of the makām-form. The ambiguity arises from the fact that a makām-system being made musically concrete entails the illustration of an instrumental elaboration entrusted to an instrumentalist (this is the taksim), to the human voice without written music (this is the layāli), or in the form of a memorised or written elaboration entrusted to an instrumental group (taqāk or daqāq) or to an orchestra with soloists, singers and choral voices. In the latter case, the listener retains the written music or poetry and the form more than the system. In some countries, e.g. those of the Maghrib or Central Asia, as in Iran, Adharbaydjan or ‘Irāk, the makām is understood precisely through the agency of its forms or models transmitted on the instrument from master to pupil or entrusted to solo artists acquainted with the traditional répertoire (nauha in the Maghrib, makom in Central Asia, raddj in Iran, magom in Adharbaydjan or makām in ‘Irāk, for example).

Whatever may be the ascendency of human voices and the impact of words and poems on the Islamic populations, even if it remains at the central core of Islamic culture, the Arabo-Irano-Turkish makām appears in the history of musical language to be a relation which has evolved from the ancient musical mode, rethought, conceived and standardised on the fingerboard of the ‘ud through an association of genres (audnā). The understanding of the makām is thus inseparable, on the level of the analysis of modal structures, from a study of the language of the ‘ud, an instrument which has defined the scale of sounds and tested the types constituting the modes. The modal languages of Islam were developed under the finger (iṣba’, pl. asāb), on the finger-board (dastān) and along the scale-range of the ‘ud. This process of elaboration allowed each makām, from the time of its creation, to go beyond its own technical and intellectual conception and each system to be transmuted into a process and a form which would put into a concrete shape the “idea-material”, the “makām-‘ud” relationship. Hence the risk constituted by the representation of a makām or its modal structures on a musical stave in the 20th century.

For the study and evolution of the theoretical scale of sounds.—The first technical and modal problem of music within Islam seems to have been the combination of the autochthonous or empirical systems inherited from the Arabo-Irano-Turkish ‘ud, the theoretical scale of sounds.—The first characteristic apotome (2187/2048; 114 cents), a major tone (40/28 = 10/7; 617 cents), a short fifth (40/27) and a perfect fourth (4/3; 498 cents), an implicit tritone (40/28 = 10/7; 617 cents), a short fifth (40/27) and a super-“wolf’s-fifth” (40/26). But al-Farābī restricts his description to the fourth, and no evidence is available concerning the details of the diffusion of this system in proto-Islamic or early Islamic music.

In Baghdaḍ, in the 2nd-3rd/8th-9th centuries, the eminent and skilled classical soloists of the ‘ud, like Ishāk al-Mawṣili, seemed more inclined to employ the Pythagorean Hellenistic system. The latter was characterised by a limma (256/243; 90 cents), an implicit apotome (2187/2048; 114 cents), a major tone (9/8; 204 cents), a minor third (3/2; 294 cents), a perfect fourth (4/3; 498 cents), an implicit tritone subsequently described by al-Farābī with reference to the harp (729/512; 612 cents) and a perfect fifth (3/2; 702 cents).

The two systems were thus only compatible on the level of the limma and of the fourth. At the same time, Mansūr Zalzal, a virtuoso lutist, apparently reconciled the popular and learned traditions by giving official status to a para-Pythagorean system based on empirical and equidistant longitudinal divisions of the string of the ‘ud, following the Pythagorean fingering-degrees.

Zalzal thus recommended the use of the following complementary degrees: a “Persian” neutral second (162/149; 145 cents; 6,4 holders), a “Zalzalian” neutral second (54/49; 168 cents; 7,4 holders), a “Persian” minor third (81/68; 303 cents; 13,4 holders) and a “Zalzalian” neutral third (27/22; 355 cents).
cent; 15.7 holders.) Thus there came about, in regard to the fingerboard of the 'ud, the confrontation between the Hellenistic or universal acoustic systems and the specific or empirical Arabo-Iranian-Turkish musical systems.

The treatises of al-Kindi, al-Munadjidjun (3rd/9th century), al-Farabi, al-Isfahani, the Ikhwan al-Safa (4th/10th century), Ibn Sinā (5th/11th century) and many other scholars thus had as their object or desired aim to position on the finger-board of the 'ud a theoretical scale capable of standardising the intervals of these different systems.

The ideal solution seems to have been found in the 7th/13th century by the Systematists with Saft al-Din al-Urmawi and Kutb al-Din al-Shirazi, thanks to a commatic scale supporting the Pythagorean system and assimilating, by justifying them by longitudinal measures and mathematical calculations, the intervals of the Dākhiliyya and the neutral intervals. It all led in practice to the (theoretical) comma, the limma (4 commas), the apotome (5 commas), the major tone (8 commas), the major comma (9 commas) divided into two limmas and a comma, and their combinations, amongst these being a minor third (13 commas), a neutral third which became "natural" (17 commas), a major third (18 commas) and a perfect fourth (22 commas).

So, in general, Iran, Central Asia and the outer regions moved away from reference to the 'ud and returned to empirical systems. The Arab world was to experience the recession before adopting from the 18th century, and more precisely with Mikha'il Mughāka (19th century), under the influence of Europe, a theoretical scale dividing the octave into twenty-four-quarter-tones (rab). Only the Ottomans and the heirs of 'Abbāsîd elitism were able to perpetuate the commatic system of the Systematists.

In the 20th century, a comparative Arabo-Iranian-Turkish study entails the reconstitution of a theoretical scale of sounds confronting the three systems of contemporary Arab, Iranian and Turkish temperaments. In spite of divergences, the octave can be divided into twenty-four intervals defining twenty-five fingering-degrees or scale-fingeringst (daraaja, bekt, yeqdh, kardr-dugdh, yehdrd, makamid, hajdhrkdh). This theoretical scale can be deduced from the maxaqa (16 commas or 7 quarters, Cairo, Damascus) the intervals are measured in terms of the pitch (takaba) then of the height of reference chosen. Also the guide mark and key tone of the scale, segah and rast, can be aligned on a frequency, a pitch and then an equivalent Latin note which varies according to the countries, schools or, obviously, languages to be accompanied. The rast, key tone, can be a 4qc, a do (Mediterranean), a 2 (Turkey), a fa or a sol (Irāk, Iran) or even a la, and the whole scale is led by it like a mobile keyboard or a set of nāūs (oblique flutes) of various pitches.

This theoretical scale can be deduced from the historical and specific scale conceived it and is reducible to the modern 'ud which is its ideal standard. For this reason, it is influenced by "units" of fourths, and presents in the 20th century preferential degrees corresponding to the open strings of the 'ud with classical tuning, supposing that, from low to high, is a bass string: karâ-râst or karâ-dâgh, 1st string segah, 2nd string såhârân, 3rd. string dâghâ, 4th string nawaî, 5th string gârân. So it is not equalised like a piano scale.

This theoretical scale is only a range without an immediate melodic outcome. The twenty-five sounds disposable on the octave are not played in conjunction or simultaneously. A given modal structure uses normally only four degrees to the fourth or eight degrees to the octave in the rules of heptatonic diastation.

Value of the intervals and formation of the genres. Historically in the treatises and logically in analysis, the approach to the makamak entails, the unit of measure and theoretical scale of sounds being known, a study of the intervals and fingering-degrees which, in dividing the fourth or the fifth, seek to define the tri-, tetra- or pentachordal genres constituting the makâmât. The genre (dāmîn, balâr, 'ikdî, in Arabic, dörtî-bişî in Turkish) is thus the elementary unit of the genres. The Systematist structures in contemporary Arab, and Turkish treatises. In Iranian treatises it is not explicitly identified, but a modal analysis should reveal its presence.

The selection of a given genre brings a choice of fingering-degrees on the theoretical scale of sounds and also ordains a specific series of juxtaposed intervals. The value of these intervals is determined by the systems or temperaments adopted.

In the Arab countries and Iran, the intervals are measured in quarter-tones at the rate of twenty-four-quarters per octave. The chromatic quarter-tone is exceptional. The current melodic intervals are the semi-tone (2 qs.), the three-quarter-tone (3 qs.), the major tone (4 qs.), the maxim tone (3 qs.), the trihemitone (an augmented second of 6 qs.). The thirds are minor (6 qs.), neutral (7 qs.) or major (8 qs.). The fourths are perfect (10 qs.), the shortened fourth (6 qs.) of the sabâ genre should be noted as well as the augmented fourth (tritone of 12 qs.) of the nikriz, navathar and kurdi-atghar genres. The perfect fifths are 14 qs. The intervals are more flexible in Iran.

In Turkey and the academic schools (Aleppo, Mousal, Baghdad) the intervals are measured in Holderian commas at the rate of fifty-three commas per octave. The current intervals are the limma (4 commas), the apotome (5 cs.), the major tone (8 cs.), the major comma (9 cs.), the "trilimma" or trihemitone (augmented seconds of 12 or 13 cs.). The thirds are minor (12 cs.), minors (13-14 cs.), rarely neutrals (15-16 cs.), Zalzalian naturals (17 cs) or Pythagorian majors (18 cs.). The fourths are perfect (22 cs.), shortened (18) or augmented (26 cs.), in the genres mentioned above. The perfect fifths are of 31 commas.

The Arab, Iranian and Turkish treatises give the specific intervals historical names, of which the variants will not be mentioned here. The fingering-degrees or scale-fingeringst are not always designated by their Eastern names, and, under the influence of European notation, Latin names of the notes are frequently used by giving them adapted inflections. The rast, key tone, can be a sî, a do (Mediterranean), a nî (Turkey), a fa or a sol (Irâk, Iran) or even a la, and the whole scale is
bémol or koron. Raised a quarter-tone (made semi-sharp), it becomes nuss-déeze, kar-déeze or sori. The Turkish codes of inflection are clearly more rigid due to the nature of the system. There are regular new initiatives, amongst which is a code of the Colloque de Beyrouth (1972). One of the most recent (code arabisque, 1978) normalises the signs and transcribes all the commatic inflections.

Just as the theoretical scale of sounds is only a range, the quarter-tone and the comma are only units of measure and not melodic or chromatic intervals. Heptatonic diatonism theoretically escapes the problem of fingering-degrees or scaling-fingerings beyond eight to the octave, when there is a given modulation. Further, the conception of the genres on the finger-board of the ‘ud can only use the open string and four fingers, which reinforces the link between the fifth and the playing of a pentachord and does not stir the musician to imagine micro-intervals smaller than the limma which do not exist in the traditional genres. Here, moreover, the makâm owes more to the ‘uday than to the laboratory.

Nevertheless, some ‘micro-intervals’ are smaller than the semi-tone or the limma. In diatonism, they may be detected below the fingering-degree segâh of the rare genres awoy-arâd and sâz-kâr described by Erlanger (quarter-tone between rî dîèze and sì mi-sémèmol). There is also a leading note at the same level in the segâh genre, which is superimposed on diatonism. However, it would appear to be a matter of Turkish limmas, which, transposed in the Arabic quarter-tone system, are devalued. In chromatism, there are micro-intervals in the execution of the rare mukhâlif genre of 4râkî; but it is, in this case, an alternated overlapping of the sabâ and segâh genres on the same part of the scale. In this case, it is even possible to analyse a makâm Muhâlîf formed from the overlapping of the three Sabâ, Segâh and Huzam makâmâd mobilising twelve degrees per octave (cf. Arabesques record 5, Luthe en Irak traditionnel, ‘Ud Jamîl Bakîrî).

As the selection of a genre brings a choice of fingering-degrees and ordains a specific series of juxtaposed intervals, the genre is an elementary and invariable modal structure which should be identified on analysis in terms of the value of its intervals and in descending order of the system. Moreover, it is probably aided by characteristic melodic formulae of the genre and by an intuitive perception. However, apart from the variations of temperament from one country to another, the universal laws of music ‘temper’ the rigidity of the specific intervals.

Some fingering-degrees of the genre, in particular the two poles or extremities often inserted in an open string of the ‘ud, are rigorously fixed, except, for instance, in the Iranian 5-Trâkian Dâshî-Dâshî mode. Others, the intermediaries, can be mobile. This mobility is frequently linked to phenomena of ascending or descending gradient or enharmonic change, quite natural on instruments with a non-fretted finger-board such as the ‘ud or the violin, and more artificial on instruments such as the kânûn. It also responds to phenomena of attraction or repulsion validated in other kinds of music.

Also, such a fingering-degree or scaling-finger will be raised more in ascending than in descending. In spite of the fairly rigid connotation of the system applied in Turkey, the third fingering-degree segâh of the râst genre occurs at 17 commas of the finale in ascending and 16 in descending, also inflecting a Zarlînian third and a Zalzalian third. By contrast, if this segâh fingering-degree becomes the finale of the segâh genre it becomes a modal pole and it is fixed more especially as it is doubled with a leading note given the space of several commas.

It may be remarked that the mobile degrees are frequently linked, as historical treatises or musical practice confirm, with the index or median finger on the finger-board of the historical or modern 7’ud. In the modes of Iran, these mobile fingering-degrees, which the analysts do not associate with the role of the 7’ud, are called mutaghâbîyaj.

The establishment of a nomenclature of Arabo-Iranian-Turkish musical genres can only lead to a didactic compromise due to the complexity of the criteria allowing the specificity of a genre to be confirmed. However, the same term can designate different genres, or the same genre may be designated variously according to the countries. An Arabo-Turkish terminology will be normalised here.

Erlanger presents an Arabo-Turkish system marked by the academic tradition of Aleppo with a quarter-tone scale and enumerates seventeen genres. An Arabo-Turkish system will be presented here marked by the ‘ud school of Baghîdî with a commatic scale. A progression of structures will follow from the ‘Hellenic’ scale (tones and semi-tones) to the ‘Islamic’ scale (which includes also neutral seconds and thirds). The reverse approach would also be plausible.

Attention will be given to eight structures of the main genres by giving precise information on their characteristic interval: sahâgîr or sâgam-sâghîn (major); básâlîk (minor); kûrdî (minor second and third); hidjâzî (with trichromite-augmented second); bayâti and naswî tetra-chords or hûsînî and溢gâhîh pentachords (neutral second and minor third); sabâ (neutral second, minor third and diminished fourth); segâh and rîtîk (finale on a neutral fingering-degree with apomote and short neutral third), nîtî, an academic and classical genre (major second and neutral third).

Six structures will also be cited derived from the main genres by correlation, overlapping, combination, inflection: kûrdî-nâhîr (kûrdî hidjâzî correlation); nîkrîz and nânâlîr (basâlîk hidjâzî correlation); musîlîfîs (sabâ-segâh overlapping); huzam (segâh/hidjâzî combination); mûsâ’ar inflection of the segâh; and sawîl (hidjâzî/rîst interaction).

All these genres are compatible with the fifth and can be represented in the form of pentachords on a diagram illustrating the real value of the intervals and the preferred insertion on the scale of sounds, itself transposable. However, so as to facilitate reading, a scale of sounds is often chosen with a nîtis key tone in do (Mediterranean) and one may also remark the equivalence in Latin notes of the height of the fingering-degrees or scaling-fingerings by giving their inflections precisely.

Formation of the musical modes from the genres.—The mode (makâm in Arabic; dastghîb, avâz, naghma in Persian; makâm in Turkish) is formed by the combination of genres. However, musicologists who do not play the ‘ud, Iranian authors and numerous Western musicologists study the mode as a whole like a Greek mode or an Indian raga.

In popular traditions and archaic practices, a single tri-, tetra- or pentachordal genre can constitute a makâm of limited ambitus. In general, it is a genre more archaic than Hellenic such as the hidjâzî, the bayâti, the sabâ or the rîtî. A Bedouin’s improvisation on his rababa is often limited to a tetra-chord. But an educated artist can decide to play deliberately in the popular style and produce an astonishing result (e.g. Djamîl Bashîr interpreting the sahâgîr-7’ud on the
Two genres joined from low to high can form the "scale systems" (diwan asaš, sulam in Arabic; dici in Turkish) of a classical heptatonic makām bearing a tonic finale (asaš, maye, duruk), a witness-pivot (gūmūz, shāhūd, gāšūa), normally placed at the juncture of the two genres and corresponding most often to an open string of the 'ud, which, in fact, by structural and acoustic definition, is a preferential degree. Other degrees can be preferential or mobile according to the genres and modes played and in terms of what the ethnomusicologists call the hierarchy of degrees.

Musical treatises class makāmtāt in terms of the degree on which they are inserted and progress from low to high. Here it will be limited to a small number of heptatonic "scale systems", simple or compound according to the identical (or theoretically identical) or different genres from which they are formed. All the makāmāt cited point to Arabo-Turkish academic traditions and a certain number of these makāms seem to be of relatively recent creation from the time of the Ottoman Empire (18th-19th centuries).

The constituent genres will be mentioned from low to high with and by their arbitrary limitation to the main octave (diwan asaš).

1. The principal makāmāt formed by the combination of two identical genres are called simple, and often bear the same name as their constituent genre or the fingering-degree of insertion on the theoretical scale of sounds: Nahwān or Bāsālīk; minor; Bāsālīk tetrachord + Bāsālīk pentachord.

2. Some compound makāmāt are formed by joining two different genres constituting a heptatonic blend (tarkīb, murekkeb): Mādūn, Ḥusayni, Ḥuzam, Muṣṭādr; pentachord (pivot on 5th degree) + rāst tetrachord (pentachord + major tetrachord).

3. Some complex makāmāt are reducible to three different genres by their octave system (a theory not found in Turkey): Ṣuzūnd, nisā’ tetrachord + nisā’ pentachord + rāst tetrachord.

Seghā: seghā tetrachord + modulating rāst or bayātī tetrachord + rāst tetrachord.

Farāhfaż: overlapping of sahā, seghā and huza (chromatism).

The definition of the makām limited to the octave is only a didactic diagram, for only archaic improvisations are limited to the octave. The extension of the system beyond the octave can be made in various ways. In the most common case, the heptatonic structure is recommenced in the adjacent low and high octaves. In scholastic practice, the theory or science of the musician adds new structures to the high and low in the form of connected genres or modes. It also leads to the formation of makāmāt of a broad ambitus, of which many are described in treatises. Going beyond the register of the human voice, they apply to instruments covering three octaves such as the 'ud with six courses of strings, the kāmūn, the santur or the nay. In this way, the makām is freed from its antiquity.

On the occasion of an improvisation (takbīm), Arabic and Turkish traditions define for each makām a point of departure (mahad, zemín), a process of melodic movement (laafer, spy), stopping points (marākūz, asma karānum), specific melodic formulas such as the kaffa before returning to the finale (karād). Iranian traditions entail the unrolling of a certain number of melodic models (gūgūs) according to a fixed protocol in the official repertoire (nadiqa), with the periodic return of a conclusive formula-coda (jūriq) such as hāli: khabara.

Apart from the vertical association of genres and modes from low to high, horizontal associations in time allow for improvisation by modulating from a makām of reference. Genres and modes constituting the initial modal system are renewed in terms of the laws of Arabo-Turkish modulation (taawwun, gezık) by the substitution or evolution of structures engendering a succession of genres and modes at intermediate stages (mujān, mujān) and illustrating a rich procession of ten or twenty makāmāt before returning to the initial genre (e.g. "Reveries sur le makām Farahfaż").

Arabesques record 6, Luth en Iraq classique, 'Ud Jamil Ghānim"

At-makām al-irākī, based on the same process, is a typically Irākī genre whose poem is entrusted to a solo singer (makāmāt) and the accompaniment to an instrumental quartet (īdāshī) from the beginning (ubahri) to the finale (tālīm) (e.g. "Meditations sur des naghams traditionnels d'Iraq").

MAKĀM

Insertion, height in frequency, transposition, gradient, ethos. -- Makāmāt are not of a fixed height in frequency with reference to universal physical principles. But they have for preferential insertion that of their main genre, which is done more readily on certain fingering-degrees of the scale of sounds. Also the Shah 'Arābān, the Seghā are inserted on seghā: the Sūzūnd on sahād, the 'Aṣghār'ashāh on sahād, the Ṣūzūnd on dūgūz, the Saḥūra, Ḥuṣāz, Rāšt on rāst, the Kurdi, Ḥuṣāz, Bayātī, Nātā, Ḫuṣāz, 'Ushshāk, Šāhād, Shāhūd on dūgūz, Seghā, Huzām, Musta‘ar on sahād; etc.

As the height in frequency of the fingering-degrees or scaling-fingerings is in terms of the height in frequency of the theoretical scale of sounds and the latter varies from one country to another and one school to
another, it would be difficult to speak of absolute height, more especially as the European pitches, which are often cited in reference, have continued to rise since the 18th century. Recourse to the näy, sometimes evoked as a pitch, presents the same risk since, with the fixed fingering-degrees, the näy transposes the scale in terms of its size.

In the Mediterranean Arab countries, the näy is generally assimilated to a do₂ and played as such by trained musicians. In Turkey the scale has been deliberately fixed and the näy key tone, called sol and written sol by convention is a ṭé₂ in official institutions. In Ṣūfī and Ḥan, the näy is more readily a fa₂ or a sol₂. These heights suit baritone singers quite well. At all times, in practice, the instrumentalists choose their scale and the soloist singers impose theirs in terms of their vocal aptitudes.

The makâmá is can be transposed in various ways, in addition to transposition by total displacement of the tuning-pitch of the instrument or the theoretical scale of sounds. Transposition can be obtained on the näy by preserving the fingerings and changing the näy. On the kānān and the sanṭūr, the playing is displaced after the tuning-pitch has been refined. On the ūd all the fingering-degrees of a course of strings can be transferred to the next course, corresponding to a translation of a fourth without modification of the internal acoustic equilibrium of the makâm. Also a baydti on a dügdh (3rd open string) can be transposed on a nawaṭ (4th open string) or on an ṣaghīrdn (2nd open string) without breaking its structure, since the finale and the pivot (4th degree) remain inserted on the open strings. In some cases, the makâm transposed in this way takes on a new name.

In other cases, a musician displaces the finale in a longitudinal fashion on the string, which leads to a transposition with translation of all the fingering-degrees and a modification of the acoustic structure of the makâm. Such would be the case of a makâm Rāšt played on a sēgḥ finale, a particularly arduous performance which alters the acoustic role of the pivot (5th degree), usually on an open string (nawaṭ), and plays it on a fingering in the middle of a string.

Some makâmá have, observed on a stave, octave scale systems absolutely identical with those of other makâmá, the only difference being that the theoretical scale is different. Such is the case of makâmá Shadd-ʿArabdn (on yegḥ), Suzzidn (on šurchān), Ḥidżaz-kār (on rāšt), Turkish Zengule and Shūdān (on dügdh). Played on a kānān in the absence of a criterion of height, they could only be differentiated from one another by formulas, details of modulation or cadence. By contrast, on an ūd, they have their own acoustic equilibrium. The yegḥ finale (1st open string) of the Shadd-ʿArabdn is on the ūd a preferential and fundamental degree. On the other hand, the rāšt finale (on a fingering of minor third on ṣaghīrdn 2nd string) of the Ḥidżaz-kār, which is a very important key tone, is not an acoustically preferential degree. Consequently, a makâm Ḥidżaz-kār is not a transposed Shadd-ʿArabdn.

The question of the gradient of the makâmá has given rise to several controversies. Some makâmá, at the time of their improvised melodic evolution, deliberately display ascending melody, others no less deliberately descending melody. The musicologists of Turkey give precise information in their works as to the nature of the pitch to be given its value. At times, two makâmá of identical modal structure and identical insertion have different gradients. Also, the Turkish Baydti is descending and the Turkish Yegḥ is ascending; the Turkish Ḥidżaz ambivalent and the Ūzād ascending; the Turkish Ṣawd descending and the Turkish Ṭuhur descending. In Ṣūfī, two popular makâmá based on the modal structure of the Ṣawd are respectively the Ṣawd and the Ṣawd, usually ascending, and the Ṣawd, usually descending.

Historically, each genre and mode is supposed to correspond to a certain ethos (ríḥ) or a "modial sentiment", which conditions the inspiration of the artist, and the perception or sensation of his companions and audience, when he improvises. Each mode or genre even had in former times its preferred hour, at dawn (makâm Rāšt), at the end of the evening (makâm ismālī), if reference is made to the Anonymous treatise dedicated to the Ottoman sultan Mehmed II (9th/10th century). But in the 20th century, the holding of musical sessions in the evening and the influence of the media have upset the nyctemeral rīḥ as they have the sentimental rīḥ.

Nevertheless, the Rāšt is classical and academic, the Baydti has a rural and collective tendency and is well-suited to popular songs, the Ṣegḥ expresses lofty sentiments and is claimed by the mystics, the Ṣawd, linked to the fresh wind of dawn, expresses the weariness of the end of the night with a clear tendency to sadness and depression. It is all together strange, on the other hand, to the idea of waking up and is not an arousing makâm. The Ḥidżaz is a makâm able to evoke sadness without depression and it is remarkable to Western ears. In a certain measure, the calls to prayer maintain a kind of nyctemeral ethos of the makâmá, since they are supposed to change the makâm at each call.

Nomenclature and comparative approaches. — The number of real or fictitious makâmá is difficult to determine in the absence of a preconceived idea and due to the plurality of musical traditions perpetuated in the heart of Arabo-Iranian Turkmén Islam.

A Persian theoretician of the Sāsānian period, Bārbād, had elaborated a mystical and cosmogonous musical system describing seven ḥusrawasānī (modes), thirty ḥabīs (genres?) and three hundred and sixty ṭaṣbgāḥ (modulations?). This type of nomenclature as the basis of fatidical numbers has not disappeared and some contemporary musicologists retain seven notes and forty intervals to the octave so as to reach three hundred and sixty makâmá. In the 7th/13th century, ʿAbd al-Dīn described twelve ṣawād, six ʿaṣāṣāt, one mumakkab and two undetermined modes.

Apart from large mediaeval treatises which studied the scales, intervals, genres and modes conceived on the ūd, and which established the nomenclatures for the classification of the modes used, we should take account of the delicate art and patronage which encouraged musicians to create a new mode and present it to the prince amidst a circle of initiates or on the occasion of a collective feast. Also, throughout centuries, hundreds of makâmá have been described and it has been possible to elaborate thousands. However, the present current practice is limited to a few tens of simple or compound makâmá and a hundred transposed makâmá.

In the 20th century, Erlanger describes one hundred and nineteen Eastern makâmá and twenty-nine Tunisian makâmá belonging to the Hispano-Arabic tradition. S. al-Mahdī describes forty makâmá. Alexis Chotin notes the existence of twenty-four naḥāʾ of North Africa, corresponding to twenty-four modes. Hüseyin Sadeddin Arel describes a hundred Turkish makamlar. Nelly Caron and Dariouche Salvate describe twelve Iranian modes, seven being ṭaṣbg and five ṣawād. Jürgen Ehmer notes the existence of the system of six makomot in Central Asia, usually
characterised by their forms. Habib Hassan Touma evaluates the mukdm of Adharbaydjan as more than seventy. Among all these structures there exist similarities and divergences. 

As for the similarities with India, we can recognise the identity of structure between the Indian Bhairavi and the Kārdū. As for the Greek heritage, it must be remarked that classical musicians of the end of the 2nd/8th century such as Ishāk al-Mawṣili [q.v.] used exclusively the Pythagorean Hellenic scale. The rehabilitation of autochthonous structures in academic music seems to be undertaken with Mansūr Žalal and his neutral fingering-degrees. Since then, “Greek” and “local” structures coexist. Some musicologists of Islam do not fail to underscore the homology between “Islamic” and Greek genres: Ionian, Aeolian, Dorian and Phrygian. The process, nevertheless, suffers from the multiplicity of classifications of the Greek genres. Thus we have to remark the presence of a major and a minor and the similarities with the modes of Greek churches, namely Kāst-natural diatonic, Bayātī-minor chromatic, and Hidżāz-kār-major chromatic.

The similarities with the Greek modes arise equally from the European influences of the 19th century which provoked a paradoxical re-Hellenisation. After the ʿAbbasid period, which marked the flight of Arabo-Iranian musical syncretism, academic musical forms regressed among the Arabs and Iranians and were to discover a new brilliance at the court of the Ottomans. But from the 19th century onwards, imperial patronage and the taste of Istanbul were more and more influenced by Europe. A renaissance of the Niḥāvand (minor) took place and the “creation” of makdūm for grand occasions; with a very broad ambitus, and a “tempered” tendency such as the Nawāzār (neuter), Sudūm-yegāh (harmonic minor), Hidżāz-kār-kūrdi (Kurdwīl-Hidżāz-kār), Farazāzād and Sulṭānī-yağūn. It is these makdūms, along with so many others perpetuated at the Ottoman court, which were to be introduced in Egypt by ʿAbdīl al-Hammūlī so as to regenerate music which was at that time in a parlous condition, if the descriptions of Villoteau are to be believed.

The similarity between the modes of Islam and the modes of the Eastern churches is at times striking, despite divergences of form and style. It might as well be attributed to relics of the common ancient heritage claimed by both traditions, to a period of modal syncretism, or to the fruits of a coexistence which lasted more than ten centuries. The same question can be posed as regards the commatic chant of the churches whose territory was administered by the Ottomans, when the latter perpetuated the Byzantine artistic heritage and commatic system.

The problem of the musical modes perpetuated by the minorities reveals the same ambiguous similarities. As regards the Kurds, for example, it is well-known in Turkey, ʿIrāk and Iran that the Kurdish singers and instrumentists interpret more readily the Ḥusaynī or Dašt modes according to their own forms and styles. The form and style can also be ascribed to the mountainous environment as well as to precise ethnic criteria. But, if it is a matter of reconciling a citizenship or a race to the modes, it is noteworthy that the same Ḥusaynī or Dašt modes were perpetuated with the same structures and more classical forms or styles in Istanbul, Baghadād or Tehran.

Some modes, endowed with structures that can be found throughout the Arabo-Iranian-Turkish world, have taken a form, style and name which makes them characteristic of a region. But they are not linked especially strictly to a nation. Also, the Šār and Daštī modes (bayātī structure) or Afsārī (seghā structure) of Iran, perpetuated equally in Adharbaydjan, correspond respectively, as far as structure is concerned, to the Shīrī, Daštī and Afsārī makānāt of ʿIrāk, and it may be supposed that they derive from a common regional ancestral patrimony in these three countries.

A classical mode can present local variants. Also the Segāh, remarkable for its finale on a neutral fingering-degree, is articulated according to various patterns: in the 3rd degree, on a modulating nāṣīt/būsālīk tetrachord (in the Arab countries) or on the equivalent of a bayātī genre (in Iran), or, in the fifth degree, on a hīḍāz tetrachord (in Turkey). Another mode called makām Navaʾī/bāzāgū: Navaʾī/Nevād makāmī is also constituted: — a Bayātī tetrachord (hardly variable) inserted on the dīḡāh fingering-degree (3rd open string on the ʿsid) — a modulating variable pentachord inserted on the navaʾī fingering-degree (4th open string on the ʿsid) which may be

(a) a nāṣīt pentachord in Turkey (5th degree hardley mobile),
(b) a nāṣīt or būsālīk pentachord in the Arab countries (5th degree mobile), or
(c) a nāṣīt, būsālīk, Bayātī or hīḍāz pentachord in Iran (5th and 6th degrees mobile).

A comparative approach to the Arab, Iranian and Turkish modes would allow, by making an abstraction of nationalisms, separatisms or claims of paternity, the discovery of a large number of divergent structures under a common name or common structures under different names. However, ambiguities of terminology are involved. What is called a makām/Cathārghān among the Arabs and Turks is a major, while the Cathārghān of Iran corresponds to an Arabo-Turkish Hīḍāzākār. The major is called Māhār or Kūst-pandjghār in Iran, while the Arab Māhār is not a major. The makāmāt called Pandjghār and Shūr in ʿIrāk would be called Sūzānāk and Kandāghār in Turkey and Syria.

The fruitless efforts since the Congress of Arabic Music in Cairo in 1932 show that it is too late to establish normalized Arabo-Iranian-Turkish nomenclature and that it is illusory to want to fix the height of the neutral degrees, very high in Istanbul and very low in Cairo. Finally, the two recent Bagdad Congresses of Music in 1975 and 1978 have allowed us to ascertain that it is just as impossible to agree to a definition of the term makām in its musical sense.

Moreover, every amateur and every musicologist will persist in perceiving the makām in terms of his sensibility or formation: familiar melodic formulas, recollection of a cultural identity, expression of an ethnic music, modal system, heptatonic on a stave, modal protocol, form of improvisation, aesthetic vestige of the Golden Ages, obstacle to progress by harmonisation, communication of a state of soul, linguistic system of the ʿsid and specific language, etc.

**Bibliography:** There is a very full bibliography on the makām as understood by orientalist musicologists or ethnomusicologists, on masīk and the ʿsid in J. Elsner, *Zum Problem des Ma- quam*, in *Acta musicologica*, XLII/2 (1973), 208-30; H. G. Farmer, arts. มะศีก and ʿṢīd in

The makâm is a stone of small dimensions: 60 cm. wide by 90 cm. high (see the data recorded by al-`Âlîd, *Tâhût al-`âlîd*, fol. 67a; measured by al-`Âlîd anno 753 AH; and see al-Sindjârî, *op. cit.*, fol. 23a). It is now "closely surrounded by glass and bars set into a polygonal base, the whole structure, capped by a much narrower kind of 'helmet', being about three yards above ground level" (A. J. Wensinck-J. Jomier, art. *Ka‘ba*). In the early periods of Islam, the stone, encased in a wooden box, was placed on a high platform so as to prevent its being swept by a torrent. During the prayer led by the ruler or his deputy, the box used to be lifted and the makâm shown to the people attending the prayer; after the prayer, the box was again placed in the Ka‘ba (cf. al-Mukaddassî, 72). It was sad to see how al-Hâджdîjî tried with his leg to set up the makâm `Ibrâhîm back to its place after it had moved (see ‘Abd al-Râzzâk, *op. cit.*, v, 49, no. 8599).

In 160/777 the makâm was brought to the abode of al-Mahdî in Mecca when he performed the pilgrimage. In the next year, when the makâm was raised carelessly by one of its keepers, it fell down and cracked; it was repaired at the order of al-Mahdî and its upper and lower parts were braced with gold. Al-Mutawâwakkî in 241/853-5 improved the pedestal of the makâm, embellished the makâm itself with gold and ordered the building of a cupola over the makâm (cf. al-Sindjârî, *op. cit.*, fol. 120b). In 252/866 the makâm was stripped of its gold by the governor of Mecca `A`fîr b. al-Fâdî, the gold was then melted down for money, the pieces of metal placed in the Ka‘ba; the Prophet himself who later removed the stone from its original place (see al-Sindjârî, *op. cit.*, fol. 120a ult. - 120b, 121a; on Ismâ‘îl b. Yûsuf, see al-`Âlîd, *al-Yâlî al-`âlîdîn*, ed. Fu‘âd Sayyid, Cairo 1938/1963, iii, 311, no. 783). A thorough restoration of the makâm was carried out in 256/870 by the governor `A`fîr b. al-Hassan al-`Âlâhîmi (see on him al-`Âlîd, *op. cit.*, vi, 151, no. 2050). Al-`Âlîkî gives a detailed description of the stone in its place (cf. *Le Makâm* sion, lxxiv [1971], 477-91). When the stone was brought to the dâr al-imârîa, al-`Âlâhîmi noticed the inscription on it and tried to copy parts of it. R. Dozy reproduced the inscription and tried to decipher it (R. Dozy, *Die Inschriften zu Mekka*, Leipzig 1864, 155-61).

His reading and interpretation are implausible (Prof. J. Naveh’s opinion, communicated verbally). Lengthy and heated discussions took place among the scholars about the place of the makâm. The traditions about whether the stone was established in its place are divergent and even contradictory (see e.g. Ibn Abî `l-`âhîlî, *Sharî‘ Nâhîî al-balâ`gât*, ed. Muhammam Abu `l-`Âfîl `Ibrâhîm, Cairo 1964, xii, 160; al-Kudâ‘î, *Ta`rîkî*, Bodleian ms. Pacocke 270, fol. 58a; al-Hârizmî, *al-Mu`assânât*, ed. Hanâm al-Dîsîrî, 500; al-Sâlihî, *op. cit.*, fol. 38a-b; al-Mutã’âlî, *al-Haddî‘î*, ed. Muhibb al-Dîn al-Kha`bî, Cairo 1343, i, 298). These traditions were divided by al-Sindjârî into five groups. According to some reports, `Umar was the first who removed the stone. Others say that in the time of Abraham the stone was in the same place as it is now, but in the time of the Djâhiliyya it had been attached to the Ka‘ba and so it remained during the periods of the Prophet and of Abû Bakr and for some time during the caliphate of `Umar, who returned it to its proper place. A third series of traditions claims that the Prophet removed the stone from its original place (next to the Ka‘ba) and put it in its present location. A fourth tradition maintains that `Umar moved the stone to its present place and returned it to the same spot after it had been swept away by a torrent. Finally, some scholars say that the makâm has always been in the place in which it is nowadays; `Umar re-installed it to this place after it was swept away by a torrent (see al-Sindjârî, *op. cit.*, fol. 23a-b, 76b-78a). A tradition which contains new aspects of the location of the makâm is recorded by Ibn Kaţîrî. The stone was in the Ka‘ba; the Prophet took it out of the Ka‘ba and attached it to its wall (i.e. of the Ka‘ba). Then he said, "O people, this is the kiblîa" (Ibn Kaţîrî, *Tafsîr*, ii, 322). It is noteworthy that in this tradition there is no mention of `Umar, of his advice or of the changes carried out by him. It is quite plausible that the Prophet’s change had to be legitimised and duly justified. Muhibb al-Dîn al-`Âlîdî tries to explain this discrepancy by reporting that `Umar inquired after the death of the Prophet about the place in which Abraham put the stone. In the time of the Prophet, the stone was indeed attached to the wall of the Ka‘ba; but `Umar was aware of the Prophet’s will to follow the sunna of Abraham, and returned the makâm to its original place, the place in which it had been put by Abraham (al-`Âlîdî, *al-Kura*, 347; quoted by Abu `l-`Âlîdî ‘Abd al-Dawî, *Ahwâl Makka wa l-Maddîh*, fols. 86b-87a). A divergent report is recorded by al-Sindjârî on the authority of Ibn Surâkah. Between the door of the Ka‘ba and the place of Adam’s prayer (where God accepted his repentance) there were nine cubits; it was the place of makâm `Ibrâhîm and there the Prophet performed two rak‘as after finishing the salât and after receiving the revelation: "May the makâm `Ibrâhîm as a place of prayer…”’. It was the Prophet himself who later removed the stone to the place where it is nowadays, sc. at a distance of 20 cubits from the Ka‘ba (al-Sindjârî, *op. cit.*, fol. 77a). Instructive is the report of Ibn Djubayr. The ditch (hufrâ) at the door of the Ka‘ba (in which the water gathers when the Ka‘ba is washed) is the place of the makâm in the time of Abraham; the place is crowded by
believers who pray there; the stone was moved by the Prophet to the present place (see al-Riḥla, 55 inf. - 56; al-Sīndjārī, op. cit., fol. 78a). The change of the place of the makām and the possibility that the stone should be moved to another place of the haram led to a disturbing question: would it be incumbent upon the believer to pray, in such a case, in the new place (since the injunction clearly makes it necessary to take the makām as a place of prayer), or to stick to the original place? (See al-Sīndjārī, op. cit., 77b and also fol. 78a: the former makām occupied half of the ditch (ḫafra) at the biqʿa.

Some traditions related by al-Fākhī add certain peculiar details about the change carried out by ʿUmar. A report traced back to Saʿīd b. Ḏubayy says that Abraham placed the stone in front of the Kaʿba. ʿUmar removed the stone and placed it in its present place in order to make the circumambulation of the Kaʿba easier. When the Prophet was sent, he reinstated the makām in the place where it had been put by Abraham. ʿUmar asked where its location had been during the period of the Diḥayyya, and returned it to that place; hence the present place of the makām Ibrahim is the same as it was in the time of the Diḥayyya (see Ibn Bābawayh, Ilāt al-sharaʿa ʿtī, ed. Muhammad Sādīq Bah al-Turjīm, Nadhir 1385/1966, 423, bāb 160; quoted by al-Maġlisī, op. cit., xcix, 232, no. 1; cf. anon., untitled ms. Vatican Arab. 1750, fol. 32b).

Semantic evolution of the term. The semantic study of this vocable for the period previous to the creation of the genre is complicated by the fact that the term makām, which is frequently used, is common to two nouns, makāma and makāmī [q. v.]. Both are derived from the radical k-w-m, which implies the idea of "to rise, to stand in order to perform an action", but which is often weakened in that it simply marks the beginning of an action, whether the agent rises or not, and even loses its dynamic sense altogether, taking on the static sense of "to stay in a place". Makām occurs fourteen times in the Kūrā with the general sense of "abode, a place where one stays", more specifically in the beyond, but in one verse (XIX, 74/73), where it is used in conjunction with nadi, "tribal council", it must be referred to a meeting of important people; the same applies to a verse of Zuhayr b. Abī Sulmā (Cheikhū, Šaʿwāraʿ al-Nāyānīyya, 573, v. 6: makāma ... andyā). Otherwise, from the archaic period onward, makām naturally conveyed the sense of "situation, state", and, in a verse of Kaʿb b. Zuhayr (Bīnāt Suʿād, ed. and tr. R. Basset, Algiers 1910, v. 41), the makām of the poet, which is certainly dramatic, is judged terrifying (hāʾith) by the commentator. It is probable that an analysis of ancient poetry would supply more precise and illuminating examples, but it seems likely that by means of a transference of meaning, starting with a tragic situation, makām comes to signify, not maglisī "assembly" (as it is glossed by the editor, who confines himself to reproducing the dictionary definition), but "battle", similarly, in a verse of Abī Tamūmān in -dā (Bādī al-tamāmī fī sāḥr Disār Abī Tamūmān, ed. M.I. al-Aswād, Beirut 1347/1928, i, 222, v. 5), makāma (read as makʿāma by the editor, but glossed as "scene of warlike actions") is used in conjunction with muʿtarak and doubtless has the sense of "theatre of warlike valour". In other examples of this type it is the plural which is attested, and it is not known to which factor or which singular it corresponds. In any case, it is certainly in the sense of "battles, military actions" that this plural is to be best understood in a passage of the Kitāb al-Bukhārī of the al-Dīnjāzī (ed. Hājjīrī, 184, 1. 2; rectify accordingly the translation by Pellet, 289), where there is a case of Bedouins talking of battles of the pre-Islamic period (aysīm [q. e.]) and of makāmāt, acts of heroism.

In assemblies of important people, eloquence was a natural feature, and it is not surprising that, by means of another transference of meaning, makām should also refer to the topics discussed in the course of these meetings, then, by extension, to more or less edifying addresses delivered before a distinguished audience. This evolution is attested, in the 3rd/9th century by Ibn Ḥutayba [q. v.] who, in his ʿUyun al-akbar (ii, 333-43), gives the title Makāma al-ṣuhbāʾ ind al-ḥāṭifīz ʿaw tāʾ-ʾmulaʾk to a chapter in which he reproduces pious homilies designated, in the singular, by the term makām. Before him, the Muʿtaṣili Iskāfī (d. 240/854 [q. e.]) had written a Kitāb al-Makāmāt fi tafaḥ ʿAli, and, in the following century, al-Masʿūdī [q. v. ] (Murūj, iv, 441 = § 1744) speaks of homilies by ʿAli b. Abī Ṭalīb and (v, 421 = § 2175) of a sermon by ʿUmar b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz, delivered on the occasion of their makāmāt, where it is impossible to tell whether the corresponding singular is mukdmāt or makāmāt. Whatever the case may be, al-Hamādhānī was
perhaps thinking primarily of the latter interpretation, while retaining in the background the memory of the concept of feats of arms when he adopted the term makdmdt to designate a hitherto unknown genre, which he considered instructive, if not edifying, of Abu 'l-Fath al-Iskandari and the "sketches", the "sessions", in the course of which they are reported by 'Isa b. Hisham; then, this word came to be applied to a whole genre, and was ultimately confused often, as will be seen in due course, with risala [q. e.]. W. J. Prendergast (The Ma-
qamah of Badi' al-Zam'an—Hamadani, London-Madras 1915, repr. with introd. by C. E. Bosworth, London-Paris 1973, 11-14) has collected a number of objections to the references of makdmdt and makdmdt in poetry and prose pre-
re-dating Badi' al-Zam'an, but the most exhaustive research has been that of R. Blachère, Étude sémantique sur le nom maqāma, in Machry (1953), 646-52 (repr. in
Analecta, Damascus 1975, 61-7).

Birth of the genre. In the makdmdt described by Ibn 'Utayba, it is often a Bedouin or a person of rather shabby appearance, although extremely elo-
quent, who addresses an aristocratic audience. Before an audience of common people, an analogous role was performed by the kāsī [q. e.], who originally delivered edifying speeches but, as is well-known, in the course of time soon took on the dual function of story-teller and mountebank, whose activity was to a certain ex-
tent comparable to that of the makaddī [q. e.], the wandering beggar or vagrant who went from town to town and easily gathered around him an audience who rewarded him financially for the fascinating stories that he told. It seems probable that the first to introduce these colourful characters into Arabic literature was al-Dījāhz [q. e.], who devoted a long treatment to them in the Kitāb al-Brājikala2 and wrote at least two other pieces on the stratagems of thieves (Hyaal al-Brājika) and beggars (Hyaal al-Makaddīn) of which al-Bayhaki (Maqâm, ed.-tr. Pellat, Schwally, i, 521-3, 622-4) has preserved extracts which are unfortunately very short (see Pellat, Arabische Gesetzeswerke, Zürich-Stuttgart 1967 = The life and works of Jāhiz, London-Berkeley-Los Angeles 1969, texts xlii and xliii).
The interest taken by the aristocracy and men of letters, not only in the popular classes, but also in members of the "millet" is remarkably illustrated by the Kāsīdah sayyid 'Abd al-Dulaf al-Khazradji (4th/10th century) collected by Sahl b. Harun (Muqaddasī, ed. Z. Mubarak, in 1945, 15) criticise
the idea of the "session" as we know it was in the air—powerful evidence in support of this conclusion is sup-
plied by the silence of a compatriot of the latter, Ibn 'Arif (d. 606/1010, q. e.), who at the beginning of his Masā'il al-muqaddāsī (ed.-tr. Pellat, Algiers 1953, 5) declares that he himself has been inspired by the Kalila wa-Dìmna, by Sahl b. Hārun [q. e.], who also wrote about animals, and by Badi' al-Zamān, but makes no
mention of Ibn Durayd. In another context, in his account of the great rival of al-Hamadhanī, al-Khārazmī [q. e.], Abū Bākr (323-83/934-93), Brockellm (S. I, 150) adds, having listed the mas. of the Ra'is ul-ma'amasī of the author, "neben Maqaddasī, in deren 100er- und 100er
hundert Jahren zwischen 358 und 988/998 und 1008/1008 [q. e.]." It does not seem obligatory, in fact, to search desperately for a model whenever an innovation appears, since the most elementary justice demands that allowance be made for personal invention. Prendergast (op. laud., 20-1) poses the question as to whether Badi' al-Zamān owes anything to Greek or Byzantine models, but considers such influence totally improbable and

quence or wisdom is a commonplace of adab, and while the anecdotal literature discussed by Beeston has certainly exercised an influence, it has not been the only or even the main source of

As early as 1915, Prendergast (op. laud., 6) had drawn attention to and translated a subsequently well-
known passage of the Zahr al-adīd (ed. Z. Mubarak, Cairo 1344, i, 235; ed. Budjawai, Cairo 1972/1953, i, 261) of al-Husūrī (d. 413/1022 [q. e.]), who states that al-Hamadhanī imitated ("arada") the forty badīthīs of Ibn Durayd [q. e.] and composed four hundred "ses-

sions" on the theme of the kudya, the activity of the makaddīn. After Margoliouth had, in the first edition of the El (s.v. al-Hamadhanī), given credit to this passage, Z. Mubarak, in 1930, adopted the same point of view in al-Mukafat (xxvi, 412-20, 561-4) and reproduced it in his thesis on La prose arabe au IVe siècle (Paris 1931), while, in the same volume of the
Mukafat (588-90), 'Sādīq al-Rafī'ī refuted his arguments by emphasising the weakness of the source on which he relied. R. Blachère and P. Masmou (al-
Hamadhanī, choix de Maqâmāt, Paris 1957, 15) criticise the exploitation of the information supplied by al-
Husūrī and write that the only conclusion to be drawn from it is "that at the end of the 10th century or at the beginning of the 11th, a Muslim scholar discovered a link between the 'sessions' of Hamadhanī and the stories attributed to a philologist-poet of Iraq, Ibn Durayd"; as Prendergast had done, these authors observe that no work of this genre features in the list of Ibn Durayd's writings, and C. E. Bosworth, in his introduction to the reprinted edition of Prendergast, concludes that al-Husūrī's information is suspect. Powerful evidence in support of this conclusion is sup-
plied by the silence of a compatriot of the latter, Ibn 'Arif (d. 606/1010, q. e.), who at the beginning
of his Masā'il al-muqaddāsī (ed.-tr. Pellat, Algiers 1953, 5) declares that he himself has been inspired by the Kalila wa-Dìmna, by Sahl b. Hārun [q. e.], who also wrote about
animals, and by Badi' al-Zamān, but makes no
mention of Ibn Durayd. In another context, in his account of the great rival of al-Hamadhanī, al-Khārazmī [q. e.], Abū Bākr (323-83/934-93), Brockellm (S. I, 150) adds, having listed the mas. of the Ra'is ul-muqaddāsī of the author, "neben Maqaddasī, in deren 100er- und 100er
hundert Jahren zwischen 358 und 988/998 und 1008/1008 [q. e.]." It does not seem obligatory, in fact, to search desperately for a model whenever an innovation appears, since the most elementary justice demands that allowance be made for personal invention. Prendergast (op. laud., 20-1) poses the question as to whether Badi' al-
Zamān owes anything to Greek or Byzantine models, but considers such influence totally improbable and

In another context, in his account of the great rival of al-Hamadhanī, al-Khārazmī [q. e.], Abū Bākr
(323-83/934-93), Brockellm (S. I, 150) adds, having listed the mas. of the Ra'is ul-muqaddāsī of the author, "neben Maqaddasī, in deren 100er- und 100er
hundert Jahren zwischen 358 und 988/998 und 1008/1008 [q. e.]." It does not seem obligatory, in fact, to search desperately for a model whenever an innovation appears, since the most elementary justice demands that allowance be made for personal invention. Prendergast (op. laud., 20-1) poses the question as to whether Badi' al-
Zamān owes anything to Greek or Byzantine models, but considers such influence totally improbable and
concludes that "the same demons of difficulty, obscurity and pedantry entered the orators and poets of both nations in different periods". This assessment, the accuracy of which will become apparent in the course of the study of the evolution of the makāma, cannot, however, be fully applied to al-Hamadhānī. It is undeniable that this author was, in the framework of Arabic literature and Arab-Islamic society in general, subject to various influences, but he should be given credit for having succeeded, through a commendable work of synthesis, in setting in motion two principal characters charged with precise roles in particular a hero who symbolises a whole social category.

Structure of the original makāma. From the point of view of form, this genre is characterised, in the work of its initiator, by the almost invariable use of sadf [q.v.], of rhymed and rhythmic prose (sometimes blended with verse) which, in the 4th/10th century, tended to become the almost universal mode of literary expression, especially in the class of administrative secretaries to which al-Hamadhānī belonged, and was to remain so until the end of the 19th century. As regards the structure of an individual makāma, the fundamental characteristic is the existence of a hero (in this case Abu 'l-Fath al-Iskandari) whose adventures and eloquent speeches are related by a narrator (in this case Isā b. Hishām) to the person who speaks it and the first rāwī or fictitious. In a typical makāma, Kiliro adds (48), the order of events is as follows: arrival of the rāwī in a town, encounter with the disguised balāgī (the eloquent man = the hero), speech, reward, recognition, reproach, justification, parting. It need hardly be said that this general scheme does not apply invariably to all the makāmāt of al-Hamadhānī, still less to those of his successors. From the start, this literary form of the 9th century must be interpreted to cover a great variety of subjects: criticism of ancient and modern poets, of prose-writers like Ibn al-Muṣaffā and al-Dhīhī, of the Muṭazzī, exposure of the sexual slang and jargon of vagabonds, display of lexicographical knowledge, etc.; six makāmāt of Badi' al-Zamān celebrate the author's benefactor, Khašāl b. Ahmad, the ruler of Sūdiyyān, to whom Margoliouth (art. cit.) believes that the whole work may have been dedicated. It is not, however, certain that all these compositions were put together in a compilation constituted ne varietur. In fact, Ibn Sharaf (op. laud., 5) counts no more than twenty of them and adds that they were not all available to him, while al-Hamadhānī (Rasā'īl, Beirut 1890, 390, 516), quoted by al-Thāʾī al-Šāhī (Ya'mta, Damascus 1885, iv, 168) and al-Husrawī (see above), claims to have written four hundred of them, which is highly improbable; current editions contain fifty-one each (fifty-two in all), so that fifty may be reckoned the average number of makāmāt of Badi' al-Zamān in circulation in the Middle Ages; the figure of fifty was subsequently considered artificial to be a traditional characteristic and was respected by numerous imitators of al-Harīrī (see below), who had himself adopted it.

In summary, the term makāma appears to be characterised fundamentally by the almost exclusive use of rhymed prose (with the insertion of verse) and the presence of two imaginary persons, the hero and the narrator. As for its content, this appears to be a complex amalgam having recourse to numerous genres, especially in verbal acrobatics, the first manifestations of which are encountered in the works of the most eminent successor of Badi' al-Zamān, al-Harīrī (446-516/1054-1122 [q.v.]). The latter retains the structure created by his predecessor and presents a hero and a narrator, but many of his imitators were to dispense with the former character, if not with both. The diversity of themes dealt with in primitive makāmāt is the scene for the exploitation of the genre for the most varied of purposes and we shall see that if the objective of the genre is that of the authentic adab, seeking to instruct through entertainment, by means of a harmonious blending of the serious and the joking (al-qidd wa l-hazl [q.v.]), many makāmāt deviate from this purpose and in this respect follow the evolution of the adab which has a tendency either to neglect the qidd or to forget the last qadah.

Further, some compositions corresponding approximately to the exigencies of this genre are known by other names, such as ṣūda or ṣadīth, while some so-called makāmāt show none of the fundamental features of "sessions". What has happened is an evolution similar to that of the word ṣaḥākat, which after usually designating biographical works arranged according to generation (tābāda), is ultimately applied to those which follow alphabetical order. A confusion between riḍā and makāma is already visible in the Risālat al-Tawābi' of Ibn Shuhayd (382-426/992-1035 [q.v.]), who was well-acquainted with Badi' al-Zamān since he makes use of his ṣāḥīb, his inspiring spirit (ed. B. al-Bustāni, Beirut 1951, 172+). J. Vernet goes so far as to assert (Litteratura arab., Barcelona n.d., 114) that he was inspired by the Risāla of Badi' al-Zamān in the writing of his Risāla, which in effect contains two features of the "sessions", rhymed prose and the presence of a companion of the author, in this case a genie who questions the tawāri' of various representatives of Arabic literature. Other evidence is supplied at an early date by Ibn Sharaf (see above) who gives the title ṣadīth to his compositions, while one manuscript of the surviving fragment bears the title Ṣādir al-intikād and another, Ṣādir 'il al-intikād, the subject-matter comprises questions of literary criticism articulated by a scholar expressing his opinions of ancient and modern poets, somewhat in the style of al-Hamadhānī, but without an intermediary rāwī (see Ihsān Ḥabbās, Ta'liqd al-madāri jī al-adāb 'in al-ʿArab, Beirut 1391/1971, 460-9).

These two authors were writing in al-Andalus where, on the other hand, the word makāma was to be used "to designate any rhetorical exercise in rhymed verse, with or without an ingredient of poetry, whatever the theme inspiring it: congratulating a recently-appointed provincial judge, accompanying a basket of first-fruits sent as a gift, describing a landscape, recounting an incident of minimal importance or the perils of a journey, giving praise or blame or simply indulging in caprice, as an antidote to boredom. Any theme is considered suitable for a genre of composition, laden to the point of asphyxia with all the devices of language, erudition and pedan-
try and well-nigh indecipherable, is indiscriminately called risdla or makdma, without any account being taken of the theme (if indeed it has one...)" (F. de la Granja, Makdmdt al-Sarakustiyya, ii/2, 282) is a session which is preserved in Berlin (see Brockellmann, I, 95; Blachère and Masnou, op. laud., 39 and n. 1), but it cannot be said whether it is an imitation or an original work. Again in the 4th/10th century, 'Abd al-'Aziz al-Tráki was the author of a makdma on the resurrection (Brockellmann, I, 524).

Chronologically, it is here that one should place Ibn Shuhayd (see above) and Ibn Sharaf (see above) who confines himself to presenting his hadith in the form of the beginning of a dialogue followed by a long monologue of the scholar who takes the place of the hero and the tásí, one gains the impression that, for this learned Tunisian who made his home in Spain, the essential features of makdama are rhymed prose and the intervention of a fictional character who is an eloquent speaker (balígh). It is thus that many later authors interpret the scheme of Badí al-Zaman, when they do not eliminate the hero. In any case, the works of Ibn Shuhayd and of Ibn Sharaf, not to mention the Zahr al-kdth of the Harírî, testify to the rapid diffusion of the Makdmdt of al-Hamadhání in Ifríqiya and al-Andalus where, in the same century, a poet, Ibn Fattúb, is the author of a makdama on the poems of his time which was also presented in the form of a dialogue (Ibn Bassám Dhkhría, ii/2, 273-88; F. de la Granja, op. laud., 63-77), and where Ibn al-Sháhid [q.v.] made the account of a journey by a member of a group of travellers in a makdama (Dhkhría, ii/2, 104-95; F. de la Granja, 81-118) which exercised a certain influence on the genre as developed in Hebrew (see below). Ibn Bassám (Dhkhría, ii/2, 246-57) mentions another makdama by Abu Muhammad al-Kurtubi (443-83/1051-92; see R. Arie, Notes sur la maqáma andalous, in Hesért-Tamuda, ix/2 [1968], 204-5).

In the early 14th century, the physician Ibn Bu lán (d. after 460/1069) [q.v.] was the author of a Makdáma fi tadbir al-amrád (Brockellmann, S I, 885) which might well deserve examination. However, one of his most eminent imitators was Ibn Nákinya (410-83/1020-92 [q.v.]), nine of whose makdámá are available to us; this author renounces the oneness of the hero and introduces several narrators, but this plurality would amount to nothing more, according to Blachère and Masnou (39-40), "than a mark of respect paid to the model", Badí al-Zamán, to the extent that the possibility of varying the methods of narration has been understood (ed. İstanbul 1331; O. Rescher, Beitrag zur Maqámen-Literatur, iv, 123-52; tr. Cl. Huart, in J.A., 10th series, xii [1908], 435-54). Nevertheless, the most eminent successor of al-Hamadhání is incontestably al-Harírî (446-516/1054-1125 [q.v.]) who gave the genre its classic form, freezing it, so to speak, and diverting it from its actual function; according only a secondary interest to the content and placing his entire emphasis on the style which often takes on the nature of ponderous obscurity, al-Harírî’s ultimate aim is the preserving and teaching of the rarest vocabulary, to such an extent that some twenty philologists have commented on his makdámá and many of his imitators accompany their own compositions with lexico graphical commentaries. (In the same way, a

Maghribi author was to write 12 makdámá in dialectical Arabic in order to improve the language spoken in southern Algeria; see G. Faure-Biguet and G. Delphín, Les stances d’El-Aouall, testes arabs en dialekt mazigh el-Morbiel Qadibi al-Fali (M. le Mauvais sucré), in J.A., 11th ser., ii [1913], 285-310, iii [1914], 303-74, iv [1914], 307-78.) The success of al-Harírî’s Makdáma, which appealed to the taste of readers to such an extent that, after the Kur’án, children were made to memorise them, overshadowed those of alHamadhání, which were too easily intelligible, and prompted many later writers to imitate the rhetorical artifices invented by al-Harírî (see Prendergast, 22-5; Crussard, Études sur les stances de Harir, Paris 1925; Blachère and Masnou, 42-6) and to take such little interest in the substance that verbal richness remained in fact the principal, if not the only specific characteristic of this original and fertile literary genre in its principle.

In spite of the specialisation of the term which designates it, we still see al-Qházálí (d. 505/1111 [q.v.]) in his Makdáma al-ulamá bayna yaday al-khárífsa wa l-umárâ (ms. Berlin 8537/1 and al-Samání [d. 562/1167 [q.v.]) in his Makdáma al-ulamá bayna yaday al-umárâ (Hadjji Khalifa, no. 12702), of which the titles and content recall the chapter of Ibn Kutya mentioned above, returning to the previous notion of makdáma = "pious discourse"; the same applies to al-Zamákhashari (467-518/1074-1124 [q.v.]), who, while appearing to take his inspiration from al-Hamadhání and al-Harírî, composed fifty makdámá in which he addresses himself to a number of moral exhortations, also entitled Naqá‘ al-klíb; they would appear to testify to the repentance of the author who has decided, after an illness, to renounce profane literature (see Brockellmann, S I, 511; Blachère and Masnou, 40-1; ed. Cairo 1512, 1525; tr. Rescher, Beitrag, vi, 1913), but, unable to forget that he is also a philologist, he produces a commentary on his own compositions (Yákút, Udbá‘, xii, 193).

Two authors of the 6th/12th century are also credited with makdáma composed in imitation of al-Harírî: al-Hasan b. Sa‘fí, nicknamed Malik al-Nuhtú (498-568/1095-1173; see Yákút, Udbá‘, vii, 123-4; F. de la Granja, 82-4); and al-Suyúthí (d. 519/1124), who, according to F. de la Granja (ms. Berlin 8537/1) and al-Samání (d. 577/1182) of Bagdadh, who only work cited by Yákút (Udbá‘, ii, 282) is a Kitáb Makdáma.

The work of al-Harírî soon became known in Spain, where the most celebrated commentary on it, that of al-Shárí¡í (d. 619/1222 [q.v.]), was written. These makdámá were already being imitated there, apparently, by a slightly younger contemporary of their author, Ibn al-Aghtarkwí (d. 539/1143) in al-Makdáma al-Sawakúsitiyya, which numbering the henceforward traditional fifty, may perhaps, according to F. de la Granja (op. laud., p. xiii) the only Spanish ones which conform to the classical norms; in addition, the other title by which they are known, Kitáb al-Khamis makdama al-luzumiyya, could be an indication of the influence of al-Ma‘arrí and of his Luzumiyya (cf. LUZUM MÁ LA YALZÁM; A. M. al-Abáddí, in RIEEIM, ii/1-2 [1954], 161), two of them, which deal with literary criticism, have been the object of a study on the part of Isbán ‘Abbás (op. laud., 500-1), but the others would doubtless merit closer examination (on the ms., see Brockellmann, S I, 543).

It was also at the beginning of the 6th/12th century that the suzir Abí‘ Amír Ibn Arkám composed a makdama in praise of the Almoravid amir of Granada Tamím b. Yusuf b. Taqání (see R. Arie, art. cit., 206), judging by the fragment which has been preserved by al-Fath b. Khakán (Kala zd al-dá‘ýn, ed. H. D. Redlich, Ein Stamm der Araber aus deren Geschichte, I [1900], 316, 319; see also F. de la Granja, 82-4).
This composition in rhymed prose is related to the rahil of the kasida, which appears in it a fictitious person who engages the hero and a narrator, but he uses simpler language; he имени дает признания автору и приводит некоторые его произведения, которые могут быть интересны для историков и искусствоведов. 

While still dealing with al-Andalus, we may further mention in which the hero is questioned about a number of them to a fakih of Granada named Abū al-Rahmān b. Ahmad b. al-Ḳaṣīr (d. 576/1180; see al-Sa‘īdī,xxxvi [1953], 111-27). An author of Maghribi origin, Ahmad b. Yahyā al-Tilimsānī, also known as Ibn Abī Ḥāḍirāla (725-776 or 777/1325 to 1357-6), who spent most of his literary career in Cairo, was renowned in his day as a writer of makdama and a doctor who eulogises sixteen-al-Salih, presumably himself a chess enthusiast (see Brockelmann, II, 5-6, 1965). 

Too much attention should not be given to the Makdama fi kawaṣīf Baghdad fi l-strawal al-Ḳāiss, which did not survive. In the 8th/14th century, imitations seem to proliferate, often applying to religious or parenetic subjects. 

In the beginning of the 7th/13th century, attention may be drawn to the Makdama fi kawaṣīf Baghdad fi l-strawal al-Ḳāiss published by R. Arie (Notes, 207-14): Khatrat al-tayfi rihlat al-shitār wa l-strawal (a eulogy of Malaga), published by K. and M. al-Ḳāissī, 1952-53. An author of Maghribi origin, Ahmad b. Yahyā al-Tilimsānī, also known as Ibn Abī Ḥāḍirāla (725-776 or 777/1325 to 1357-6), who spent most of his literary career in Cairo, was renowned in his day as a writer of makdama and a doctor who eulogises sixteen-al-Salih, presumably himself a chess enthusiast (see Brockelmann, II, 5-6, 1965). 
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recall that the kādī 'l-ğämâa of Granada, al-Nubahî [q.v.], inserted in his Nuzhat al-Bâṣîr wa l-aḥârîn, in 781/1379, a commentary on his own Makâma makâliyya presented in the form of an erudite, obscure and passionless poetry, between a palm-tree and a fig-tree (see R. Arié, art. cit., 212-12). In Spain in the following century, in 844/1440, a similar calamy to that described by Ibn al-Wardi (see above) is described by Ibrâhîm Pascha, and added a commentary, the Ẓâd al-muṣṭâfîr (printed in Bagdâd in 1924; Brockelmann II, 373; S II, 501). Also encountered are the names of al-Šâhâl al-Makâliî (1007-90/1597-1679; S II, 395), ʿArîf (ed. 1123-1713; S II, 630), Baʿbîd al-ʿAlâwî who produced in 1128/1715 (S II, 601) an imitation of al-Ḥarîrî in which the Nâṣîr al-Ḥaṣîl (the victorious conqueror) recounts the fifty adventures, in India, of Abu ʿl-Ẓafâr al-Ḥindi (see Aḥârî, the "triumphant Indian vaga-bound") under the title al-Makâma al-ḥāziyya (lit. 1264), and al-Dâzjârî (1050-1150/1640-1710; S II, 586).

In Morocco, the genre is represented by Muhammad b. ʿIbas (d. 990/1582) and Muhammad al-Makâlàî (d. 1014/1613-2), whose Makâma bâzâriyya is a eulogy of Muhammad b. Abû Bakr al-Dâlî (d. 1021/1612 [see div. in Suppl.], the son of the founder of the Al-Ġâmî al-dâlîyya [see M. Lakhdar, La vie littéraire au Maroc sous la dynastie califâve (1073-1311/1664-1894), Rabat 1971, 42). Muhammad al-Masûlî (d. 1107-1166/1794-1774) describes this zâwîya and contrasts its destruction in al-Makâma al-fikriyya fi makhâsin al-ʿzawîya al-bâzâriyya, which is of classical structure, with hero and narrator (see Lakhdar, 156-8).

Nemoy (op. laud.) records a ms. (Yale L-182) of al-Makâma al-rûmîyya of al-Bârî (1099-1162/1688-1749 [q.v.]), which is part of his Târif al-ḥamûm wa-taṭfâgîr al-ğãmîm fi ṭ-riḥla ilâ bâlîd al-dâlî [see R. Y. Ebied and M. J. L. Young, Arabic literature in Europe, vol. iv (1711-1779), p. 148]; al-Safâdî (696-764/1296-1363 [q.v.]), a contemporary of the Cretan Ahmad b. Ibrahim al-Rasmî (1106-79/1791-1863), who wrote a probable imitation of the work of al-Bârî, in the same way that al-Ḥarîrî, in the two rûsâlas called al-ṭînîya wa-l-šiṣna, employed only words containing respectively a sâ in and a yôn, Abû Ṭâlib al-Iṣâkî (d. 1094/1684) wrote an apologia of al-Makâma al-isrâṣîrîyya wa-l-tâṣfaṣîyya in which pairs of words which differ only in diacritical points are placed beside each other (Brockelmann, II, 283). A display of erudition is the main characteristic of al-Ḥarîrî's al-ṭâhîṣîyya, which is a eulogy of Ibrahim b. Abû Bakr al-Husaynî al-Dilaîwî (d. 1174/1760) and his son Abu ʿl-Khayr Abû al-Râdhân (d. 1200/1786) use this form (Brockelmann, II, 374, 377, S II, 508) as a means of bringing together, in an entertaining fashion, a whole series of ancient and modern proverbs, the father, in Makâmû l-amûtâl al-ṣârîra (ca. 1324), and the son, in al-Makâmû l-amûtâl al-ṣârîra (ms. Berlin 8528/3).
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al-'Azíz al-Gízání at Tunis in 1972 and called al-Bdhiyya (on the founder of the zawiya al-Bdhiyya... (ibid., iv, 335), al-Shafi'I (S II, 908), Ibn Rayyan (S II, 909), Ibrahim b. IqI b.
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Madjma al-bahrayn, [34x-20]YAZIDJI], who, with his Arabic literature, it was the best means of stimulating the task of reviving this genre in accordance with the classical norms, believing that, as a genre exclusive to 123-9); (op. laud., [q.v.]), Ibrahim (1872-1932 who also aspired, although with less success, to present a satirical portrait of society in the form of a long makama (see H. Pères, in B. Ét. Or., x [1943-4], 13 ff.; Kotsarev, op. laud., 104-7). The Wadjdl, published in Cairo in 1910, contain eighteen "sessions" which have not attracted much interest (but see the Tunisian review al-Makdmdt, xxxi ff.). Finally, it is possible that other writers of the first half of the 20th century have composed as rhetorical exercises or for a specific purpose, makham which have not come to the attention of literary critics and historians. This applies notably to Amín al-Rhibáni (1876-1940 [q.v.]), whose RihdnIyydt contain (ed. 1956, ii, 83-6) Makdma al-kabhdgIyya, where the narrator is a mothgrub ("udhdha) searching for an attractive book in a library.

The above list cannot be regarded as exhaustive; it is based essentially on the article Makama by Brockelmann in EP and his Geschichte der arabischen Literatur, the material of which has already been exploited by Blachere and Masnou (op. laud., 123-9); our intention has been to complete this inventory by means of less ancient works but, in order to achieve a more satisfactory result, it would be necessary to go through recently published or still unedited biographical works, as well as catalogues of manuscript collections, and to carry out research in certain libraries whose riches have not been explored. As our list has been compiled in approximately chronological order, no mention has been made of a dozen or so fairly late authors whose dates have not been precisely located. Blachere and Masnou mention the following: al-SukkarI (Brockelmann, S II, 906), al-KhánimI (S II, 908), al-Há'írI (Rescher, Beitrag, iv, 328), al-Sghání (ibid., iv, 334), al-ShírI (ibid., ii, 908), Ibn Rayyán (S II, 909), Ibrahim b. 'AmI b.

Brockelmann also mentions al-DjázárI (S II, 758, III, 379), al-HámpI (S III, 338) and 'Abd Alláh Pashá FikrI (d. 1307/1890 [q.v.]), whose works (al-'Ajl al-fikrIyya, Bulletin 1915) contain a number of makham including al-Makdmdt al-fikrIyya fi l-mamdhkI al-bdIyya which has been published separately in Cairo in 1289 (Brockelmann, II, 475, S II, 722). Some Makdmdt by Mahmúd Rashíd EfendI were edited in Cairo in 1913 (S III, 85). In 1907, in Cairo, Muhammad TawfIk al-BakrI published a collection of makham, Saharíd al-lAItaIa, a number of which were chosen by 'Uthmán ShákIr and included, in 1927, in his work entitled al-lAItaIa fi 'l-adhdh.

It is not our intention to dwell here on the Hadith Isá b. HýjIám al-ImwlyáhI (1868-1930 [q.v.]) of which the first edition in book form dates from 1907; this "novel", which is both the first major achievement of 20th century Arabic literature and the swan-song of classical literature, has been the object of a number of studies, the list of which is to be found in G. Widner, Beiträge zur neueren literatur, iv, 237 ff., s.v. al-Makdma. In 1913 appears a handsome edition of 20th century have composed, as rhetorical exercises or for a specific purpose, makham which have not come to the attention of literary critics and historians. This applies notably to Amín al-Rhibáni (1876-1940 [q.v.]), whose RihdnIyydt contain (ed. 1956, ii, 83-6) Makdma al-kabhdgIyya, where the narrator is a mothgrub ("udhdha) searching for an attractive book in a library. Some other works which helped to attract the public, for didactic purposes, a successful imitation of al-Harin; in his work, which nevertheless contains sixty makham (instead of the fateful number of fifty) accompanied by his own commentary, the hero and the narrator meet sometimes in the town, but other times in the desert, a traditional setting for eloquent speech (see also Blachere and Masnou, 49-50).
MAKAMA

Ahmad b. al-Hādī (S II, 909), al-ANTIṣ̄a (Rescher, iv, 116), al-Munayyir (S II, 1101), al-Husayn (Rescher, iv, 311), al-Raʃīd (Rescher, iv, 399), al-Umāri al-Mawṣili (Rescher, iv, 199).

In general, however, it seems certain that the most significant representatives of the genre have not escaped scrutiny, giving rise to the works enumerated in the bibliographies of the notices devoted to them by the present Encyclopaedia. But alongside those authors whose makdāna are known only by a sometimes misleading title or by a brief mention in one or other of the bibliographical works, there are a number whose surviving works deserve, if not an edition, at least a fairly thorough examination, in order to allow for a more confident judgment. The general observations which follow are therefore still fragmentary.

Of the characteristics of primitive makdama, all the authors have essentially retained the use of rhymed prose, more or less rhythmic and mingled with verse, and, taking the example of al-Hamadhānī and especially of al-Ḥarīrī, a vocabulary obscure to the point of being sometimes impenetrable; furthermore, sajadi, which sometimes goes to acrobatic extremes, is all the less likely to make use of simple language since the object of many of the authors is to make a display of their verbal dexterity. Quite apart from this common feature, the presence of two characters is not always retained or, if it is, so that the narrator and the hero are the same person in a large number of makdāna, where this device is still retained.

From a theoretical point of view, the “savan”, which belongs to adab is, by this definition, certainly designed to entertain, but also to instruct, since it is inconceivable that, originally, prose literature could have lacked any purpose. While the didactic function was to be served by means of the educational adventures ing content, it was soon the form which fulfilled this role to the detriment of the essence, through the accumulation, scarcely bearable today for the average reader, of rare and unnecessary words, through a disagreeable pedantry and an impenetrable obscurity. The first objective, for its part, was to be realised, as in the case of adab, by a mixture of the serious and the joking, by the interesting quality of the adventures rather than the theatrical element introduced by the two imaginary characters. Now, just as the rīsāla, being a convenient means of display on the part of authors full of false modesty, tended to be nothing more than a rhetorical exercise, in the same way the makdama, while supplying authors with an opportunity safely to express personal opinions in fictitious guise, enabled many others simply to make a show of their lexicographical expertise, at the same time, however, aiming at a certain aestheticism, one is tempted to say, at art for art’s sake. This tendency is an expression of the love of Arabic-speakers for fine verbal style, and one gains the impression that an exquisite form sometimes conceals nothing more than a total vacuum. It is, however, not impossible that at least some of the compositions which appear most hollow lend themselves to different interpretations at a level which has yet to be ascertained.

The authors of manuals on the history of Arabic literature, when tackling the subject of makdama, rightly cite al-Hamadhānī and al-Ḥarīrī as those whose works are considered the first milestone on the path followed by this original genre; subsequently, they maintain their silence and, for the next seven centuries are unaware of one author worthy of mention as an eminent representative of the “ sessions”, which is surprising. There are a number of unfortunate declines; more detailed studies will perhaps enable one to correct this severe judgment, but the fact remains that, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, it is necessary to wait until the 19th century to find, in the Makdama al-Balakhi, a third significant milestone, although the new lease of life given to the makdama by this author did not inspire any notable works, perhaps because his object was far too didactic. In any case, the fourth and final milestone was planted by al-Muwaylihī, whose Ḥaddīth liḍī b. Ḥyānam is sometimes described as a novel. But at this time rhymed prose had already begun to lose its appeal, and the educated public turned for entertainment, either in the original, or in translation, to foreign works which inspired modern Arabic literature to the detriment of a henceforward discredited genre.

The theatrical element contained in classical makdama has not been satisfactorily exploited, for we do not see many playwrights drawing from them their inspiration and staging some of them. Alī al-Raṣī (Some aspects of modern Arabic drama, in R.C. Oste (ed.), Studies in modern Arabic literature, Warmminster 1975, 1272 ff.) thinks that the shadow-plays of Ibn Dānāyīl [q.v.] are linked to Arabic literature through the makdama and points out that the Moroccan al-Ṭayyib al-Ṣidīkhī has based himself on the famous Madīra [q.v.] and other sections of al-Hamadhānī to write plays which have met a great success; but this is always an isolated case, so that the narrator and the hero are the same person in a large number of makdāna, where this device is still retained.

In Persia, particularly highly esteemed were the twenty-four “sessions” which Ḥamid al-Dīn Balkhī (d. 559/1156) composed in 551/1156 in imitation of the two great Arabic authors (Ḥādīdī Khalīfī, no. 12716; lith. Tehran and Cawnpore); some of them consist of debates between a young man and an old, a Sunni and a Shiʿī, a doctor and an astronomer; others contain descriptions of summer and autumn, love and death, a zarĀḥ, and mystical discussions, but the sense is always sacrificed to the form (see H. Massē, Du genre “Débat”, 143-4). The example of Ḥamīd al-Dīn does not seem to have been much followed; nevertheless, the journalist Adīb al-Māmālik (d. 1917) composed a series of makdama (Browne, iv, 349). In Spain, Yehūdā ben Shlōmō Ḥarāzi (1165-1225 A.D.) first translated al-Ḥarīrī into Hebrew (in 502/1205), then composed fifty makdāna which he entitled Sefer Tabkemāni; in these “sessions” the style of the model is imitated by means of a very skilful use of Biblical quotations; as for the content, it has been noted that Ḥarāzi was inspired by a makdama of Ibn al-Shāhid which we have mentioned above (see S. M. Stern, in Tarbiz, xvii [1946], 198-202; J. Schirmann, ibid., xxii [1952], 198-202; J. Razahhī, ibid., xxvi [1957], 424-59; the work had been the object of partial translations into German, by Kraft (in Literaturblatt des Orientis, iii [1940], 196-8, xiv, 213-5) and L. Dukes (Eenhansulien, etc., Vienna 1873, 92-4), before being published by P. de Lagarde, under the title Iudas Harizii Macamae (Göttingen 1881, 2nd ed. Hanover 1924).

A contemporary of Ḥarāzi, Jacob ben Eleazar of Toledo (beginning of the 13th century A.D.) for his part composed a Makdama which is a sequel to the last, with a narrator, but no hero; this work has been studied by J. Schirmann, Les contes rimés de Jacob ben
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Eleazar de Tolede (in Etudes d'orientalisme ... Lévi-Provençal, ii, 285-97). In addition, J. M. Millás Valliercosa mentions, in La poesía sagrada hebraico-española (Barcelona 1948, 133-4, 136-7, 144) other Jewish poets in Spain whose works could be compared to makāmā.

The archbishop of Nisinian, ʿEbedeyrahū ʿAbdul-Ḥaʃīḏū (d. 1318 A.D.) composed in 1290-1, in imitation of al-Ḥarīrī, fifty ‘sessions’ in Syriac verse of religious and edifying content, divided into two parts designated under the names Enoc and Elias; he himself explained, in a commentary written in 1316, the extremely artificial language abounding with acrostics and verses which can be read indifferently from right to left or from left to right (see Chabot, Litérature syriaque, Paris 1934, 141); the first half of these ‘sessions’ was published by Gabriel Cardahi in Beirut, in 1899, under the title Paradaisa dha Edhen seu Paradissus Edom carmina autore Mar Ebedes Sobiensis.

Apparently there is no makāmā composed or translated into Latin or Romance during the Middle Ages, but it is quite clear that the hero of the picaresque novel, the picaro, closely resembles in many ways the characters of Abu l-ฟาṭḥ al-İskandarl or Abu Ṣayd al-Sarāḏī, and the diffusion in Spain of the work of al-Hamadhānī, and later and more significantly that of al-Ḥarīrī, suggests a direct or indirect influence of the makāmā. The works which have been undertaken in this area (in particular by Menéndez Pelayo, Orígenes de la novela, 1943, i, 65 ff. ; A. González Palencia, Del Lazarillo a Quevedo, Madrid 1946, 3-9) appear as so far inconclusive. On the other hand, A. Rumeau (Notes au Lazarillo, in Langue néo-latinæ, no. 172 (May 1965), 3-12) has shown that the central episode, La casa lorigga y oscura, of the Lazarillo de Tormes is closely related to an anecdote mentioned by al-Baghīṣī (Mustafar, tr. Rat, ii, 670), but already figuring in the work of al-Bayḥakī, who probably borrowed it from al-Ḏāḥīṯ; thus it is likely that the long road travelled from the faṭā to the nukaddi of the latter to the picaro passes through the makāmā. This question, related to that of the influence of the 1001 Nights, has been recently discussed in an extensive thesis by M. Tarchouna, Les margitans dans les recits picaresques (Paris 1983). Several ‘maitrise’ theses deal with al-Hariri, fifty ‘sessions’ in Syriac verse of the same name, composed in 1290-1, in imitation of the Hariri; the first half of these was published by Gabriel Cardahi in Beirut, in 1899, under the title Paradaisa dha Edhen seu Paradissus Edom carmina autore Mar Ebedes Sobiensis.

The house of Kaki were local rulers of Așkwâr in Râkûnîk, the eastern part of Gīlân in the Caspian coastlands. Makan rose to prominence in Tabaristan in the service of the ‘Alid princes there, and as the ‘Alids themselves dissolved into internecine rivalries, he became the contender with a fellow-commander, Asfâr b. ʿṢhirîyâ [see Asfâr b. ʿṢirawayh] for control over the Caspian lands. Makan allied with the Ḥasanid al-Ṯâlîd al-Ṣaghîr al-Ḥasan b. al-Ḳâsim [q.v. in Suppl.] against the latter’s rival Djaʿfar b. al-Ḥasan b. al-ʿUṯrîqî and his supporter Asfâr, but was worsted in battle in 316/928 by the rule of the ‘Alids in Tabaristan, and Makan had temporarily to flee in to Daylam. His fortunes nevertheless revived, and by 318/930 he was master of Tabaristan, Gūrgān and even of Niṣāḥūr in Khūrāsān, and had repelled an attack by Asfâr’s supplanter Mardwājîd b. Zîyâr [q.v.], master of Ray (319/931).

Mardwājîd’s clan could not be stemmed by Makan, who lost Tabaristan and had to retire to Sarāmîn territory in Khūrāsān, receiving from the amīr Nāṣr b. Ahmad [q.v.] the governorship of Kirmān. However, when Mardwājîd was assassinated in 323/935 by his slave troops (according to Gardizī, at Makan’s instigation), Makan returned from the east to the Caspian region, established himself as governor of Gūrgān for the ‘Alids, and allied with another local leader, Mardwājîd’s brother Wusqâmīr, founder of the subsequent Ziyârī dynasty [q.v.]. With Wusqâmīr’s support, he threw off the control of Būḥārā, but the amīr sent him against him an army under Abū ʿAlī Ahmad b. Muḥṭadī Câghînâ. Makan was dislodged from the town of Gūrgān and compelled to fall back on Ray; however, he was able to remain in the eastern part of the town called Iškâhâbâd on the Dângmân road, the forces of Wusqâmīr and Makan were defeated on 21 Rabi’ i 329/25 December 940. Makan was killed and his head sent first to Būḥārâ and then to the caliph in Baghdād.

Mākān’s career is typical of several Daylamī commanders in the early stages of the ‘Daylamī intermezzo’ of Persian history, when the decline of caliphal power in northern Persia allowed various local interests to vie for power there; but in the long run, it was the Būyīds who were able to establish the most enduring domination (ʿAlī b. Bûya, the later Imām al-Dawlâ [q.v.]), seems to have taken an important step forward in his career by joining Mākān’s army as a commander, perhaps in ca. 316/928, but left Mākān when the latter was temporarily eclipsed by Mardwājîd, see above). Collateral relatives of Mākān, the family of his cousin al-Ḥasan b. Frûzān, continued to rule locally in Daylam till the end of the century.

Bibliography: 1. Sources: Masʿūdī, Muruǧî, ix, 6-8 = §§ 3578-9; Arīb, 137-8; Miskawayh, in Eclipse of the Abbasid caliphate, i, 275 ff., ii, 3-6; Gardizī, ed. Nāmī, 30-1, ed. Ḥabībī, 83-5, 153; Hamadhānī, Taḵmāla, ed. Kānānî, 1, index; Ibn Isdîyâr, ed. Browne, 208 ff.; Nūḥī, Aqūdī, Arūqī Samarkandī, Cāhā makâlā, ed. Kāzwīnī and
Makassar, since 1972 renamed “Ujung Pandang” with reference to one of its oldest quarters around the harbour, is the capital of the Indonesian Province of Sulawesi Selatan (South Celebes). It has 434,168 inhabitants, among them 332,618 Muslims. After World War II, Makassar was the capital of the Dutch-sponsored East Indonesian State (until 1950). It still remains the dominant cultural, administrative, economic and traffic centre in East Indonesia, its population comprising notable minorities of Torajas, Minangkabaus, Ambonese, Tampuers, etc.

Its name “Makassar” originates from the people living in its hinterland, stretching over the most southern part of the south-western peninsula of Sulawesi. The population of the island of Selayar, to the south, is usually also counted among the Makassars, although their dialect shows a number of differences from genuine Makassarese. Their neighbours to the north are the Buginese, who are closely related to the Makassars in their customs, manners, and language. At the present, there are about 1,250,000 people living in the predominantly Makassarese-speaking kabupaten (regencies) of Gowa, Takalar, Jene Ponto, Bantaeng, Maros, and Pangkajene (here mixed with Buginese).

Originally, as H. J. Friedericy had pointed out by examining the old Bugis-Makassarese epic La Galigo, Makassarese society was divided into three main groups: the ana’ karaeng, or family of the king, the to deceng, or free people, and the ata, or slaves, who were either captives, those who could not repay their debts, or who had acted against the adat (customary law). Since the beginning of the 20th century, slavery has been abolished. An outstanding feature of the character of the Makassars (and Bugineses) is called sar’. Laws and regulations are divided into two parts: the rules of adat are broken; it usually leads to revenge.

Little is known about the history of Makassar in pre-Islamic times. In the middle of the 14th century, the area was under the rule of the Javanese kingdom of Majapahit. According to the chronicles of Gowa and Tallo’, which are the names of the two ancient Makassarese kingdoms, Gowa originally consisted of an alliance of nine small districts, each under a noble; after the government had passed into the hands of one man and the kingdom had expanded, to include for example the lands of what was later Tallo’, Gowa is said, after the death of the sixth king (the first one described as an ordinary mortal), to have been divided between his two sons; the one became ruler of Gowa and the other of Tallo’. Both kingdoms usually had close relations and were known to the Europeans as the “kingdom of the Makassars”. About the year 1512, one year after the conquest of Malacca by the Portuguese, “Malays” were given permission to settle in Makassar and to build a mosque in their quarter. Also, in other ports on the west coast of South Sulawesi, Muslim traders began to settle. Those in Pangkajene were resisting tendencies among the family of the local ruler to adopt the Christian belief. But on the whole, during the 16th century, the Makassars and their rulers were still adhering to their traditional religion, and an even-handed policy was pursued towards the Muslim traders, most of whom originated from Johore, Malacca, Patani, Bantam, and Tallo’, who thus were forced to convert to Islam. The karaeng of Tallo’, Tu Njasuru’ (first half of the 16th century) is said to have travelled to Malacca and Johore for trade reasons. During the reign of Tu Njajo as karaeng of Gowa (1565-1590), the ulam of Ternate, Bâb Allah, visited Makassar about 1580. Besides trying to solve their political disputes, Bâb Allah, a fervent enemy of the Portuguese who had murdered his father, urged the karaeng to adopt Islam. It seems doubtful that he had any success, and it was not until 9 Djumâd I 1014/22 September 1605 that the young karaeng of Tallo’, Mallingkaang Daeng Nyoni, who at the same time acted as patih (prime minister) of Gowa, publicly confessed the Islamic shahâda. Later he was known as Sultan ‘Abd Allah Awwal al-Islâm. The karaeng of Gowa, I Mangu’ rangi Daeng Nara’bîa, soon followed his example and adopted the name Sultan ‘Alâ al-Dîn. On 18 Radjab 1016/16 November 1607, the islamisation of the two Makassarese kingdoms was officially declared to be completed. This was followed by successful wars against the Buginese neighbours, who thus were forced to convert to Islam too. One of the most celebrated teachers of Islam at that time was the miraculous Dato’ riBandang, a mystic from Kota Tengah in the Minangkabau, who is said to have been a pupil of Sunan Giri in Java. Other outstanding teachers were Dato’ riTiro and Dato’ Patimang. Their tombs became centres of worship.

In the first half of the 17th century, the kingdom of Makassar extended very much, so that it brought under its suzerainty almost the whole of Sulawesi, Buton, Flores, Sumbawa, Lombok and the east coast of Kalimantan. In 1609, the Dutch East India Company was granted permission to establish a factory, but disputes about the trade with the Moluccas gave cause to repeated warfare and treaties which reduced the sovereignty of the Makassarese kings, and led to the expulsion of the Portuguese and later, in 1667, of the British as well. A treaty dictated by Admiral C. Speelman in 1667, which was reconfirmed in 1669, gave the right to the Dutch to settle there permanently. These wars are the topic of the Sja'ir Perang Mangkasa³.

Although the main port in South Sulawesi was (and is) Makassar, the most skilled sailors and shipmakers, however, were not the Makassars but the Buginese, especially those from Wajo, who formed in Makassar—like in some other major ports, e.g. in East Kalimantan—their own community supervised by the matau. The third matau, Amannna Gappa, assisted by two of his colleagues from other ports, compiled in about 1676 a code of trade and navigation law which reflects at the same time their understanding of the cosmic order, together with Islamic and traditional elements.

Both the Makassars and likewise the Buginese are usually considered as strong, and sometimes fanatical confessors of Islam. Generally speaking, most of the legal duties of Islam are conscientiously observed. But this does not prevent them from maintaining, at the same time, pre-Islamic religious convictions, and a number of “mystical movements” are still in ex-
istence or are even gaining in strength, especially among the villagers, but also among the Muslims in the eastern countries, there remained through the Middle Ages (and also later) a marked difference between the Persian and

or Association of Mushalla Indonesia Mutahhidin, which was published since 1906 for some measures of length and surface area, see MISAHA.

which was imposed in his empire a uniform system of weights and measures, and introduced a much heavier pound than the Roman libra of 327.45 g, neither Muhammad nor 'Umar made such a reform; and as later rulers could not claim canonical character for their systems of weights and measures, their bewildering diversity was in the Muslim countries even greater than in mediaeval Europe, where Charlemagne's system remained as a firm basis. The weights and measures which were used in the countries conquered by the Muslims were however not altogether different, as projecting original conquerors had introduced their metrological systems in other countries and, secondly, a mutual influence shaped them to a certain extent. For the needs of the fiscal administration [see BAYT AL-MAL and DIWAN] and the market supervision [see HUBB], every governor and finance director of the provinces of the caliphal empire had to enforce what the caliph decreed concerning weights and measures. But rulers who had in mind to establish a truly new regime fixed new weights and measures, just as they built up an administration different from that of their predecessors. The 'Ayyubid prince 'Adud al-Dawla, al-Mandr in its orientation. A branch of the modernist Muhammadiyah movement was established in 1929.

In 1950, Makassar became the starting point of the 'Darul-Islam' rebellion led by Kahar Muzakkar. In 1963 came the establishment of the I'titan Masjid and Mushalla Indonesia Mutahhidin, or Association of Central and Southeast Sulawesi, in the Moluccas and in Irian Jaya.


MAKAYIL (A.), *measures of capacity* (sing. mizān; var. mawzil, sing. mizān), and MAWZIL (A.) *weights* (sing. mizān). On the measures of length and surface area, see MIṣĀBA.

1. In the Arabic, Persian and Turkish lands. In the history of Oriental metrology, the spread of Islam meant no abrupt break. Whereas Charlemagne imposed in his empire a uniform system of weights and measures and introduced a much heavier pound than the Roman libra of 327.45 g, neither Muhammad nor 'Umar made such a reform; and as later rulers could not claim canonical character for their systems of weights and measures, their bewildering diversity was in the Muslim countries even greater than in mediaeval Europe, where Charlemagne's system remained as a firm basis. The weights and measures which were used in the countries conquered by the Muslims were however not altogether different, as projecting original conquerors had introduced their metrological systems in other countries and, secondly, a mutual influence shaped them to a certain extent. For the needs of the fiscal administration [see BAYT AL-MAL and DIWAN] and the market supervision [see HUBB], every governor and finance director of the provinces of the caliphal empire had to enforce what the caliph decreed concerning weights and measures. But rulers who had in mind to establish a truly new regime fixed new weights and measures, just as they built up an administration different from that of their predecessors. The 'Ayyubid prince 'Adud al-Dawla, the Fātimids, the II-Khan Ghāzān and the Turcoman Uzun Hasan introduced new metrological systems.

For the study of Muslim weights one has recourse to the accounts in literary sources, the analysis of glass weights which served as standards and, hardly, to data in European sources, such as Merchants' Guides. But despite the relatively rich information, research in Muslim metrology has not resulted in generally-accepted conclusions. From the accounts of the Muslim authors and the archaeological findings, different values have been calculated. The data in the European sources mostly point to smaller ones, which cannot be considered as mistaken.

The names of the weights and measures of capacity point to their origins: the rafī, the most common weight, is an Araamic form of the Greek λίτρον; the kintār (100 rafīs) is obviously the Latin centenarius; and the kafiz is the Persian name of a measure of capacity. When the Arabs conquered the lands of the Near East, all these names were already used for different weights and measures. The mudā, a measure of capacity, was in ʿIrāk (about) 1.05 litres, in Syria of 3.673 litres, and in Egypt of 2.5 litres. The diversity of the weights and measures called by the same name was a phenomenon common to all Muslim countries. Almost every district had its own weights and measures, and in some countries those used in the capitals were different from those of the countryside. This is what the Arabic geographers tell about ʿIrāk and its capital Rāvīn, about Khūzistān and its capital al-Ahwāz and about Aleppo (Halab) and its province. Further different weights were used for various commodities: in many provinces meat was weighed by a rafī different from that of other articles. In all provinces of Upper Egypt there was a rafī for meat and bread and another for other commodities. In many countries there were particular rafīs for pepper, silk, etc. For grain, one used in all Arab countries measures of capacity; for liquids one had other measures of this kind. One learns, however, from the sources that in course of time there was a trend in several countries to use for liquids (e.g. olive oil) weights, and secondly, there was a tendency to replace weights (and measures of capacity) by bigger ones. Despite the mutual influence between the metrological systems of the Near Eastern countries, there remained through the Middle Ages (and also later) a marked difference between the Persian and
Arab countries (although there was some overlapping). The mutual influence and the age-old mediaeval Merchants' Guides point to a smaller so 10 weight dirhams that of 150 dirhams, i.e. 463 g, used for spices.

just as 10 silver dirham was the mithkdl. The mithkdl was also divided into mustard grains each. The writers usually give the value of a (real) weight in this unity was not equal everywhere. For in Central calculations. Decourdemanche concluded that it was of 3.0989 g, and this later value was taken by Sauvaire as basis for his in 1845 concluded that it was of 3.0884 g, whereas a commission appointed by the Egyptian government was equal to 3.0884 g, whereas the Damascenus rail was in the Mamlik period still equal to 1.85 kg, but the Italian Merchants' Guides make it 600 light Venetian pounds, i.e. 1.8072 kg. The rail of the northern provinces of Syria was in the 7th/13th and 8th/14th centuries, according to the Arabic sources it was of 2.22 kg, which was considered as the canonical. Thus a metrological theory was elaborated. Every weight was supposed to consist of a certain number of weight dirhams (to be distinguished from the weight of the coin called by the same name). The French scholars who came with Bonaparte to Egypt found that this dirham was equal to 3.0884 g, whereas a commission appointed by the Egyptian government in 1845 concluded that it was of 3.0884 g, and this latter value was taken by Sauvaire as basis for his calculations. Decourdemanche concluded that it was 3.148 g, and Hinz 3.125 g. But the Egyptian government established in 1924 that it is 3.12 g, and both the glass weights of the caliphal period and the data in the late mediaeval Merchants' Guides point to a smaller value. In addition, mediaeval Muslim writers say that this unity was not equal everywhere. For in Central Syria it was, according to them, lighter than in other Near Eastern countries. Another standard weight unity was the mithkdl. Just as 10 silver dirham was the mithkdl of Damascus, it was equal to 440 g, whereas the mithkdl of the Damascenus rail was reckoned at 164/5 kirdts. According to the Arabic sources, the mithkdl of Damascus was in the Middle Ages equal to 3.0884 g, whereas the Damascenus rail was of 2.1688 g. In the 11th-13th/17th-19th centuries the rail of Aleppo was slightly heavier and weighed 2.28 kg. Even in Palestine every district had its own rail; that of Jerusalem (also used in Nablus) was in the Middle Ages of 2.47 kg and in the 19th century of 2.78 kg.

Grain was measured in southern Syria and in Palestine by the ghirâra, a measure of capacity which was however of different size in every province. The ghirâra of Damascus was equal to 731/2 mudds, containing 2.84 kg of wheat each, or to 3 Egyptian ir-dabbâh. So it contained 208.74 kg of wheat. But in Jerusalem, the ghirâra contained, at least at the end of the Middle Ages, three times as much, sc. 626.22 kg of wheat, and in Qâzza 313.1 kg. In northern Syria one used for weighing grains the makkâk. Even this was a name given to different measures. The makkâk of Aleppo and Tripoli contained 83.5 kg of wheat and that of Hamât 92.77 kg, according to Ibn Faqî Allah al-'^Umarî and al-Kalkashândî. But in the period of the Crusades, the makkâk was smaller. Ibn al-'^Adîn recounts that the makkâk of Aleppo was in the 6th/12th century half of the makkâk of his own day, so that it must then have been of about 40 kg of wheat. Once more one becomes aware of a characteristic trend of the development of weights and measures in the mediaeval Near East: that there was a tendency to use heavier and bigger ones. In the 19th century one used in Syria the kayî of 28.18 kg of wheat.

Judging from the glass weights found in Egypt, the standard rail in Umayyad times was in that country equal to 440 g, whereas the 'Abbâsids introduced a lighter rail, weighing 390-400 g. But in the 'Abbâsids Egypt also a "big rail" (rail khabîr) of 493 g was used. Under the Fâtimids, several rails were used. According to the Arabic writers of that period and shortly afterwards, such as Elijya of Nisibîn, writing in the first half of the 5th/11th century, al-Mâghâzî of the late 6th/12th century and Ibn Mâmmâtî, at the beginning of the 7th/13th century, and a later text referring to a happening in the early 5th/11th century, they were the following (rail dividing the weight of 8 dirhams, i.e. 444.9 g, used for weighing bread, meat and other articles; that of 150 dirhams, i.e. 463 g, used for spices
(and therefore called fulfuli, pepper ratl) and also for cotton; the ratl laythi of 200 dirhams, i.e. 964 g, used under the rule of the Ayūhids, reckoned at 720 (later 700) light Venetian pounds, i.e. 216.885 g. Weights in ʿIrāk, where the old Persian tradition prevailed, were altogether different from those used in Syria and in Egypt, although some had the same name. The ratl of Baghdād which was equal to 401.674 g (according to others, to 397.26 g) (130 or 128 4/7 dirhams respectively) was considered as the “canonical” ratl of the Muslims, because it was used from the days of the first caliphs. Al-Muqaddasi recounts that this ratl was also used in Upper Mesopotamia. But a short time later, Eliya of Nisibin says that in his native town one had a ratl of 926.49 g (210 mittāḥils) and he mentions also a ratl of Balad as being twice as much, i.e. 1.8529 kg. His contemporary Naṣīr-i Khusrāw mentions the ratl of Mayyāfārīkīn which was equal to 1.483 kg. The measures of capacity which were used in Egypt for a long time under the Ayyubids, one began to weigh olive oil by the kīnār (ratl) ġarvī, as is borne out by an account of Ibn Mammātī.

For great quantities of various commodities, one used some kinds of “loads”. The kīmml was reckoned at 600 “Egyptian ratls”, i.e. 266 kg, but as far as spices were concerned it consisted of 500 ratls only, i.e. 222.45 kg. This latter unity is that which the Italian traders called the spīrta and reckoned at 720 (later 700) light Venetian pounds, i.e. 216.885 g.
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exaggeration. In Rayy, the capital of Djibal, one had a rail of 300 dirhams, i.e. 926.94 g. This rail was also used in some provinces of Adharbâyjân, as in those of Khûrân and Urmîya. But outside Rayy, one used in Djibal a rail which was the double of the Ravy one, and in other provinces of Adharbâyjân one used the rail of Baghdad. The rail of Ardabil weighed, according to al-Îstakhî, 1,040 dirhams, i.e. 3,213 kg, and according to al-Mukaddasî 1,200 dirhams, i.e. 3.7 kg. In Shiraz one weighed bread and meat by the rail of Baghâdâd, whereas other commodities were weighed by the same rail as that used in Ardabil (eight times as much as that of Baghâdâd). The standard weight for small quantities of dry (and even liquid commodities) was in most provinces of Persia the mana (also called manâd), which had spread widely in western Persia. But even mana was a name given to different weights. In the province of Khûzistân, outside the town of al-Ahwaz, it was equal to 4 rails of Baghâdâd, so that it weighed 1.6 kg. In the neighbouring province of Pârs, one used in some towns, like Arradjan, a mana of 1.2 kg (equal to 3 Baghâdâd rails) and in others one of 926.94 g. In Isfâhân one used a mana of 400 dirhams, i.e. 1,253 kg, and in Fâsâ one of 300 dirhams, i.e. 926.94 g. The mana of Rayy was of 1,853 kg, and that of other towns of Djibal 1.235 kg, and in Fasa one of 300 dirhams, i.e. 926.94 g. This rail was indeed fixed at exactly 3 kg. In 1926 the same standard weight in the whole kingdom of the Il-Khâns, which was the double of the Rayy one, was also the standard weight of the provinces of Asia Minor. According to the reports of the Arabic authors by law, and in 1935 the metric system was introduced, weighing 288 kg, and at present a kharwâr of 297 kg is widespread (although others are used). In the Muslim regions of Asia Minor one used, according to Elyia of Nîsîbîn, in the 5th/11th century a rail which was equal to 317.69 g, but later authors say that the rail vûmî weighed 120 dirhams, i.e. 370.776 kg. Ibn Fadl Allâh al-Îmârî, who wrote in the first half of the 8th/14th century, mentions the different rails of several provinces of Asia Minor. According to him, one used in some (as in those of Antîlya, Aksarây and Karâ Haşar) a rail of 1.779 kg; in Bursa a rail of 9.64 kg; and in Kântâmûrî a rail of 7.118 kg. As to the rail of Siwâs, the contemporary Pegolotti says that it was of 4.8 kg, whereas one learns from an Arabic source that it was of 4.618 kg. In the 18th century Istanbul had a rail of 2.8 kg, and Konya had in the 19th century a rail of 481 g. Beside these different rails, one used everywhere in the Ottoman empire another weight, the âkka, which was equal to 1.283 kg. For grain, one used in the Middle Ages in the Turkish provinces of Asia Minor measures of capacity, which in some cases were equal to the Egyptian mudd. Ibn Fadl Allâh al-Îmârî lists them and says also that in Bursa one used a mudd which was bigger by a quarter. In the Ottoman period the mudd contained 513 kg of wheat (being of 666.4 l). In North Africa the rail of Baghâdâd, being considered as the canonical, was the most common as long as the Æbbâsîds exercised suzerainty there. The Fâtimids, however, introduced a heavier rail, which had been previously used for weighing pepper. It was reckoned at 140 dirhams, i.e. it was equal to 432,572 g, according to the detailed account of al-Mukaddasî. Ibn Hawkâl, who probably describes conditions prevailing at the beginning of their rule, says that meat was weighed in al-Kayrawân by a rail of 128 dirhams, i.e. 393.49 g, whereas other commodities were weighed by a rail of 4.5 kg. Elyia of Nîsîbîn gives for the common Maghribi rail of 137 1/4 dirhams, thereby confirming the account of al-Mukaddasî. Ibn Hawkâl’s report about a heavy rail of al-Kayrawân refers certainly to that used in this town, according to the later al-Bakrî, for figs, nuts and other victuals, and this was 10 times heavier than the pepper rail. The latter author gives also some data about the weights used in various other provinces of the Maghribi, in the post-Fâtimid period there. According to him, one used in Tenes, Melïla and Nakrî, a rail of 330 dirhams, i.e. 1.019 kg, whereas meat was both in Tenes and in other towns weighed by much heavier rails. Ibn Bââsîa makes two statements about the common Maghribi rail: in one he says that it was equal to a quarter of a Damascene rail, that is 463.47 g, and in another he says that it was 1/4 of an Egyptian rail, i.e. 356.164 g. From Pegolotti, one learns that one used in the first half of the 8th/14th century in Tunis a rail of 490.7 g. For grains, one had in the Maghribi various mudds. According to al-Bakrî, there was used in Fàs a small mudd of 4.311, but in most places bigger units were used. Al-Mukaddasî says that in al-Kayrawân a mudd was used which equaled 201 l, and al-Bakrî reports that the people of Tâhût had a mudd of 243 l (or a rational mudd of 28.5 l), whereas other provinces, such as in Tunisia in the 19th century the külse of 10.08 l and the matsu, twice its weight. In Muslim Spain, a rail of 503.66 g was com-
monly used. But for weighing meat, one had a raf" four times as heavy. For grain, one used a kafiz ... Firishta [q.vv.]. Ibn Battuta (iii, 290, tr. Gibb, iii, 695), describing the famine of 734/1334, refers to the Dihll weighing by a 4 containing 2 1/2 i.e. 1.12 kg; rails, rath was equal to 12 the kulla rail ...ery difficulties in interpreting references before the 19th century. An attempt was made by the East India Company in 1833 to standardise the weights system in Regulation VII, “A regulation for altering the weight of the Furruckabad [i.e. Farrukhabad] rupee and for assimilating it to the legal currency of the Madras and Bombay Presidencies; for adjusting the weight of the Company’s sicca rupee, and for fixing a standard unit of weight for India”. This provided for the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 ratti</td>
<td>= 1 māghā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 māghā</td>
<td>= 1 tōlā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 tōlā</td>
<td>= 1 sēr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 sēr</td>
<td>= 1 man</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The sēr was further divided into 10 4 16 chālān (just as the rupee was divisible into 16 ānā “annas”, the ānā being originally not a coin but merely a money of account, “sixteenth share”). The central unit here, the tōlā, was fixed at 180 grains, i.e. 11.6638 gm.; thus the “official seer”, sēr, was fixed at 2.057 lbs.av. = 0.93 kg., and the “official maund”, man, at 82.286 lbs.av. = 37.32 kg. The Indian weights and measures act, Act. XI of 1870, provided for the extension of this system, throughout British India, and provided for a future redefinition of the sēr as precisely equal to the standard kilogram, although with the death of Lord Mayo, the proposer of the Act, this scheme did not materialise at the time, and the above system of weights remained in force until the official introduction of the metric system after Indian independence (persisting unofficially in country districts up to the present day). The anglice form “maund” derives from man through Port. mão, possibly influenced by an old Eng. “maund”, a hamper of eight bales, etc.; see OED, s.v. Maund. (s.v.)

This relative scale was general throughout north and central India and Bengal, although the values of)” and man were very variable; the situation is further complicated by the presence side by side of a kācā and a pakē sēr and man almost everywhere (cf. medieaval Europe: “Brabantian servus” is a serv approximately 75 lb. Some, but not all, of these estimates correspond to the Muslim historians: e.g. Diva Ala of 5 (Taikh-i Firuz Shahi, 316 ff.) the interprets in the above system of weights and measures by Eliya, archbishop of Nisibin, in JRAS (1877), 291 ff.; R. Brunsvich, Mesures de capacité de la Tunisie médiévale, in RAfort, 1935/3-4, 86-90; idem; in AIEO Alger (1973), 74-87; W. Hinz, Islamische Masse und Gewichte, Leiden 1955. Russian tr. with corrections, together with a treatise on weights in Central Asia, Musul-manerki mer i vosa s percevdom w meriecskuyu sistemu, tr. Y. Bregel, (with) E. A. Davidson, Materiali po metriogro sredneevropeiskogo vremeni Asiz, Moscow 1970; P. Balog, Umnyayad, Abbasid and Tulunid glass weights and vessel stamps, New York 1976; A. Grohmann, Einführung und Christomatik zur arabischen Papyruskunde, Prague 1955, 139 ff.; F. Vivé, Dénaross, estampilles et poids musulmans en verre en Tunisie, in CT, iv (1956), 17-90; A. S. Ehrenkreutz, The hurr system in medieval Iraq, in JESHO, v (1962), 309 ff.; Cl. Cahen, Dénax et commerce dans les ports méditerranéens de l’Egypte médiévale d’après le Minhalat al-folkhumayni, in JESHO, vii (1964), 275 ff.; B. Lewis, Studies in the Ottoman archives, in BSOAS, xvi (1954), 489; E. Ashtor, Histoire des prix et des salaires dans l’Orient médiéval, Paris 1969, 103, 125; A. K. S. Lambton, Landlord and peasant in Persia2, London 1969, 403 ff.; C. E. Bosworth, Abu’l-Abdallah al-Khwarizmi on the technical terms of the secretary’s art, in JESHTO, xii (1969). (E. ASHTOR)
tracing the history of Muslim cemeteries. Works of fikr refer only to prohibitions concerning tombstones (kabr, pl. kab'ar [p. o.]) and the visiting of burial-places (ziyara [p. a.]). At the most, a few occasional references may be gleaned from these sources: Ibn Ba'tha and Ibn Kudama recall, for example, the dictum of the Prophet forbidding prayer in cemeteries (cf. H. Laoust, La profession de foi d'Ibn Ba'tha, Damascus 1958, 80, 149, and idem, Le precie de droit d'Ibn Qudama, Beirut 1950, 21). Ibn Taymiyya notes that the cemeteries of Christians and Jews must not be located in proximity to those of the faithful (cf. idem, Essai sur les doctrines sociales et politiques d'Ibn Taymiyya, Cairo 1939, 372). For more substantial information, it is necessary to consult works of topography, guides to pilgrimage and the accounts of travellers. Even here, it very often happens that such information is dispersed and responds only partially to the requirements of the historian. Thus in his topography of the city of Damascus, Ibn 'Asakir devotes a whole chapter to the cemeteries, but he is primarily concerned with locating the tombs of the revered individuals who are buried there. While he identifies the site of the first cemetery of Damascus, that of Bâb Tûmâ (currently Shaykh RasÈån) where the Muslims killed at the time of the conquest of the city were buried, it is only by chance that he mentions those of al-Bâb al-Saghîr and al-Farâdis, in referring to the tombs of the Companions of the Prophet (cf. Ta'Vmek ma'mud Dimashkî, ii, ed. S. Munadîjî, Damascus 1954, 188-200, tr. N. ElâisÈéjî, La Description de Damas, Damascus 1959, 303-16). His aim is not to describe the history of the cemeteries, their creation, development and abandonment, but to give a topography of the tombs.

It is in the same manner that the authors of topographical works of the two holy cities—Mecca and Medina—describe the cemeteries. They recount the traditions relating to their origin, but are concerned above all with the topographical landmarks of tombs of the members of the family of the Prophet whose names are listed. They accord the same treatment to the Sahâba and the Tabi'in (cf. al-Azrâkî, Mâlta* al-sa'dayn, Dimashk, 1959, 303-16; al-MaknÎI, Khitat wa-md djd^a fi-hd min al-dthdr, Damascus 1965, 209-13; al-Bâb, Kthi, 1977, 5; lmmal al-alkhâr fi madnat al-mukhârâh, Cairo n.d., 147-62).

Somewhat different is the account given by al-Makrîzî in the chapter of the K'hâıt devoted to the cemeteries of Cairo. He locates them, tells the story of the acquisition of the site of the Kârâfà at the time of the conquest, and gives a brief account of its development and extension. But the greater part of the chapter deals with the localisation of the tombs—mosques, palaces, ribâts, musalsâs—dispersed throughout that vast expanse at the feet of the hill of al-Mu'âttâm known as the "city of the dead" (cf. al-Makrîzî, al-Mawdî'iz qa ta'l-is'trâb bi-dhâr al-khâ yat qa ta'l-is'târ, Beirut n.d., ii, 442-3, 451-3).

By adding to the information supplied by topographical works that which may be gleaned from the accounts of travellers, it is possible to identify the privileged sites where Muslim cemeteries were established; in general, according to a comprehensible urban logic, they are laid out on the exterior of the ramparts, close to the gates of the town: for example, in the case of Damascus, the cemeteries of Shaykh RasÈån near Bâb Tûmâ, of al-Bâb al-Saghîr, of Bâb Kaysàn, of Dâdhdî near Bâb al-Farâdis, of al-Sûfiyya near Bâb al-Djâbiyya, etc. (cf. Kh. Moaz and S. Orî, Inscriptions arabes de Damas, les sites funéraires. 1. Le cimetière de l'Ekhtâr, Sérop, Damascus 1977, 9-13); in the case of Mecca, the cemetery of al-Hadjîn, close to Bâb Ma'sî (cf. al-Azrâkî, op. cit., ii, 3, 81; Ibn Bat-

The slopes or foot of mountains imbued with an atmosphere of sanctity are also propitious sites for cemeteries. The cemeteries of the Karāfā in Cairo, at the feet of the Dzābal al-Muṣṭaṭṭam, are the best examples of this. Also worthy of mention in this context are the cemeteries of al-Ḥaqlūn in Mecca, on the hill of the same name (cf. above), and that of Szalihsiyya in Damascus, at the foot of Mount Ḥāṣiyūn (q.v.).

While the perspective in which cemeteries are described in the works of Arabic topography does not fully respond to all the requirements of the historian, it does, on the other hand, identify well the relations existing between the cemetery and the town, ambivalent relations which reflect the difficulties of representing pagans in interactions with members of the community, difficulties similar to those already mentioned in the context of tombs (cf. Y. Rāghib, Les premiers monuments funéreaux de l’Islam, in Annales Islamologiques, ix [1970], 21-2). In fact, in the view of some of the fakāhā, the cemetery is an impure case. It will be recalled that Ibn Ḫudaymāna and Ibn Ṣāḥib (op. cit., 80, 149) include it in the list of places unsuited to prayer, in the same manner as public baths, enclosures where camels shed excrement, abattoirs and rubbish dumps. However, for the majority of authors and the consensus of believers, the cemetery is a holy place, seeing that it contains the tombs of individuals venerated in Islam: members of the Prophet’s family, the Sahāba or Companions, the Tabīʿīn or successors, awliyāʾ and jālibūn. Ibn Bāṭṭuṭa and al-Makrīzī, referring to the mosque of the Prophet’s family, the Sahāba and the Tabīʿīn, say that the same atmosphere of sanctity is to be found in the Moslem cemeteries of the Prophet’s family, the Sahāba and the Tabīʿīn. In Baghdād, in the cemeteries of Bāb al-Ḥarb, a number of Hanbalis are buried in the shadow of the tomb of Ibn Ḥanbal, and Ḥanāfīs about that of Abū Ḥanīfah (cf. Makdisī, op. cit., 258, 259, n. 1, 446, n. 2, 447, 448, 453, n. 1, 388). At Karbālā, Shiʿīs were buried in the cemetery which developed around the tomb of the imām Abū Ḥusayn and, in the small Syrian town of Buṣrā (q.v.), they established their own cemetery around the maqṣūdīyīn of Abū al-Ḥādrī (q.v.).

At the present day, Muslim cemeteries display an extremely varied typology. A vast extent of spaces, with barely perceptible tombs, where the dead lie in anonymity conformed to the most rigorous injunctions of the fakāhā, or a city where the visitor becomes lost in the labyrinth of streets fringed with the façades of false buildings, behind which shelter tombs and funeral monuments, a veritable “city of the dead”, desert necropolises gathered together in the hollows of dunes and fields of flowers from which funeral steps emerge, cemeteries built into the walls of cities or dispersed in palm-forests or groves of cork-oak—all of these constitute the cemeteries of Islam.

Bibliography: Given in the article, to which should be added, M. Galal, Essai d’observations sur les rites funéraires en Égypte actuelle..., in REI, xi (1957), 131-299. (S. Ovī)

2. In North Africa

The most common terms used to designate a cemetery in the languages and dialects of the Maghrib are the plural forms mākūbār and khor l-ma’mūrāna and roja (in Moroccon and Algerian Arabic); and Ḧabbanā (Tunisian and Algerian Arabic); the Berber form included-ātābīr or ātāhān (Kabyle); sammār, issnādī, timdīlīn (Middle, High and Anti-Atlas Mts.), izmarān (Rīf), etc.

The cemeteries of North African towns and villages may be both extra and intra muros. Thus Fās, for example, has at least ten important graveyard sites. These include the Bāb Futūh, which is separated by a small valley and stream into two halves: the so-called al-Kābīb “the cupolas” (because of its numerous mausoleums for holy men) to the west, and Siddi Ḥarázam to the east. The whole of the cemetery overlooks the madīna of Fās from the south. At the
same time, there are within the city walls immense graveyards, such as Bab al-Hamra and Sidi 'Ali al-Meṣâli in R. Le Tourneau, *Pit avant le profanateur*, Casablanca 1949, 114, 135 and index, 538). The various sites may differ in social composition and rank, and within any given cemetery there may exist a diversity of types of graves and elaborations of these.

In some tribal localities, there is a tendency for particular lineage groups to have their graves within a particular plot (cf. D. M. Hart, *The Aith Warqaghargh of the Moroccan Rif*, Tucson 1976, 144). It may be the case, in regard to some towns of the region, that urban growth "is hindered particularly by the stiff collar of cemeteries which modern Islamic towns have had the greatest difficulty in breaking through" (X. de Planhol, *The world of Islam*, Ithaca, N.Y. 1959 (original French ed. Paris 1957), 11), but this is not everywhere so; there are examples, at least in Tunisia, of cemeteries having been moved in order to facilitate urban expansion; elsewhere, formerly external sites have now become, because of expansion, part of city centres.

Some writers have noted a striking contrast between the cemeteries of Europe and those of the Islamic shores of the Mediterranean: that the former are enclosed, sad places, whilst the latter are open spaces, favoured especially by women and children, and used for visiting, for strolling about and for picnic nics. It seems that in the Muslim towns of the Mediterranean lands, attitudes towards death and the dead imply certain specific rights and duties that are absent in Christian Europe; cf. J.-P. Charay, *La vie musulmane en Algérie d’après la jurisprudence de la première moitié du XXe siècle*, Paris 1965, 237; Hart, *op. cit.*, 147.

In the far west of Islam, during mediaeval times, judging on the basis of 8th/12th century Seville, the 'ulama were concerned about the maintenance of cemeteries both from the physical and the moral points of view. The ḥāḍir 'Abdīn remarks upon the tendency to construct buildings within cemeteries and to use these buildings and the space around them for purposes considered illicit or indecent (E. Lévi-Provençal, *Séville musulmane au début du XVIe*, Paris 1947, 57-8). Some dynasties constructed elaborate necropoles for their dead, e.g. Chebbi (q.v.), built by the Marinid sultans Abu Sa'id and Abu I-Hasan between 710/1310 and 739/1339 on the site of the ancient Roman city of Sala (see H. Basset and Lévi-Provençal, *Chélia, une nécropole méridionale*, in *Hespéris*, ii [1922], 1-92, 255-316, 385-425), and the Sa'diān tombs of Marrakesh, mostly built during the reign of Ahmad al-Mansūr (986-1012/1578-1603) (see G. Deverdun, *Marrakesch des origines à 1912*, Rabat 1959, 381 ff.).

A number of customs and rituals are associated with cemeteries in the Maghrib. Most of these include ceremonial visits and meals, usually accompanied by prayers at gravesides. Thus in Fās, at least until World War II, the family of a deceased person on the day after the death sent a meal to the grave to be distributed to the poor assembled there (wādū 'l-kbār "the supper of the grave"). Generally, various individuals or groups (family, men, women) visit graves on specific occasions, such as 'Āshura day, on 26 Ramadan, and on 'Arafa, the day before the Greater Festival. In most urban centres, the obligatory outdoor place of prayer, musallā, is in the major cemetery. There the chief religious rite of the Greater and Lesser Festivals, the morning worship of the first day, takes place, and on the Greater Festival, the imām, in the capacity of the head of the local community, is carried out by the kadī (see E. Westermarck, *Ritual and belief in Moroc-

...
bricks as material for tombs (Geuffroy, Erste Theil der Hoffhaltung Des Türkischen Keysers ... ed. Hoeniger, Basel 1596, i. p. cli). The use of this transient material, if in fact not limited to isolated cases, could explain the small number of tombs which have survived from this period. This might then support the hypothesis according to which the funerary art of the later Ottoman period began to develop in the 10th-11th/16th-17th centuries only.

One of the characteristics of the Ottoman gravestones—unparalleled in this form—is their thronesque shape, with a representation on top of some kind of headgear. Such a representation is reserved for tombs of men, but it is not the only form used. (Only further investigation can confirm the assertion, repeatedly put forward, that the form of the upper part of tombs for women, widespread since the 11th/18th century, can indeed be traced to an old Turkish, nomadic headgear.) The headgear on tombs of men—in a comparable form and frequency not to be found in any other region of the Islamic world—can be proved to have been in existence since ca. 900/1494-5. The oldest example in Istanbul is the tomb of a Dervish Mehmed in Eyüp (918/1512-3). In the next 200 years, hardly any social differentiation can be detected in the form of the headgear, since only a small number of turban forms appear which cannot be clearly associated with a particular social group.

Since the 11th/18th century, it became customary in Istanbul to represent, on gravestones of men, a headgear which was specific for a certain social class, or to express the social affiliation in another way (representations in relief of headgear and other distinctive marks). In the same way in which the graves of dervishes began to show the turbans of the various tarıkas, and not the headgear in general use, the form of the turban started to indicate the differentiation between the various professional and social groups in other areas of society. Besides, one finds other representations in relief which indicate to which group the deceased belonged: insignia of bûlûk and ğemâ 'at for Janissaries, rossettes (gül) of the various tarıkas, especially for women from ca. 1250/1834-5, and yet other infrequently, images of utensils and instruments.

For about a century, this strong differentiation marks the image of Ottoman gravestones. The introduction of the fez from 1829 onwards leads, again, to a general levelling and standardisation. (In other parts of the empire this development appears with some delay; e.g. in Bosnia, turban forms, which in the capital had fallen into disuse at the beginning of the 18th century, were still used towards the end of the 19th century.) Besides the fez, turbans remained in use, but in Istanbul they were, since about 1850, almost exclusively reserved for 'ulumâ' and dervishes. Finally, the Atatürk reforms, especially the reform of the script and the legislation on headgear, mark the end of the tradition of Ottoman graves.

As in other fields of Ottoman art, an ever-increasing degree of European influence upon grave ornamentation can be detected from the second half of the 18th century onwards. Before that period, gravestones had hardly been decorated, but now vegetational motifs, both of traditionally oriental (cypresses, etc.) and of western origin (flower-baskets, cornucopias, etc.) were spreading more and more. By the roundabout way of Europe, older Islamic motifs, like the arabesque, were rediscovered for tombstone art towards the end of the 19th century. In general, the development of ornamentation of tombstones went parallel to that of representative and architectural art.

Whereas tomb inscriptions in Arabic can be found for the early period, Ottoman became the dominant language in the 10th/16th century. With regard to their contents, these inscriptions underwent but very few alterations: they follow a formula which corresponds largely to that of Ottoman documents (see Kraclitz, Osmanische Urkunden in türkischer Sprache, Vienna 1921, 12 ff., adapted to gravestones by Prokosch, Osmanische Inschriften auf Gräbern bei der Moschee des Kanabay-Klosters in Topfane-Istanbul, Istanbul 1976, 3-4):

1. invocatio: mostly kâve 'l-bâkî, or another of the 99 names of God [see AL-ÂSMA' ÂL-ḤUSâNā].
2. benedictio: merhâm ve maghâfir, occasionally more elaborate.
3. inscriptio: statements about the deceased. Apart from the name, details on his origin, relationship and profession, may be given here.
4. request for prayer: mostly râhûlân or rûhûnâ fâtîhâ.
5. date.

Such concise and rather uniform inscriptions were standard during a long period, even if particular components occasionally are expressed more elaborately. From the 18th century onwards, poetical expressions on the transtitoriness of temporal existence are often inserted between the invocatio and the benedictio, in which reference is almost always made to the same limited and reiterated répétitions of this kind. In the same period, chronograms are more and more used, especially for dervishes. In later times, there is a clear tendency towards more elaborate inscriptions. Instead of the original 5-6 lines of concise text, there often appear 15-20 lines which, however, do not provide more factual information.

Traditional Ottoman Islamic society did not allow the inscription andere of tombs, or their re-use; burial-places had to remain for ever. Yet the loss of many tombstones, and above all of most of the (uninscribed) foot-end stones might be attributed to their being used again by Ottoman masons. Since the middle of the 19th century, the construction of roads for traffic and new buildings has become another source for destruction of cemeteries, and consequently of tombstones, a problem which has still not been solved. However, at present most of the permanent losses cannot be imputed to such interferences (in which, as a rule, at least part of the tombstones are erected again at some other places), but to the hardly supervised re-use of historical cemeteries.


4. In Iran [see Suppl.]

5. India

The word makbara is used in India for both graveyard and mausoleum, although kabristân is also heard for the former; kahâr, may, besides the grave itself, signify a monumental tomb, especially of the simpler variety; dargâh is used especially for the tomb of a shirine of a pir, where there may be also such associated buildings (mevâqeh, mehman-îgâhâ, etc.; in Kashmir a pir's tomb is usually called ziyârat, and the related mazâr may also be used, especially for the smaller wayside shrine; râwa is commonly used for a
monumental tomb within an enclosure, not necessarily of a pir. The solitary grave is rare; the individual grave becomes a focus for other sepulchres. In this way many family graveyards especially have come into being—"family" in the case of a pir being held to include murids. There is a tendency in some regions for graveyards of the Muslim community to be situated to the south of habitations, possibly an extension of the Hindū association of the south as the "quarter of Yama", the god of death: in the Lodī period the entire region of Dihli south of Farīdābād and Purānā Kī's down to the Kutb complex was used mostly as a vast necropolis. Khuldābād, near Daulatabad, was originally called simply Rawda and was a necropolis village. Community graveyards may be enclosed by a low boundary wall, but protection is generally careless and graves and walls may fall into early ruin. Some enclosures are known to be family graveyards, where the standard of upkeep is higher; there may be an imposing entrance to the east and a tall and substantial wall to the west, with arched openings or depressions which serve to indicate the kibla; some of the Kadhuk Shāhīs (Yamamoto [q.v.] has suggested that some of these may have been intended as sleep places) have substantial mausoleums in addition to simple graves. In the Kadam Shārīf tomb and mosque of similar proportions and sumptuous decoration standing on a marble and there is an inscribed marble headstone; individual mausoleums may also be provided with such a separate structure on the kibla side, or the enclosure wall may be modified in such a way as to incorporate one: e.g. the tomb of Sikandar Lodī in Dihli has three arches and a raised platform in the west enclosure wall which presumably formed a khanātī mosque. A mausoleum very often has openings on three sides with the west wall solid to incorporate an internal mīrāb (the tombs of the Barīd Shāhīs [q. v.], however, are regularly open on all four sides). The larger mausoleums may be provided with a full-scale mosque, either replacing or in addition to an internal mīrāb; Bigdāpur [q.v.] provides many excellent examples, of which the Ibrahīm Rawda is the finest example with tomb and mosque of similar proportions and sumptuous decoration standing on a common platform in an elaborate enclosure; the Tādī Maball [see MAHALL] has not only a superb mosque on the kibla side but an identical building on the east essentially for the symmetry of the plan but incidentally also to serve as a mihrāb-dārma. (The conversel arrangement, wherein a single tomb is subsidiary to a mosque, is common, especially when both have the same founder.) Some major mausolea, however, are without any indication of the kibla at all: e.g. Humāyūn's tomb at Dihli (plan at Vol. ii, p. 262 above) has neither internal mīrāb nor external mosque or other structure (the building on the west, where a mosque might be expected, is in fact the main gateway); although the enclosure wall on the south-east has a range of exterior arches which formed the kibla wall of the earlier "Nilā gunbad". At some graveyards there is a special mortuary provided for the ghassdls to work in; outstanding examples at the graveyard of Afdal Khān's wives at Bigdāpur, and the tombs of the Kutb Shāhī kings at Golkonda. Some form of wall is of course a common adjunct; a bā'ālī [q.v. ] is commonly found included in a Cīghtī dargāh complex, and occasionally elsewhere (e.g. within the fortified enclosure of the tomb of the "Sayyid" sultan Mubārak Shāh at Kollā Mubārapur, Dihli). There has been no study of the typology of gravestones (i.e. the stone or brick structures above ground level, the tā'īlid) in India as a whole, although many types with regional variation can be recognised. Dā'far Shārīf [q.v.], referring primarily to the Deccan, says that on a man's tomb, above the (commonly) three diminishing rectangular slabs, a top member is placed "resembling the hump on a camel's back, or the back of a fish", and adds that in north India tombs of men and women are distinguished by a small stone pence (kalamād) raised on the flat upper surface; but in both types the tomb itself will be seen side by side in Dihli graveyards. The tombs of women are generally flat above the diminishing rectangular slabs, and more frequently in north India than in the Deccan may display a flat takhtī, in form like a child's slate, where those of men have the kalamād (the explanation commonly given is that only males are literate and so can carry a pence, whereas women have to have everything written for them!); in south India in particular a woman's tomb may have instead a basin-like hollow on the upper surface. The woman's tomb, given the same date and provenance, is lower than the man's. In the case of the larger mausoleums, it applies to the cenotaph tā'īlid as much as to the kalamād of the actual grave. There is a range of types for men and women's tombs, a mere stepped surround with the inscription, a string bed (kalamddn) with rope lashings which would have been used as the bier. A cirdghddn, which frapramn (the circular frame on which the corpse was burnt, may be placed at the head of or alongside any tomb; the actual
grave may, in the case of the illustrious, be covered with a pall kept in place by ornamental weights (mir-i farāj). The tomb of a pir may be marked also by a white (or green in the case of a sayyid) triangular flag (mir-i āqīl) and a horseman carrying a spear, sometimes led by an attendant. Similar carvings (or paintings on wood) are reported in Crooke's ed. of Dīja'far Shari'ī (ref. below) from Afghanistan, Kurdistan, and the Orakzay Pathāns; this ethnological aspect stands in need of further investigation.

A curious class of tomb, sparsely but widely distributed, is that of the "nine-yard saints", nām gaz pir, usually ascribed to warrior saints of the earliest days of izb. Many of these have the reputation of miraculously extending their length over the ages. (Miracles are reported at other tombs: lumps of silver in the pavement of the dargah of Muntadib al-Dir "Zar Bakhlū" at Khuldābād are said to be the remains of silver trees which grew after the saint's death, which were broken off for the upkeep of the shrine; hairs from the Prophet's beard at the same place are said to increase in number yearly.) Many tombs have the reputation of curing various ailments through the thaumaturgic power of a pir persisting; e.g. women still tie ribbons on the lattice screens on the tomb of Sallām Cishti at Fathpur Sikrī as a cure for barrenness. (The virtue is not confined to Muslims: I have seen an obviously Hindu woman making oblations at the tomb of the Ẓādī brothers at Bigāpur.)

Tombs may bear inscriptions (and inscribed tombs, though not for any but the simplest treatment here; further information is provided in the articles HIND. vii. Architecture, tombs, MUGHAL. Architecture, and on the various regional dynasties. The simplest type, that is it provides a covered place over the tawilī, is the ṭhartī [see MIZALLA], a single dome supported on pillars; those covering a square or octagonal area are the commonest, although the hexagonal plan is known. From the use of the umbrellas in both Buddhist and Hindu funerary practices, there is possibly here a persistence of an eschatological idea (but the Hindu use of the ṭhartī to mark the site of a cremation, so common with the Rājpūts rulers at e.g. Udaypur and Dwarkpur, is a borrowing back from Islamic forms). Even with this simplest type there is the possibility of the common principle that a funeral building (or its site; cf. the tomb of Tūgbūl Shāh mentioned above) might be intended for a different purpose during the owner's lifetime. An elaboration is to support a square roof on twelve pillars, thereby furnishing three openings on each side as well as making possible a larger area (this type of building, bādarā, is also of wide secular use for plenties). Filling in the openings with stone screens (dālī), leaving an entrance on each side, is frequently practised, although as noticed above the western side is often closed to provide an indication of kibla; Tomb 2 at Thānlēr [g. v.; see plan of tombs] is a bādarā whose sides have been filled in with purpose-cut masonry. An extension of this type is characteristic of Gujrat, whereby both an inner chamber and a surrounding veranda are provided with screened walls; after the Mughal conquest of Gujratī tombs of this type are found in north India, e.g. those of Muḥammad Qāwālī at Gwāliyar, Sallīm Cishti at Sīkār, etc. When a tomb is given greater prominence by being raised on a plinth, the sepulchral chamber may be placed at earth level in a tahkāna, with a cenotaph tawilī immediately above it on an upper floor; but where this applies to the principal inhumation at a large mausoleum, it is not practised for later and subsidiary burials, and is not held to be required for burials within a raised mosque pahn. The preponderant form of the mausoleum is a square chamber surmounted by a dome; an idiosyncratic type occurs in the royal Bahmani tombs (Haft Gumbad) at Gulbāgā [g. v.], where two square domed chambers are conjoined on a single plinth (the sultan in one chamber, his immediate family adjoining); but the octagonal form [see MUTIAMMAN] is also known from the 9th/14th century (popular for royal tombs of the "Sayyid" and Lodi dynasties. Tombs of pīrs at Multān and Uzāb [g. v.], nobles of the Sūr dynasty [see especially Ḥusayn Sūrī], and not infrequently in Mughal times); in the earliest monumental tomb, that of Nāṣir al-Dīn Māhmūd ("Sultan Ghārī") at Dihlī, the plinth of the structure accommodates a vaulted octagonal sepulchral chamber. In two of the Sūr tombs at Sāsārām [g. v.] the mausoleum stands in the middle of an artificial lake, approached by a gateway and causeway; the idea recurs in the Mughal period with fine but anonymous examples at...
I'timádpur, near Ágrá, and Nárñaw [q. v.], where the idea of a pleasure for use in the lifetime of the subject seems patent. Mughal mausolea introduce new plans: the oblong, the square or oblong with chamfered corners to produce a "Baghdádi octagon" (e.g. the Táj Mahal), a square chamber with engaged corner rooms (e.g. Humáyún's tomb, tomb of ʿAbd al-Rájiḥ Kháňgháñán), or engaged corner turrets (e.g. tomb of Sa’dád Dýang). They may also incorporate independent symmetrically disposed minarets (see MÁNARA, 2, India), and may stand within a formal garden (see BÚSTAN, and further references in MÁ, 12). The wooden tombs of Kháshúmir do not fall into any of the above categories, and are described under ZIYÁRA.

**Bibliography:** In addition to articles in the bibliography and other articles cited: for graveside requirements and practices see DýANÁRA; Día’ár Sharíf, Kánnán-i Islám, Eng. tr. as Herílots' Islam in India, ed. W. Crooke, Oxford 1921, esp. ch. ix, "Death"; W. Crooke, Popular religion and folklore of northern India, Allahabad 1894, Chap. iv, "The worship of the sainted dead", which has illuminating references to Hindu-Muslim syncretisms. F. Wetzell, Islamische Grabbauten in Indien in der Zeit der Soldatenkaiser, Leipzig 1918, provides a typological framework for the study of monumental tombs of the Delhi sultanate, in rich in plans and sections. T. Yamamoto, M. Aro and T. Tsukinowa, Delhi: architectural remains of the Delhi sultanate period, i, Tokyo 1967, describe (in Japanese) and illustrate 142 monumental tombs and 72 graveyards of Dílí, excellent photographs; idem, ii, Tokyo 1968, analyse in depth several of the same monumental tombs. Some good illustrations of "Nizám al-Din's graveyard" at Cándéri in R. Náth, The art of Chándéri, Delhi 1979. Much of the information above is based on a personal photographic collection, which will eventually be housed in Victoria and Albert Museum, London. (J. Búrtón-Págè)

**MÁKBÚL IBRÁHÍM PÁSHA, [see IBRÁHÍM PÁSHA.**

**MÁKDISHÚ, the capital of the Somaíí Républic, independent since 1960, comprising the former Italian Somalia and British Somaliland, lies in lat. 2° N. on the East African shore of the Indian Ocean.**

Although it is not specifically mentioned in the Periplus of the Erythraean Sea (ca. A.D. 106), this Alexandrine report attests the presence of Arab and Egyptian traders on the coast. The principal exports were cinchona and frankincense, tortoise-shell and "slaves of the better sort, which are brought to Egypt in increasing numbers." Recent excavations at Rás Háífún by H. N. Chittick, as yet unpublished, disclosed Egyptian pottery of Roman Imperial date, probably 2nd to 3rd century A.D. Apart from some ruins of uncertain date that are possibly South Arabian, Mákdishú is stated by a 16th century Chórónica dos Reys de Quíloa, preserved in a summary form by João de Barros, to have been founded by "the first people of the coast who came to the land of Sofála [q. v.] in quest of gold." This date is uncertain, but it was at some time between the 10th and 12th centuries A.D., when the Sofála gold trade became the monopoly of Kišva (Port. Quíloa) [see KÍLWA]. It is not to be thought that there was any single immigration of Arabs; rather, they came in trickles, and from different regions of the Arabian peninsula; the most remarkable one came from al-Áhsá on the Gulf, probably during the struggles of the caliphate with the Kármásháíns. Probably at the same time, Persian groups emigrated to Mákdishú, for inscriptions found in the town refer to Persian sūr, Shíráz and Néyshábúr dwelling there during the Middle Ages. The foreign merchants, however, found themselves obliged to unite politically against the nomadic, Somaíí, tribes that surrounded Mákdishú, and against invaders from the sea. In the 10th century A.D. a federation was formed of 39 clans: 12 from the Mükri tribe; 12 from the Díd’á risí tribe; 6 from the Aṣkábi, 6 from the Ismá’ílíi and 3 from the Aflatíi. Under conditions of internal peace, trade developed; and the Mükri clan, after acquiring a religious supremacy and adopting the nísha of al-Kábšáni, formed a kind of dynasty of sálama and obtained from the other tribes the privilege that the kádi of the federation should be elected only from among themselves. It is not known at what period Islam became established, but the earliest known dated inscription in Arabic in Somalia is an epitaph at Baráwa of 496/1105.

In the second half of the 7th/12th century, Aḥú Bakr b. Fákhr al-Dín established in Mákdishú an hereditary sultanate with the aid of the Mükri clans, to whom the new ruler recognised again the privilege of giving the kádi to the town. In 722/1322-3 the ruler was Aḥú Bakr b. Muhammád; in that year he struck dated billon coins in his name, but without title. During the reign of Aḥú Bakr b. Urmá al-Hámid, the town was visited by Ibn Baṭtaṣá, who describes the town in his Ríba. The relationship of this sultan with his predecessors is not known, but he was probably from the family of Aḥú Bakr b. Fákhr al-Dín; and under this dynasty Mákdishú reached, in the 8th/14th and 9th/15th centuries, the highest degree of prosperity. Its name is quoted in the Maḥáfa Mílát, a work by the Ethiopian ruler Záre’a Yáš’kob, who refers to a battle fought against him at Gömut, or Goimit, in Dawaró by the Muslims on 25 December 1445. To these centuries are to be ascribed, in addition to the billon coins issued by Aḥú Bakr b. Muhammád, the undated copper issues of ten rulers whose names are commemorated on their coins, but whose sequence even is not known. They are linked by a similarity of script, weight, type and appearance, and certain of the issues share with contemporary Kišva issues a reverse legend contrived to rhyme with the obverse. To this period belongs also the foundation of the three principal mosques in Mákdishú, all dated by inscriptions, the Friday Mosque in 636/1238, that of Arba’ Rukún in 667/1268, and that of Fákhr al-Dín in Sha’bán 667/April-May 1269. Their handsome proportions witness to the prosperity of the times there.

In the 10th/16th century, the Fákhr al-Dín dynasty was succeeded by that of Muḥáfír. It is possible that one copper issue refers to a ruler of this dynasty. In the region of the Wébí Shábéllá, the true commercial hinterland of Mákdishú, the Aḫdurán (Sómáíí), who had constituted there another sultanate which was friendly with and allied to Mákdishú, were defeated by the nomadic Háwiya (Sómáíí), who thus conquered the territory. In this way, Mákdishú was separated by the nomads from the interior, and began to decline from its prosperity, a process which was hastened by Portuguese colonial enterprise in the Indian Ocean and later by the Italians and the British. When Vašco da Gama returned from his first voyage to India in 1499, he attacked Mákdishú, but without success; and similarly in 1507 Da Cunha failed to occupy it. In 1532 Aḥú Bakr b. Gáma, son of Vašco, came there to buy a ship. In 1585 Mákdishú surrendered to the Ottoman amir ʿAli Bey, who came down the coast in that year with two galleys as far as
Mombasa; all along the coast, the suzerainty of the Ottoman Sultan was recognised. In 1587, however, the Portuguese re-asserted their authority with a strong fleet, but no attempt was made to attack Makdishu. The vials of their wrath fell on Faza, where large numbers of people were slaughtered and 10,000 palm trees destroyed. Ali Bey returned with five ships in 1589, but, although the coast again declared for the Ottomans, he was himself defeated and captured in Mombasa harbour, from which he was deported to Lisbon. Although this was the end of Ottoman attacks on the eastern African coast, a new copper coins were issued by no less than eleven rulers. All these bear a title of 

In 1700 a British squadron of men-of-war halted before Makdishu for several days, but without landing. After the 'Umāni Arabs had taken Mombasa from the Portuguese in 1698 Makdishu and other towns on the Sōmāli coast were occupied at uncertain dates, but after a while their troops were ordered back to 'Umān. The sultanate of Makdishu continued to decline, and the town was divided into two quarters, Hamar-Wen and Shangani, by civil wars. Little by little the Sōmāli penetrated into the ancient Arabian town, and the clan of Makdishu changed their Arabic spelling of the name, which became the rēr Shēkh, the Dijīf/ät al Shangani, the 'Affīli the Gudmanā, and even the Mukri (Kahtāni) changed their name to rēr Fākhī. In the 12th/18th century the Darandollā nomads, excited by exaggerated traditions of urban wealth, attacked and conquered the town. The Darandollā chief, who had the title of imām, set himself up in the Shangani quarter, and once attacked for the Karīmāni's forces of electing the kāfīd was recognised. In 1823 Sayyid Sa'īd of 'Umān attempted to assert his authority over Makdishu, and arrested two of the notables. It was not until 1843 that he was able to appoint a governor. He chose a Sōmāli, but the new governor shortly retired inland to his own people. When Charles Guillaud visited Makdishu in 1846, he found only "an old Arab" who presided over the customs house. Guillain's fourth volume, an annual rent of 160,000 rupees, in 1892.

Established over Makdishu, only to be ceded to Italy, in 1895; A. Negre, A propos de Mogadiscio au moyen âge, in Annales de l'Unite du Benin, ii (Nov.-Dec. 1975), 175-200, repr. in Annales de l'Unite d'Abidjan, Série 1, vol. v (1977), 5-38.

E. CERULLI [G. S. FREEMAN-GRENVILLE]...
9. The tip (ɗawalak) of the tongue: the sounds pro-
nounced at the tip of the tongue (rā) (mīm), and nūn.
10. The lips (ṣīdīk): the labials fā, bā, and mīm.

In the second classification, less detailed than the first,
Makhdūm enumerates them in the opposite way, i.e.,
from the lips to the throat, but with only six ar-
ticulatory zones:
1. The lips: fā, bā, and mīm.
2. The tip of the tongue and the extremity (sāraf) of the
palate (qāf): rā, mīm, and nūn.
3. The back (zahr) of the tongue and the zone going
from the interior (khālīn) of the middle incisors
(hamza) to the palate: ɗād, ɗād, and ɗād.
4. The back part of the mouth, between the root
(‘akada) of the tongue and the uvula: ɗīm, kāf, and
kāf.
5. The throat: ɗūn, hā, kāf, and ɗūn.
6. The back part of the throat: hamsa.

It will be noted that, in this scheme of classification,
the place of emission of the ɗūn is placed with that of
kāf which might suppose a realisation as ɗīm, and that
of waw, yā, and ɗīl is not given with preci-
sion, whilst that of the hamsa is placed in the throat.

The second description of the points of articulation of
the phonemes of Arabic is provided for us by
Sībawayhi (d. ca. 180/796 [q.v.]) in his Kitāb
(ed. H. Dērenbourg, Paris 1889, ii, 452-3). In this,
Sībawayhi enumerates, going from the throat towards
the lips, 16 places of emission of the sounds:
1. The back part of the throat: hamsa, hā, and ɗīl.
2. Its middle part (awsal): ɗūn and hā.
3. Its fore part: ɗūn and kāf.
4. The back part of the tongue and palate (hawak): kāf.
5. A little lower (asfal) than the place (mawdi)
of the kāf: kāf.
6. The middle part of the tongue and the middle part
of the palate: ɗīm, ɗīn, and yā.
7. The beginning of the edge (kāffu) of the tongue
and its molars (adrās): ɗād.
8. The edge of the tongue, from its forward part
to its extremity, and the palate, a little bit below the
pre-molar (dabāk), the canine tooth (nāb) and the
incisors (nāb and ɗās): lām.
9. The tip of the tongue and a little bit below the
middle incisors: nūn.
10. The same position, but a little further towards the
inner part of the back of the tongue: rā.
11. The tip of the tongue and the bases (usūl)
of the middle incisors: tā, dāl, and tā.
12. The tip of the tongue and a little bit above the
middle incisors: ɗād, sīn, and sād.
13. The tip of the tongue and the tips of the middle
incisors: zā, ḍhāl, and ḍhā.
14. The inside of the lower lip and the tips of the up-
per middle incisors: fā.
15. The two lips: hā, nūn, and waw.
16. The nasal cavities (khvajām): nun realised lightly
(khafṣā).

The most important difference between the descrip-
tion of al-Khalīl and that of Sībawayhi lies in the fact
that al-Khalīl indicates the place of emission of waw
and yā realised as long vowels (a and y), whereas
Sībawayhi indicates these places of emission realised
as consonants (w and y).

It was Sībawayhi’s description which was to prevail
for all the later grammarians, in whose works it
is found cited en bloc, sometimes with a few variations.
Thus al-Muharrad (K. al-Mukaddab, Cairo 1963, i,
192-3) separates the place of emission of ɗūn from that
of ɗīm and names the place of emission of ɗād by a
word which denotes the corner of the mouth (ṣīdīk).

One should finally note that the makhdūrd al-hurūf
have been the subject of a very interesting study by a
Moroccan scholar, Muḥammad b. ‘Abd al-Salām al-
Fātī (1717-95), in his commentary on the Lamiyya of
Abū ‘l-KĀsim al-Shāhī (K. al-Muktadab, Cairo 1963, i,
xxviii (1949), 225-85; idem, La conception phonétique des Arabes, in ZDMG, cvii (1958), 74-105;
idem, Traité de philologie arabe, i, Beruit 1969, 51-70;
G. Troupeau, Le commentaire d’al-Nāṣirī sur le chap.
Le système consonantique de la koinē arabe
d’après le Kitāb de Sībawayhi, in CLOS, i (1977),
63-98; idem, Les zones d’articulation de la koinē arabe
d’après l’enseignement d’al-Halīl, in Arabica, xxiv

MAKHDUM-I DJAHANIYAN. [see ιdğal
bukamr].

MAKHMUD KULI “FIRAKI”, perhaps rather
Makhtum Kuli (local forms Magtimkuli and Fragi), a
prominent 18th century Turkmen poet
(1733?-1782). Much of the information about this
poet is obscure, and sources are unreliable. Among
the 10,000 lines ascribed to him, a substantial amount
must certainly be considered spurious, invalidating
their informative value. Moreover, it is unclear
whether the events alluded to have a real historical
significance or are merely literary devices. Hence it is
uncertain whether he was really born in the Gürgen
River region, studied at the Shīrghāz and Kūkīlās
madrasa in Khiwa and Bukhārā respectively, worked
for a time as a silversmith and a cobbler, bewailed a
brother, who had disappeared into captivity in Persia
(where he himself had suffered too), lost an infant son
and was separated from his love. However, there is a
personal flavour in the relevant descriptions. Such
uncertainties are often met with when discussing ma-
jor Turkmen poets.

It does however seem that he was a son of Dawlat
Muhammad “Azādī”, that he travelled widely, and
that he was well versed in classical Persian and
Turkish letters as well as in the folklore of Central
Asia. Iran and Khiwa. His lyrical and didactic (not epic,—
though Yassāwi-like elements spring to the eye—not
strictly religious) poetry remained widely appreciated,
not only among his compatriots but in the whole of
Central Asia.

Bibliography: 1. Editions: A. Chodzko,
Specimens of the popular poetry of Persia, London 1842,
389-94; N. Berezin, Turetskaya khrestomatiya, ii,
Kazan 1857-76; H. Vambilé, Die Sprache der Turkamen
und der Dagegen Machdumkulis, in ZDMG, xxxiii
(1879), 368-444; (31 poems and 10 fragments, with German tr.; not too reliable);
Shaykh Muhsin Fānī, Makhtum-kuli diwanī wa yedī
‘arifl bi manzumāt, Istanbul 1340/1924 (a bad
rept. of Vambilé); B. M. Kerbavae, Sornik
izbrannitkh proizvedeniy turkmenskogo poeta Makhtum-Kuli
(I. pol. XVIII deka), Ashkhabad 1926 (289 poems,
Arabic script, useful). A. Gyrjenedi (?),
Magtīnguli, saylanan edirneler, Ashkhabad 1940
(un-
critical); Kurban, Makhdūmkuli, Berlin 1944;
Magtīnguli, saylanan eserler, Ashkhabad 1957, 2 vols.
(375 poems). 2. Studies and translations:
A. Samoylovič, Ukażeta ‘pseny Makhtum-kuli, in

MAKHDUM AL-MULK, a Mughal religious leader, whose real name was MAWLANA ‘abd ALLAH. He was the son of Shuykh Shams al-Din of Sultanpur. His ancestors had emigrated from Multan and settled at Sulтанpur near Lahore. The pupil of Mawlana ‘Abd al-Kadir Sirhindi, he became one of the foremost religious scholars and functionaries of his day. A committed SunnI, he never became a knowledgeable traditio

Khanan (d. 968/1560) exalted his position very much by giving him the sub-division of Thakawala which yielded an annual income of one lakh of rupees, while Akbar gave him the title of Makhdum al-Mulk, by which designation he has become known to posterity. When the Emperor introduced his religious innovations and tried to convert people to his "Divine Faith" [see DIN-I ILAHI], however, Makhdum al-Mulk opposed him. Akbar became very angry. He ordered Makhdum al-Mulk to go on a pilgrimage to Mecca and Medina. Setting out in 987/1579, he completed the enforced canonical journey within two years' time. On his return from the Hidjaz, Makhdum al-Mulk died or was poisoned in 990/1582 in Ahmadabad. He was the author of the following books, none of which are now extant: (1)‘Imam al-anbiya, a work on the sinlessness of prophets (cf. Bada’uni, iii, 70); (2) Minhad al-din, a life of the Prophet (cf. Ma’arif al-umara, ii, 252); (3)‘Asyia Shara‘ Mullah, a gloss on DjamT’s commentary on Ibn al-Hadjib’s Rukn-imawd, (invocatory prayers) and Awrdd (prac-
tions of sada). Numerous are the compila-
tions of awrad (invocatory prayers) and ishtas (prac-
tical directives) attributed to Sharaf al-Din, but his most comprehensive work was a sharh (commentary) on the Safi catechism, the Addb al-muridin of Abb ‘Nasir Subrawardi (d. 1561). The literary and spiritual tradition of Sharaf al-Din was continued by several notable Firdawsl saints who were his successors, beginning with Muzaaffer Shams Balkhi (d. 830/1424). The attainments of this regionally delimited silsila were lauded throughout Hindustan; its major shaikh was found recognition in the most popular pan-Indian tdkhirus, e.g., ‘Abd al-Hakḳ Dihlawi’s Akhbar al-akhydr and Ghulam Sarwar Lahori’s Khazinat al-asfiq. Bibliography: Sharaf al-Din Makhdum al-Mulk, a Mughal religious
erald on his return from the Hidjaz, Makhdum al-

meditation on God. When he re-emerged at Bihār Sharif (ca. 60 miles from Patna city) in the 1320s, he was acknowledged as a spiritual preceptor and guide of extraordinary power. From the Khazinat al-asfiq. The several writings of Sharaf al-Din reveal him to be a knowledgeable traditionist as well as a skilled dialectician, and they reflect different Sufi categories and concepts. He is best known for one of his collections of letters, Maktabat-i sad. He has also been credited with three other episodical volumes: Ruq-k-i jaww ‘id, Maktabat-i dā sad, and Maktabat-i bīst-i huqrāt. Several are the compila-
tions of awrad (invocatory prayers) and ishtas (prac-
tical directives) attributed to Sharaf al-Din, but his most comprehensive work was a sharh (commentary) on the Sāfi catechism, the Addb al-muridin of Abb ‘Nasir Subrawardi (d. 1561). The literary and spiritual tradition of Sharaf al-Din was continued by several notable Firdawsl saints who were his successors, beginning with Muzaaffer Shams Balkhi (d. 830/1424). The attainment of this regionally delimited silsila was lauded throughout Hindustan; its major shaikh was found recognition in the most popular pan-Indian tdkhirus, e.g., ‘Abd al-Hakḳ Dihlawi’s Akhbar al-akhydr and Ghulam Sarwar Lahori’s Khazinat al-asfiq. Bibliography: Sharaf al-Din Makhdum al-Mulk, a Mughal religious

Notes from a distant flute: the extant literature of pre-Mughal Indian Sufism, Tehran 1972, 72-77; S. A. A. Rizvi, A history of Sufism in India, i, Delhi 1978, 298-40. (B. LAWRENCE) MAIKHFI, the much-disputed pen-name of Zib al-Nisā’ Begum, eldest child of the Mughul emperor Awrangzib (1068-1118/1658-1707). She was born in 1638 at Dawlatabad in the Deccan. Her mother, Dilara Banû Begum (d. 1657), was the daughter of Shahnawaz Khan (d. 1659), a dignitary of Shahjahan’s reign. For her early education she was assigned to Háfíza Maryam, a learned lady who was the mother of one of Awrangzib’s trusted nobles, ‘Inayat Allâh Khán (d. 1139/1726-7). Under Háfíza Maryam’s guidance, Zib al-Nisâ’ memorised the Kur’ân, for which Awrangzib rewarded her with a purse of 10,000 gold pieces. Later, she studied under some of the best scholars of the time, foremost among them being Muhammad Sa’d al-Azhâr (d. 1116/1708-9), a poet and man of learning who came to India from Persia during the early part of Awrangzib’s reign. Her accomplishments included mastery of Arabic and Persian languages as well as skill in calligraphic writing. She was a great lover of books, and is said to have collected a library which was unrivalled in its time. Many writers and scholars benefited from her generous patronage, and some of them composed books bearing her name. Significant among such writings was Safi al-Din Ardabili’s Zib al- tafsîrî, which was a Persian translation of Fakhri-
Din Razi’s exegesis of the Kur’ân. Zib al-Nisa remained unmarried throughout her life. It is reported that she was involved in a love intrigue with ʿākil Khân, a nobleman of Awrangzîb’s court, but this is pure fiction invented by some 19th-century Urdu writers. She incurred Awrangzîb’s wrath for complicity with her brother, Akbar, in his unsuccessful rebellion against the emperor. In 1681 she was imprisoned in the Sâlimgah fort at Dihll, where she spent the remaining years of her life until her death in 1702. Whether or not Zib al-Nisa’s love poem is a disputed question. A collection of verse published in her name under the title of Dîwân-i Makhrî has been subjected to critical scrutiny, and is regarded as the work of someone other than Zib al-Nisa². Sporadic verses attributed to her indicate that she was a promising poet, favouring a lyrical style. Bibliography: Mustaʿīd Khân Sâki, Maʿdîq ir-ʿIlmîyayn (tr.), Dîwan-i Zib al-Nisa, Calcutta 1947; Ahmad Khân Hâshimi Sandlîwâli, Tâglîkha-yi makhrîzân al-dârî wî, ii, ed. Muhammad Bâqîr Lahore 1970; Muhammad Kudrat Allâh Gopamâwî, Tâglîkha-yi naftâ tîdî al-afkâr, Bombay 1336/1957-8; Dîwân-i Makhrî, Cawnpore 1283/1666-7; Muhammad b. Muhammad Raśîd ‘Malik al-Kuttâb’ Shîrâzî, Tâglîkha-i khawâûsî, Bombay 1306/1589; Shams al-Dîn Sîmî, Kâmîs al-kâmîs, iv, Istanbul 1913; T. W. Everitt, An oriental biographical dictionary, London 1894; Magan Lal and Jessie Duncan Westbrook, The tears of Nissa, New York 1913; P. Whalley, Noor al-Hasan Delhi 1969; Muhammad Akil Mushlîm, Quellenuntersuchungen zum Kitâb al-‘Iqd al-farîd, QuellenUnters., ii, Tehran 1335/1956-7; Nur al-Hasan Delhi 1969, and Ahmad Khan Hashimi Sandalwall, Four eminent poetesses of Iran, Calcutta 1950; J. Rypka, History of Iranian literature, Dorsten 1956; ‘Ali Akbar Masûgîr Sallîmî, Zannâî al-sâhilî, Tehran 1314/1935-6; M. Ishaque, Four eminent poets of Iran, Calcutta 1950; The tears of Nissa, Noor al-Hasan Delhi 1969; and letters under the Mughals, Dihll 1976. (Munibur Rahman)

Makhlad, Banû, a family of famous Cor- dovan jurists who, from father to son, during ten generations, distinguished themselves in the study of fîkh. The eponymous ancestor of the family was Makhlad b. Yazîd, who was kâdî of the province of Reyvob (the kâta in the south-west of Spain, the capital of which was Malaga), in the reign of the amîr ʿAbd al-Rahmân II, in the first half of the 3rd/9th century. His son, Abû ʿAbd al-Rahmân Bâkî b. Makhlad [q.v.], was by far the most famous member of the family, and his direct descendants devoted their intellectual activity mainly to commenting on the masterpieces of their celebrated ancestor. A list of these scholars, with bibliographical references, is supplied in a little monograph devoted to the family of the Banû Makhlad by Rafael de Ureña y Smenjau, Familias de jurísculos: Las Benimajlad de Córdoba, in Homenaje a D. Francisco Cor- dora, Saragossa 1904, 251-8. Bibliography: Add to the Bibli. of Bâkî b. Makhlad: Manuela Marín, Basîn ibn Majlîl y la introducción del estudio del hadîth en al-Andalus, in al-Qantara, i (1980), 165-208; W. Werkmeister, Quellenuntersuchungen zum Kitâb al-ʿIqd al-farîd, Berlin 1983, 267-70 and index. (E. Lévi-Provençal)
and was buried at the side of his father and his uncle al-Tayyib close to the mausoleum of the SufT Djawhar al-Adan (6th/12th century, cf. Ta'rikh Thaqaf al-Adan, ii, 29 (f)). Having studied under both father, his uncle and ʿAbd Allāh b. Ahmad Bā Surūmī al-Shirī (d. 943/1536-7) he was kādi in Shībīr twice, became a great authority (ʿumada) on fākh, and was consulted from all parts of the Yaman and Hadramawt. As will be seen from the list of his writings, he was not only a fākh and theologian, but pursued a special interest of astronomy and chronology. He also wrote some poetry (ardjiz).


Bibliography: O. Lofgren, from khuzna, “to shut up, to preserve, to hoard”. The word is believed to have been first used in North Africa as an official term in the 2nd/8th century applied to an iron chest in which Ibrahim b. al-A ḡlab, amīr of Ifriqiya, kept the sums of money raised by taxation and intended for the ʿAbbāsid caliph of Baghdad. At first this term, which in Morocco is synonymous with the government, was applied only to the financial department, the Treasury. It may be said that the term makhzan (pronounced makḥzan) meant the Moroccan government, and everything more or less connected with it, at first merely the place where the sums raised by taxation were kept, intended to be paid into the treasury of the Muslim community, the bāyi al-māl [q.v.]. Later, when the sums thus raised were kept for use in the countries in which they were collected, and they became, as it were, the private treasuries of the communities in which they were collected, the word makhzan was used to mean the separate local treasuries and a certain amount of confusion arose between the makhzan and the bāyi al-māl.

We do find in Spain the expression ʿabd al-makhzan, but it still means slaves of the treasury rather than slaves of the government, and in al-Andalus, later it seems that in Morocco, in proportion as the state became separated from the rest of the Muslim community after being successively under the Ḥumayyids of Damascus, the ʿAbbāsids of Baghdad, the Ḥumayyids of Spain and the Fāṭimids of Egypt, that makhzan came to be used for the government itself.

To sum up, the word makhzan, after being used for the place where the sums intended for the bāyi al-māl of the Islamic empire were kept, was used for the local treasury of the Muslim community of Morocco, when it took shape under the great Berber dynasties; later, with the Shārifīs, the word was applied not only to the treasury but to the whole organisation more or less administrative in nature which lives on the treasury, that is to say the whole government of Morocco. In tracing through history the changes of meaning of the word makhzan, one comes to the conclusion that not only is the institution to which it is applied not religious in character but, on the contrary, in law, the term māẖrēḏā had two meanings. Certain judicial districts in the Ottoman Empire were referred to as makhzan, mektubiyet, [see mevel bayet]. The name derived from a common attribute of the judges appointed to these districts. All were judges ‘going out’ to their first appointment after teaching in schools, madrasa [q.v.]. The judges who had completed this appointment and were awaiting assignment to a higher ranking judicial district were called makhzandu mawāṣīsī.

In inheritance law, in 1864, al-falak was the term for the denominator which was used to divide an inheritance among heirs. We do find in Spain the expression ʿabd al-makhzan, but it still means slaves of the treasury rather than slaves of the government, and in al-Andalus, later it seems that in Morocco, in proportion as the state became separated from the rest of the Muslim community after being successively under the Ḥumayyids of Damascus, the ʿAbbāsids of Baghdad, the Ḥumayyids of Spain and the Fāṭimids of Egypt, that makhzan came to be used for the government itself.

To sum up, the word makhzan, after being used for the place where the sums intended for the bāyi al-māl of the Islamic empire were kept, was used for the local treasury of the Muslim community of Morocco, when it took shape under the great Berber dynasties; later, with the Shārifīs, the word was applied not only to the treasury but to the whole organisation more or less administrative in nature which lives on the treasury, that is to say the whole government of Morocco. In tracing through history the changes of meaning of the word makhzan, one comes to the conclusion that not only is the institution to which it is applied not religious in character but, on the contrary, in law, the term māẖrēḏā had two meanings. Certain judicial districts in the Ottoman Empire were referred to as makhzan, mektubiyet [see mevel bayet]. The name derived from a common attribute of the judges appointed to these districts. All were judges ‘going out’ to their first appointment after teaching in schools, madrasa [q.v.]. The judges who had completed this appointment and were awaiting assignment to a higher ranking judicial district were called makhzandu mawāṣīsī.

In inheritance law, in 1864, al-falak was the term for the denominator which was used to divide an inheritance among heirs. We do find in Spain the expression ʿabd al-makhzan, but it still means slaves of the treasury rather than slaves of the government, and in al-Andalus, later it seems that in Morocco, in proportion as the state became separated from the rest of the Muslim community after being successively under the Ḥumayyids of Damascus, the ʿAbbāsids of Baghdad, the Ḥumayyids of Spain and the Fāṭimids of Egypt, that makhzan came to be used for the government itself.

To sum up, the word makhzan, after being used for the place where the sums intended for the bāyi al-māl of the Islamic empire were kept, was used for the local treasury of the Muslim community of Morocco, when it took shape under the great Berber dynasties; later, with the Shārifīs, the word was applied not only to the treasury but to the whole organisation more or less administrative in nature which lives on the treasury, that is to say the whole government of Morocco. In tracing through history the changes of meaning of the word makhzan, one comes to the conclusion that not only is the institution to which it is applied not religious in character but, on the contrary, in law, the term māẖrēḏā had two meanings. Certain judicial districts in the Ottoman Empire were referred to as makhzan, mektubiyet [see mevel bayet]. The name derived from a common attribute of the judges appointed to these districts. All were judges ‘going out’ to their first appointment after teaching in schools, madrasa [q.v.]. The judges who had completed this appointment and were awaiting assignment to a higher ranking judicial district were called makhzandu mawāṣīsī.

In inheritance law, in 1864, al-falak was the term for the denominator which was used to divide an inheritance among heirs. We do find in Spain the expression ʿabd al-makhzan, but it still means slaves of the treasury rather than slaves of the government, and in al-Andalus, later it seems that in Morocco, in proportion as the state became separated from the rest of the Muslim community after being successively under the Ḥumayyids of Damascus, the ʿAbbāsids of Baghdad, the Ḥumayyids of Spain and the Fāṭimids of Egypt, that makhzan came to be used for the government itself.

To sum up, the word makhzan, after being used for the place where the sums intended for the bāyi al-māl of the Islamic empire were kept, was used for the local treasury of the Muslim community of Morocco, when it took shape under the great Berber dynasties; later, with the Shārifīs, the word was applied not only to the treasury but to the whole organisation more or less administrative in nature which lives on the treasury, that is to say the whole government of Morocco. In tracing through history the changes of meaning of the word makhzan, one comes to the conclusion that not only is the institution to which it is applied not religious in character but, on the contrary,
it represents the combined usurpations of powers, originally religious, by laymen, at the expense of which ... ajaysh a sum for replacing them (from ndba "to act as a substitute").

From this time onwards, Morocco assumed the appearance of a proper makhzan with its military tribes; ministers, its crown officials of high and low degree, its governors to whom were soon added the innumerable groups of palace officials which will be mentioned below.

The frequent intercourse between the Sa'dids and the Turks, who had come to settle in Algeria at the beginning of the 10th/11th century, brought to the court of Morocco a certain amount of eastern ceremonial, a certain amount of luxury and even a certain degree of pomp in the life of the sovereign and in that of his entourage and of all the individuals employed in the makhzan.

The increasing official relations of Morocco with European powers, the exchange of ambassadors, the commercial agreements and the ransoming of Christian slaves, largely contributed to give this Makhzan more and more the appearance of a regular government. The jealousies of the powers, their desire to maintain their garrisons in Morocco and the need to have a regular government to deal with them further strengthened the makhzan both at home and abroad and enabled the sultan Mawlay al-Hasan to conduct for nearly twenty years this policy of equilibrium between the powers on one side, and the tribes on the other, who kept till his death the empire of Morocco in existence, built up of very diverse elements, of which the makhzan formed the facade.

The very humble, almost humiliating, attitude imposed on the European ambassadors at official receptions increased the prestige of the sultan and the makhzan in the eyes of the tribes. The envoy of the Christian power, surrounded by the presents which he brought, appeared on foot in a court of the palace and seemed to have come to pay tribute to the commander of the Muslims, who was on horseback. All the theatrical side was developed to strike the imagination of the makhzan with much care, and it succeeded in creating an illusion of the real efficiency of this organisation in the eyes of both tribes and powers.

Under the Berber dynasties, the Almohads, the Marinids and the Banū Watṭāṣ, the military tribes, the gāzī (gish) were almost all Arab; under the Sa'dids they were entirely Arab; to the Djaḥsh and Banū Ḥilāl Arabs were added the Ma'ālik Arabs of the Sūs. On the other hand the Sa'dids had removed from the registers of the gāzī a certain number of the Arab tribes who then paid in money the kharāḍt for the abūs lands of the Muslim community which they occupied. These tribes, in contrast to the gāzī, were called tribes of the nāsha'd, that is to say, according to the etymology proposed for the word, they were under the tutelage of the makhzan (from nā'ib "tutor" or "substitute" for a father), or rather, they paid the tribes of the gāzī a sum for replacing them (from nāba "to act as a substitute").

From this time onwards, Morocco assumed the ap-
peformance which it had when France established her protectorate there. The frontier, settled with the Turks in the east, had hardly been altered by the occupation of Algeria by France and the territory of Morocco was divided into two parts: 1. bilād al-makhzan or conquered territory; 2. bilād al-siba [q.v.] or land of schism; the latter was almost exclusively occupied by Berbers.

The bilād al-makhzan, which represented official Morocco, was formed of territories belonging to the akhla of the Muslim community, liable to the akhla and occupied by Arab tribes, some ghīb, other nā'ba. The Berber tribes of the bilād al-siba not only refused to allow the authority of the makhzan to penetrate among them, but even had a tendency to go back to the plains from which they had gradually been pushed into the mountains. One of the main endeavours of the present dynasty, the ʿAlāwīs of Tafīlalt, which succeeded the Saʿīdīs in the 11th/17th century, has been to oppose this movement of expansion of the Berber tribes. This is why Mawlay Ismāʿīl, the most illustrious sultan of this dynasty, built 70 kāyban on the frontier of the bilād al-makhzan to keep down the Berbers. Hence we have this policy of equilibrium and intrigues which has just been mentioned and which up to about the 20th century was the work of the makhzan.

Makhzan, gradually formed in course of centuries by the possibilities and exigencies of domestic policy as well as by the demands of foreign policy, seems to have attained its most complete development in the reign of Mawlay al-Ḥasan, the last great independent sultan of Morocco (1873-94). The government of Mawlay al-Ḥasan consisted in the first place of the sultan himself, at once hereditary and also, if not exactly elected, at least nominated by the ʿulamaʾ and notables of each town and tribes from among the sons, brothers, nephews and even the cousins of the late ruler. This proclamation is called baʿya. It is, in general, he who takes control of the treasury and of the troops when the moment comes to assume the right of succession. It sometimes happens that the late sovereign has nominated his successors, but this does not constitute an obligation on the electors to obey it. There is then no rule of succession to the throne.

Formerly there was only one vizier, the grand vizier (al-ṣadr al-ʿaṣrām); the grand vizierate, a kind of Ministry of the Interior was divided into three sections, each managed by a secretary (kāṭib).

1. From the Strait of Gibraltar to the Wād Bū Regreg.
2. From Bū Regreg to the Sahara.
3. The Tafīlalt.

In the reign of ʿAlī Muhammad (1859-73), the more frequent and intimate relations with Europe and more particularly the working of the protectorate, made it necessary to found a special office for foreign relations, and a waṣīr al-bahr, literally Minister of the Sea, was appointed. This did not mean minister for the navy, but for all that came by sea, i.e. Europeans. This minister had a representative in Tangier, the nāʿib al-sūlān, who was the intermediary between European representatives and the central makhzan.

His task was to deal with European complaints and claims from perpetual settlements and to play off against one another the protégés of the European powers. The Saʿīdīs were certainly increasing in number and frequently formed an obstacle to the traditional arbitrary rule of the makhzan. The régime of the consular protectorate, settled and regulated in 1880 by the Convention of Madrid, had also resulted in discouraging the makhzan from extending its authority over new territory.

The exercise of this authority was in fact automatically followed by the exercise of the right of protection and, from the point of view of resistance to European penetration, the makhzan had everything to gain by keeping in an apparent political independence the greater part of the territory in order to escape the influence which threatened in time to turn Morocco into a regular international protectorate.

By a conciliatory policy and cautious dealing with the local chiefs, the ṣāḥib of the aṣyān and the Sharīfīs families, the makhzan was able to exert even in the remotest districts a real influence and never ceased to carry on perpetual intrigues in order to divide the tribes against one another. It maintained its religious prestige by the hope of preparation for the holy war which was one day to drive out the infidels, and sought to penetrate by spreading the Arabic language and the teaching of the Kurʾān and gradually substituting the institutions of Islam by those of Islam, so that the authorities would be able to deal with the Berbers and not with a foreign element, for Berber customs. In a word, it continued the conquest of the country by trying to complete its Islamisation and making Islam permeate its customs.

In the reign of Mawlay al-Ḥasan, the makhzan consisted of the grand vizier, the waṣīr al-bahr, minister of foreign affairs, the ʿatal—afterwards called minister of war—the amīn al-ʿumandīn, foreign minister of finance—the kāṭib al-fāṣid, secretary for complaints, who became minister of justice by combining his duties with that of the kāṭib ʿl-kudt, Kāṭib of Kādīs. These high officials had the offices (ḥānīka, pl. ḥānīk) in the masgūwar at the Palace.

The offices were under the galleries which were built round a large courtyard. At the top of the masgūwar was the office of the grand vizier, beside which was that of the kāṭib al-mashwar, a kind of captain of the guard, who also made presentations to the sultan. The kāʾid al-mashwar was in command of the police of the masgūwar and he had under his command the troops of the ghīb, the masgūwarīya, masgūwarīya as well as all the bodies of servants outside the palace (ḥanāṭī, sīn. ḥanāṭa); the muṣālī (mūlū al-rūs, grand-master of the stables, and the ṣāḥib al-hāfẓa, who had charge of the sultan’s encampments (ṣāḥib [q.v.]).

In addition to these ḥānīkās of the masgūwar, mention must be made of an individual who could play a more considerable part in the government than his actual office would lead one to expect. This is the ḥādīqī [q.v.], whose ḥānīka was situated between the masgūwar and the palace proper; he had charge of the interior arrangements of the sultan’s household. Under his orders were the various groups of domestic servants (ḥanāṭī al-dākhīlīn), masgūwarī al-ṣūlān, who looked after the washing arrangements, muṣālī al-fāṣid, who attended to the beds, etc.; he also commanded the eunuchs and even was responsible for the discipline of the sultan’s women, through the sirāfīs or mistresses of the palace. The ḥādīqī is often called grand chamberlain, although he does not exactly correspond to this office.

Around these offices gravitated a world of secretaries of different ranks, of officers of the ghīb, then the kāʾid al-rākā, who was in theory in command of 500 horsemen, the kāʾid al-mīʿa, who commanded
100, down to a simple mukaddam. All this horde of officials, badly paid when paid at all, lived on the financial, who was later known as the minister of the imamlık, was levied on the non-?F? tribes by the grand vizier, which was sufficient in the old order of things which it had itself contributed to create and maintain, was forced, if it was not to disappear at once, to undergo fundamental modifications from the moment this state of things had rendered necessary the establishment of a protectorate. The vizierate of foreign affairs and that of war were then handed over to the Resident-General, and that of finance to the Director-General of Finance, who administered the revenue of the empire like those of a regularly-organised state. The director-generalships of agriculture and education, which were regular ministries held by French officials, as were the management of the postal service, telegraph and telephone, and the board of health.

Two new vizierates had been created, that of the regal domains (al-amîlak) and that of the abâbîs. The vizierate of the amîlak was soon suppressed and the domains were henceforward administered by a branch of the finance department. The vizierate of the abâbî was under that of the Sharifian affairs. This organisation represented the principle of protectorate in the Moroccan government itself, in order to realise “the organisation of a reformed Sharifian makhzan” in keeping with the treaty. (E. Michaux-Bellaire)

Bibliography: 1. On the evolution of the meaning of the word makhzan: E. Lévi-Provençal, Documents inédits d'histoire almohade, Paris 1928, Arabic text, 71 and glossary, and esp. Dozy, Supplément, s.v. šīr, n., and the bibl. cited there. For the sense of the term in Algeria, see F. Pharaon, Notes sur les tribus de la Subdivision de Médéa, in RA (1856-7), 393; in ibid. (1873), 196 ff.; N. Robin, Note sur l’organisation militaire et administrative des Turcs dans la Grande Kabylie, in ibid. (1873), 196 ff.; E. Mangin, Notes sur l’histoire de Laghouat, in ibid. (1895), 190 ff.

2. On the history of this institution: (a) Arabic works: Kitâb al-Baydak, in Lévi-Provençal, op. cit.; Ibn Abi Zar‘, Kitâb, lith. Fâs 1305; Ibn Baṭṭûta, Riḥâs; Ibn Ḥâlidûn, Makaddima; Ifrînî, Nuzhat al-bâdî, Arabic text, lith. Fâs 1307, tr. O. Nothing was done for public health, and one could not give the name of hospitals to the few mawāsit which were found in certain towns, where a few miserable creatures lived in filth, receiving from the abâbîs and the charity of the public barely enough to prevent them dying of hunger and without, of course, receiving any medical assistance.

On the repeated representation of the Powers, the sultan had ultimately delegated his powers to the members of the diplomatic corps in Tangier, which had been able to form a public health committee in order to be able to refuse admission if necessary to infected vessels. In spite of its defects, the makhzan constituted a real force; it formed a solid bloc in the centre of surrounding anarchy which it was interested in maintaining, in order to be able to exploit it more easily on the one hand and on the other to prevent the preservation in the country of any united order which might become a danger to it. In brief, we may say that the makhzan in Morocco was an instrument of arbitrary government, which worked quite well in the social disorder of the country, and thanks to this disorder, we may add, it worked for its own profit and was in a way like a foreign element in a conquered country. It was a regular caste with its own traditions, way of living, of dressing, of furnishing, of feeding, with its own language, al-ḥagha al-makhzanîyya, i.e. the language of the vizier without the sultan or the public treasury getting any benefit from it.

The grand vizier also appointed the nâdir (< nāzīr) officials who, from the reign of Mawlay ʿAbd al-Rahmān, had been attached to the local nāzīrîn of the abâbîs of the mosques and sanctuaries. The financial staff, umanî, who controlled the customs, the properties of the makhzan (al-amîlak), the market-fairs (market-dues and tolls, etc., called mulâsî, pl. of maksî), the controller of the bayt al-mdîl, Rahmann, had been attached to the local makhzaniyya, which is a correct Arabic intermediate system of equal favour, purchased arms and munitions from the different powers and kept them in the warehouses, and the board of health. The expenses of the education service were limited to the maintenance of a fact in the social disorder of the country, and thanks to this disorder, it worked for its own benefit and was in a way like a foreign element in a conquered country. It was a regular caste with its own traditions, way of living, of dressing, of furnishing, of feeding, with its own language, al-ḥagha al-makhzanîyya, i.e. the language of the vizier without the sultan or the public treasury getting any benefit from it.

This organisation was completely centralised, i.e. its only object was to bring all the resources of the country into the coffers of the state and of its agents; but no provision was made for utilising these resources in the public interest. No budget was drawn up, no public works, no railways, no navy, no commerce and no post was provided for. Military expenses were confined to the maintenance of a regiment commanded by an English officer, of a French mission of military instruction, of a factory of arms at Fâs directed by Italian officers and of the building at Rabat of a fort by a German engineer. Everything and augmented by the gifts made by the sultan on the occasion of feasts (silâ).
Houdas, Paris 1889; Zayyani, al-Turdjuman al-
mu^rib, extract published and tr. Houdas, Le...
Descendants of al-Mughira b. 'Abd Allâh b. Umar b. Makhzûm

8 or 9 sons

Abû Rahîm
Abû Rabi’â
Abû Musaylima
Abû Bakr
Abû al-Rahmân
Hâshim
al-Walid
Nantama
Ibrikhâm
Muhammad
Umm Hâshim

Following the conquest of Mecca, Makhzûm were incorporated into the new order. Two of their number, al-Hâshim b. Hîsham b. al-Mughira and Sa’d b. Yarbû, were among those whose hearts were reconciled (al-mu’âllafa kulubuhum: Watt, Medina, 74), presumably in their capacity as leaders of the Banu ‘l-Mughira and the cadet branches respectively (Mu’arrîdî, 74, also names a second person from the cadet branches in this connection). Ikrima received a pardon, returned from the Yemen, played a conspicuous part in the suppression of the rûdâ (q. v.) in 11/632-3 (see al-Tâbarî, index, the Yemen was among the places to which this activity took him, but Mu’arrîdî seems to be alone in holding the view (69) that Abû Bakr appointed him over the Yemen), and was subsequently mortally wounded in battle against the Byzantines in Syria (at either al-Adnînayn [q. v.] or al-Yarmûk [q. v.]: al-Mus'ab, 303, 310; Ibn Sa’îd, v, 329; Ibn Durayd, 93; al-Baladhuri, Ansâb, ms., ii, 526; al-Tâbarî, i, 2100-1, iii, 2307). The continuing Makhzûm link with the Yemen also becomes apparent with the appointments there of al-Muhadjir b. Abî Umayya b. al-Mughira and ‘Abd Allâh b. Abî Rabi’â b. al-Mughira; there is disagreement in the sources about points of detail, but it would seem that al-Muhadjir was appointed as governor of San‘â by the Prophet in 10/631 but did not go there, was reappointed by Abû Bakr, went there, and was still there at the time of Abû Bakr’s death in 13/634 (Mu’arrîdî, 71; Ibn Durayd, 62, who incorrectly calls him al-Muhadjir b. ‘Abd Allâh b. Abî Umayya; al-Tâbarî, i, 1750, 2013, 2315, iii, 2357). Even more confused are the reports relating to ‘Abd Allâh b. Abî Rabi’â, who is one of those named in the earlier context of Makhzûm trade in the Yemen. He was appointed over al-Djanad and its mikhâl by the Prophet (Aghânî, i, 32), over all or part of the Yemen by Abû Bakr (al-Baladhuri, Ansâb, ms., ii, 531), and over the Yemen by Umar (al-Mus’ab, 317; Ibn Sa’îd, v, 328, Khâlîfî b. Khayyât, Ta’rikh, ed. Zakkar, 154; Ibn Hazm, 146); he was governor of al-Djanad at the time of ‘Umar’s death (al-Tâbarî, i, 2798; Aghânî, i, 32) in 23/634 and at the time of the death of Ummân (al-Tâbarî, i, 3057 Add.) in 35/656.

Two other Makhzûms who were particularly active in this period were Khâlîfî b. al-Walid b. al-Mughira [q. v.], who had earlier played a vigorous part in the Meccan military opposition to him, Khâlîfî participated in the conquest of Mecca; and Ikrima fled to the Yemen.

two more of the sons of al-Mughira, together with four of their sons (P. Crone, Meccan trade (forthcoming), ch. v).

The emergence of Muhammad as Prophet in the second decade of the 7th century A.D. met with strenuous opposition on the part of the Makhzûm leader of the time, Abû Djihal b. Hîsham b. al-Mughira [q. v.: he it was who in particular brought into effect the boycott of the Banû Hâshim in ca. 616-18 (Watt, Mecca, 117 ff.). In addition, his uncle, the hukam [q. v.: Ibn Habîb, 460; al-Fâsl, ed. Wüstenfeld, in Die Chroniken der Stadt Mekka, ii, 143] al-Walid b. al-Mughira, was one of the “deriders” (al-mustahzibûn) against whom verses in the Meccan suras of the Kur’ân are said to have been directed (Watt, 176, and cf. 93). al-Muhadjir was appointed as governor of San‘â by the Prophet shortly after the hujjra at the battle of Badr [q. v.: where the Meccan force which went to the assistance of the threatened caravan was led by Abû Djihal. The Makhzûm losses were heavy: seven or eight of al-Mughira’s twenty-five or so grandsons were killed on the Meccan side at Badr (among them Abû Djihal himself), together with a similar number and proportion of the same generation of the cadet branches of Makhzûm, and others were taken captive (for details, see Ibn al-Kalbî, tables ii, 22-3 and Register; al-Musâb, 299-346; Watt, Mecca, 176-7); the three Makhzûms who fought on the Prophet’s side at Badr, viz. al-‘Arqam b. Abû Manâf, Abû Salama b. Abû al-Asad, and Şamâs b. ‘Uttmân, were all from the cadet branches of Makhzûm, not from the Banu ‘l-Mughira (Mu’arrîdî, 73-4; Watt, Mecca, 176, and cf. 93). Losses of an order such as this inevitably weakened the position of Makhzûm at Mecca, and in particular vis-à-vis Abû Sufyân [q. v.]; there is disagreement in the reports relating to this activity took him, but Mu’arrîdî seems to be alone in holding the view (69) that Abû Bakr appointed him over the Yemen), and was subsequently mortally wounded in battle against the Byzantines in Syria (at either al-Adnînayn [q. v.] or al-Yarmûk [q. v.: al-Mus’ab, 303, 310; Ibn Sa’îd, v, 329; Ibn Durayd, 93; al-Baladhuri, Ansâb, ms., ii, 526; al-Tâbarî, i, 2100-1, iii, 2307). The continuing Makhzûm link with the Yemen also becomes apparent with the appointments there of al-Muhadjir b. Abî Umayya b. al-Mughira and ‘Abd Allâh b. Abî Rabi’â b. al-Mughira; there is disagreement in the sources about points of detail, but it would seem that al-Muhadjir was appointed as governor of San‘â by the Prophet in 10/631 but did not go there, was reappointed by Abû Bakr, went there, and was still there at the time of Abû Bakr’s death in 13/634 (Mu’arrîdî, 71; Ibn Durayd, 62, who incorrectly calls him al-Muhadjir b. ‘Abd Allâh b. Abî Umayya; al-Tâbarî, i, 1750, 2013, 2315, iii, 2357). Even more confused are the reports relating to ‘Abd Allâh b. Abî Rabi’â, who is one of those named in the earlier context of Makhzûm trade in the Yemen. He was appointed over al-Djanad and its mikhâl by the Prophet (Aghânî, i, 32), over all or part of the Yemen by Abû Bakr (al-Baladhuri, Ansâb, ms., ii, 531), and over the Yemen by Umar (al-Mus’ab, 317; Ibn Sa’îd, v, 328, Khâlîfî b. Khayyât, Ta’rikh, ed. Zakkar, 154; Ibn Hazm, 146); he was governor of al-Djanad at the time of ‘Umar’s death (al-Tâbarî, i, 2798; Aghânî, i, 32) in 23/634 and at the time of the death of Ummân (al-Tâbarî, i, 3057 Add.) in 35/656.

Two other Makhzûms who were particularly active in this period were Khâlîfî b. al-Walid b. al-Mughira [q. v.], who had earlier played a vigorous part in the Meccan military opposition to him, Khâlîfî participated in the conquest of Mecca; and Ikrima fled to the Yemen.
Harith also took part in the conquest of Syria and later migrated there with 70 of his ahl bayt, ... as potential successor to Muawiya) and Ibn Uthal himself was killed in vengeance by Abd al-Rahman's nephew Khalid b.

Khalid's line lies above all in his own accomplishments and that the line came to an end in the time of (their ancestor) al-Walid b. al-Hadjdjadj). of these ladies, while it may not have been typical, does at least give us an indication of how large such a settlement could be (al-Muṣ̄ab, 306-8). In the following generation, the ten recorded marriages involving the six daughters of al-Mughira b. Abd al-Rahman are also instructive: one with a Mahzūmi (an ibn `am) three with Marwānids (including one of Abd al-Malik's sons) and five with other Kurāshis (descendants of Abū Bakr, Umar, Uthman, al-Abbās and Taḥala respectively); the tenth of these marriages, that of Umm al-Banin bint al-Mughira b. Abd al-Rahman to al-Hadidjāḥ b. Yusuf [q.v.] (al-Muṣ̄ab, 310), represents the earliest indication of a Mahzūmiyya being given in marriage to a non-Kurāshi (the two other examples of this phenomenon given by al-Muṣ̄ab (309, 310) involve sons of al-Hadidjāḥ).

A second branch of the Banu `l-Mughira to which attention should be paid is that of al-Walid b. al-Mughira, particularly in the lines of his sons Khalīd, Hāshim and al-Walid. The distinction of Khalīd's line lies above all in his own accomplishments and those of his son Abd al-Rahman [q.v.], who was governor of Bins and the Džažara for Muawiya and achieved renown as the leader of campaigns against the Byzantines. Al-Muṣ̄ab states quite categorically that the line came to an end in the time of (their agnate relative) Ayyūb b. Salama (328), i.e. by the end of the Umayyad period or conceivably just after; all forty or so of Khalīd's male descendants died in a plague in Syria (Ibn Hazm, 140). The line of Hāshim b. al-Walid is of interest because his grandson Hāshim b. Ismaːīl, in addition to being Abd al-Malik's governor of Medina, was also the father of Abd al-Malik's wife Umm Hāshim (Muʾaːrrijid, 71; al-Muṣ̄ab, 328; al-Baladhūrī, Anūsah, ms., ii, 541; Ibn Hazm, 148; Umm Hāshim); Ibn Hazm, Unmābāt al-kulāfā', ed. al-Munāqṣ̄idād, 17: her name was either `Ayya or Fāṭima). When her son Hāshim became caliph, he appointed his maternal uncle al-Hāshim b. Muhammad, the sons of Hāshim b. Ismaːīl, to terms of office as governors of Medina; they later ran foul of his successor, al-Walid b. Yazīd, and were tortured to death on his instructions by the governor of `Irāk, Yūsuf b. Umar [q.v.] (al-Muṣ̄ab, 329; al-Baladhūrī, Anūsah, ms., ii, 541 (Muhammad was governor of Mecca and then of Medina)). As far as the line of al-Walid b. al-Walid is concerned, its interest lies primarily in the fact that it produced Umm Salama bint Yaʿkūb b. Salama, who married the future first Abbāsid caliph, Abu ʾl-Abbās; their daughter Rayya married the caliph al-Mahdī and bore him two sons (Muʾaːrrijid, 72; al-Muṣ̄ab, 330; al-Baladhūrī, Anūsah, iii, ed. al-Dūrī, 161, 180; Ibn Hazm, 148).

Although there were some Mahzūmiyya in Syria (at least under Umayyad rule) one line bore the name Mahzūmī (mainly Basra) in the course of the Umayyad period, the main concentration of Mahzūmī was in the Hijāz, at Mecca and Medina. The Mahzūmī of Medina appear to have come into conflict with Uṯmān on account of his maltreatment of the Companion Anmār b. Yāsir [q.v.] (al-Masʿūdī, Muṣ̄af, iv, 266, 299 = §§ 1591, 1602), who was a maṣūlī of the family of Abū Bakr (al-Muṣ̄ab, 309, 310, al-Baladhūrī, Anūsah, iii, 176; al-Talhibārī, iii, 2388). In the events following the murder of Uṯmān, some Mahzūmī support for Talha [q.v.] and al-Zubayr [q.v.] is indicated by the Mahzūmi casualties (Khaifa, 209) at the battle of the Camel (al-Djamal [q.v.]). In the ensuing confrontation between ʿAli and Muawiya, Muʿāwiyah had the support of Abd al-Rahman b. Khalīd, who distinguished himself at the battle of Siffin [q.v.], where he bore the standard of the Syrian army (Lammens, Etudes, 5); and the Mahzūmī of the Hijāz may be presumed to have preferred Muʿāwiyah to ʿAli. The presence on ʿAli's side of Djaḍa b. Hubayra, who was from one of the cadre branches of Mahzūmī, is explained by the identities of his mother and his wife: her mother was a daughter of Abū Taibī and his wife was a daughter of ʿAli (Muʾaːrrijid, 75; al-Muṣ̄ab, 39, 45, 344, 345; Ibn Hazm, 141). Less easy to explain is the pro-Hāshimite stance of Khalīd's son al-Muhādjar, who was killed on ʿAli's side at Siffin (Ibn Habīb, 450; al-Baladhūrī, Anūsah, ms., ii, 543; Ṭāhūrī, xv, 13).

If we are to judge by the pattern emerging from the marriages reported by al-Muṣ̄ab and Zubayrī, however, it would seem that Muʿāwiyah's ultimate victory was not particularly to the advantage of Mahzūmī. Their links by marriage were stronger with the Zubayrids and the descendants of Uṯmān and al-Hakam than with the Sufyānids. Moreover, relations between Muʿāwiyah and Mahzūmī deteriorated when Abd al-Rahman b. Khalīd was (at least allegedly) poisoned in 466/666 by Muʿāwiyah's physician Ibn Uṭālī (reportedly on account of his growing popularity as potential successor to Muʿāwiyah) and Ibn Uṭālī himself was killed in vengeance by Abd al-Rahmān's nephew Khalīd b.
Mecca and Medina in the time of al-Mansur and al-Hadi, Muhammad al-Awa’s b. ‘Abd al-Rahman (from the Banu ‘Hisham b. al-Mughira) served as kadi of Mecca in the time of al-Mahdi (al-Mus‘ab, 315; Ibn Hazm, 146; al-Baladhuri, Ansab, ms., ii, 531 says in the time of Aba Dja’far, and Hisham b. ‘Abd al-Malik al-Ashjar (from the Banu Hisham b. al-Mughira) served as kadi of Medina in the time of the caliph Harun al-Rashid (al-Mus‘ab, 309; Ibn Hazm, 145). There are in addition indications that in the early Abbasid period Makhzumi links with Alids, notably Hasanids, became closer (al-Mus‘ab, 52-3, 56, 63); in particular, the mother of Idriss b. ‘Abd Allah [g.v.), who founded the Idrisid dynasty in the Maghrib in the end of the 8th century A.D., was ‘Atika bint ‘Abd al-Malik b. al-Harith b. Khalid b. al-Ashi (from the Banu Hisham b. al-Mughira: al-Mus‘ab, 54, 315).

The bulk of the wealth and assets of Makhzumi may be presumed to have been in the Hijaz: they owned much land and property in and around Mecca (al-Azraqi, ed. Wüstenfeld, in Die Chroniken der Stadt Mecca, i, 468-72 for details), as well as the tax office, nearly all Copts. He performed these duties for a long time in Alexandria, and it is plain that he had access forswear allegiance to Yazid (al-Mus‘ab, 327; Ibn Habib, 449 ff.; al-Baladhuri, ms., ii, 542; Aghdni, xv, 13; al-Tabari, ii, 82-3) seems to be alone in attributing the murder of Ibn Uthal to Khalid b. Abd al-Rahman—

The sources tell us little of Makhzum thereafter until the end of the Umayyad caliphate. There is indication that, during the caliphates of al-Mansur and al-Mahdi, special mention should be made of Makhzumi’s cousin, the great jurist and hadith scholar, Ibn Abi ‘l-Hadil, author of an important, long-forgotten fiscal treatise, al-Minhadji fi 4im khirad Misr, a large part of which was recently discovered in the acephalous ms. Add. 23,483 in the British Museum. Al-Makhzumi belonged to a great family dating back to the origins of Islam. He was a monk, the sole subsequent Makhzumi appointee to the office of kadi in Medina awarded by Ibn Umar b. ‘Abd al-Rahman b. al-Harith b. Khalid, to the post (al-Mus‘ab, 305-6) does prompt the question of whether Makhzumi may have had a stake in the business of provisioning more generally. There is not a great deal of evidence of Makhzumi’s economic involvement elsewhere: ‘Amr b. Hurayth, who was from one of the cadet branches, prospered greatly in al-Kūfa from early on (al-Mus‘ab, 333; Ibn Durayd, 61); and Muhammad b. Umar b. ‘Abd al-Rahman b. al-Harith, who took the head of the rebel Yazid b. al-Mu‘allab [g.v.] to the caliph Yazid b. ‘Abd al-Malik, was rewarded for his pains with the rebel’s dār (sc. at al-Baṣra) and some of his estates (al-Baladhuri, Ansab, ms., ii, 528). Insufficient evidence also prevents much being said about the nature of Makhzumi links with the Yemen after ‘Abd Allah b. Abi Rabia: the sole subsequent Makhzumi appointee to the office of kadi in Medina was a minister of ‘Abd al-Malik’s immediate successors; al-Walid dismissed ‘Abd Allah b. al-Musayyab b. ‘Abd al-Malik b. al-Harith b. Khalid b. al-Ashi from his post at Medina, and the sources tell us little of Makhzum thereafter until the caliph Hisham appointed his maternal uncles as governors of Medina in the 720s to 740s; their demise at the hands of Yusuf b. ‘Umar shortly preceded the end of the Umayyad caliphate. It is apparent that, as the Hijaz became more and more a political backwater after the defeat of the Zubayrids, the role of Makhzumi became increasingly restricted to one of being merely a local agent. Individual Makhzumis crop up in the sources mainly in the context of religious learning and the application of Islamic law: In addition to Abū Bakr b. ‘Abd al-Rahman (see above), special mention should be made of the fakih Sa‘id b. al-Musayyab [g.v.], who was from one of the cadet branches of Makhzumi; a list of Makhzumis who transmitted hadith is given by al-Tabari (iii, 2393-8); ‘Abd al-Aziz b. ‘Abd al-Malik b. ‘Abd al-Malik b. ‘Abd Allah b. ‘Abd al-Rahman b. ‘Abd Allah b. ‘Abd al-Malik b. al-Harith b. Khalid b. ‘Abd Allah b. ‘Abd Allah [g.v.], who founded the Idrisid dynasty in the Maghrib in the end of the 8th century A.D., was ‘Atika bint ‘Abd al-Malik b. al-Harith b. Khalid b. al-Ashi (from the Banu Hisham b. al-Mughira: al-Mus‘ab, 54, 315).
quired a concrete experience of the work, which his illustrious contemporary, Ibn Mammâti [q.v.] did not possess. Although the two works have similar documentary sources for some points and present almost the same form of administration (that of the later Fâtîmids prolonged under Saladin), they differ profoundly: the Kawdânîn al-dawânîh presents a clear, methodical account, without technical details which would be difficult for the senior civil servant to understand, of the fiscal régime of Egypt; the Minhâdî is concerned, with the concrete activities performed by the employees of the tax office. For us, its most remarkable originality lies in the minute description it gives of the customs and commercial administration of the Mediterranean ports frequented by Italian merchants; it provides despite the lacunas of the manuscript and the mediocrity of the style, something which no other work gives us in any corresponding measure. There is also an important chapter on the army, a very short one on the currency, the īrāz, etc.

The author of the present article has devoted to the contents of the Minhâdî, especially in JESHO for 1962, 1963, 1965 and 1972, a series of articles now gathered together in his Makzûmiyyât (Leiden 1978) and hopes to produce in the near future the complete Arabic text. The manuscript, however, comprises in its first part some historical developments and traditions which, having been considered for state reasons to be of no importance, were not transmitted to the next generation; in the second part, the nomenclature is much too extensive, and the nomenclature is much too extensive, and the nomenclature is much too extensive. However, they are far too numerous, and the nomenclature is much too extensive, and the nomenclature is much too extensive, and the nomenclature is much too extensive.
that the Ma‘kil settled in the pre-Saharan areas of Morocco, where they began to dominate the local populations without, however, playing a political role wide enough to be termed national. But on the accession of the Marinids (660-823/1269-1420 [q.v.]), the situation was modified. Shortly after the unsuccessful siege (660-1261/2) of Sidjilmassa [q.v.] by a Marinid prince, the inhabitants of the town, which had fallen into the hands of the Ma‘kil clan of the Munabbat, appealed to the ‘Abd al-Wäldids (7th-10th/13-16th centuries [q.v.]) of Tiemenç (‘Berrès, ii, 278-9), who led the Marinids ‘Abd al-Hakîb b. ‘Abd al-‘Haqîk (656-8/1258-86) to come to seize it in 672/1274 (‘Berrères, iv, 68-9) and to massacre the population. Various clans of the Ma‘kil, such as the Shabbanät and the Qhuribán, on the direct route from Tafrilat to Fez, before spreading, at the beginning of the 11th/17th century, in the region of Seffrou, bringing in their wake the tribes of Berber descent (see G. S. Colin, Origine arabe des grands mouvements de populations berbères dans le Moyen-Atlas, in Hespéris, 1938/2-3, 265-8). And it is probably at the end of the 9th/15th century that the Zer (Zārîr), who are authentic Ma‘kil (al-Ifrînî, Na‘tha, Fr. tr. Houdas, 329), moved northwards across the mountainous massifs of the High and Middle Atlas. Leo Africanus (i, 249-50) mentions them near Kénitra, and they then desolated the valleys of the Bou Regreg and its tributaries to come to settle to the south of Rabat, where they are still to be found (see V. Loubignac, Textes arabes des Zer, PIHEM, xlv, Paris 1953).

Leo Africanus also recalls (ii, 426-7) that in the same period the Ma‘kil were the masters of Sidjilmassa and that they controlled the traffic, levying a toll; but, even if they did not attack caravans, their presence made the traditional routes from the Maghrib to the Sudan impracticable, so that travellers had to make detours. At the end of the 9th/15th century, they were powerful enough in the south-west of Morocco to participate in the agreements reached in 904/1499 between the Berbers and Castile (D. Jacques-Meunie, Maroc Saharien, i, 317). Subsequently, their attitude towards the Portuguese regarding the position of Santiago Cruz of the Cap de Gué (see GADIR) seems to have been conditioned by their relations with the Sa‘dîds (961-1064/1554-1654 [q.v.]). In fact, in the period which witnessed the birth of the movement which was to result in the foundation of this dynasty, the Berbers of Sous, exhausted by the oppression that the Arabs had inflicted upon them, supported the action of these more or less genuine sharifs whom they continued to uphold, whereas the clan of the Shabbanät of the plain of Sous and the western High Atlas were, it seems, the only one to rally to the Sa‘dîds, whose famous sultan Ahmad al-Mansûr (986-1012/1578-1603 [q.v.]) married a wife from this family.

The Ma‘kil who remained in the region of Guercif towards the end of the Sa‘dîd dynasty gathered in 1051/1641-2 around the 4Alawid Mawlay Muhammad b. al-Sharîf (1050-75/1640-64), who seized Ouida and pressed his advantage as far as the south of Algeria, but his followers abandoned him in 1074/1664 and recognised his brother Mawlay al-Raqqîd (1073-82/1664-72 [q.v.]) whom they proclaimed in Ouida. These events were not able to limit the activity of other Ma‘kil, who continued for their part to trouble public order. It was also in 1069/1659 that Karrûm al-Hâdîj occupied Marrakech and, ten years later, Mawlay al-Raqqîd found the Shabbanät masters of the capital of the South (see G. Deverdun, Marrakech des origines à 1912, Rabat 1959-66, i, 460). The brother and successor of this latter sultan, Mawlay Isma‘îl (1082-1139/1672-1727 [q.v.]) added to his army some Ma‘kil from the oases to form the gîdh (gêdî) of Udaya, but he treated other members of the tribe harshly (see al-Zayyâni, Turjûmûn, Fr. tr. Houdas, 35), the Ablâh (= ‘Amârîn and Munabbât of the Dha‘wi Mansûr from the region of Sidjilmassa); after his death, these clans recovered their old power. It would be difficult today to trace the descendants of the various groups of Ma‘kil, more especially as the names which designated them changed frequently in the course of centuries. Furthermore, it seems that some members of this confederation were distinguished in the religious or literary sphere, but...
The adjective Ma'kil does not appear to be used, and it would be necessary to search in the lists—without any assurance of success—for those members of the tribe corresponding to the numerous families cited by Ibn al-Khalid. We will restrict ourselves to remarking that the Tha'allibis of Algeria, who produced a renowned theologian (788-873/1386-1468 [q.v.]), probably belonged to the Ma'kil, occupy a prominent position till our own day. Ibn 'Askar (Dawhat al-nāṣırī, ed. Hadži), Rabat 1396/1976, 101) notes that the fakih and saint by the name of 'Umar al-Husayni who died in the years 491/1097-8, was not khālit Husayn min 'Arab al-Ma'kil (more precisely, from the Dhawī Mansūr); such a note is however isolated. It is also not impossible that the Ma'kil may be have been part in the spread of the popular poetry known in Morocco by the name of māhūn [see māhūn].

It is evident from the brief account that precedes that different groups of this tribe were scattered over a territory which, within the present Moroccan frontiers, forms a crescent going from the Mediterranean to the Atlantic Ocean, crossing the High and Middle Atlas and turning its convex side towards the desert. But the vast territory occupied by these Arabs is not continuous, to such an extent that, being intimately mixed with Berber populations, they scarcely have the feeling of belonging to a homogeneous ethnic group. This is due to the constant policy of the authorities established in the capital to suppress energetically any sign of subdivision and to prevent these Arabs—although employed at times as auxiliaries—from moving northwards to settle in more fertile regions, which they nevertheless succeeded at times in doing, when the central power showed signs of weakness.

Biography: Among the Arabic sources, the richest is the Kāthib al-thālib of Ibn Khaldūn of which only the French translation of de Sieve is cited, entitled Histoire des Berbères, 2nd ed., Paris 1925-34, 1956). From Ibn 'Idhārī (7th-8th/13th-14th centuries), whose Bayān (vol. iii) published by A. Huici Mirandà in Tetuan in 1963 has been used by the latter in the preparation of his Hisoria politica del imparo amnade, Tétuán 1956, the Arab historians of the Maghrib and especially of Morocco (notably al-Ifrīrī/Ifriqi, Nuzhat al-bādī, Fr. tr. O. Houdas, Paris 1888-9, Ibn Abī Zaf, Rawd al-kirtās, Rabat 1972, and al-Nāṣirī, Istiglāl, Casablanca 1954-6) were led by force of circumstances to cite the Ma'kil. The same applies to even the authors of general histories such as Ch.-A. Julican, Histoire de l'Afrique du Nord, 2nd ed., Paris 1982, index, s.v. Arabes Maqā'il and Maqīl (with an extensive bibliography); the other works of the latter author, notably Citées anciennes de Mauritanie and Hesperis, contain useful information. See also F. de La Chapelle, Esquisse d'une histoire du Sahara occidental, in Hesperis xiv/1-2 (1930), 35-95, esp. 65-70. Finally, one should cite an unpublished thesis submitted in Paris in 1984 by M. Kabyl and entitled Société, pouvoir et religion au Maroc, des Mérinides aux Wattāsides (XIV-XVII siècles), index. (Cn. PALL.)

This history, al-Magmū' al-mubārak, generally known by the simple title of History, is a universal chronicle covering the period from the origins of the world to the accession of Baybars (658/1260). It is divided into two major sections: the first concerning pre-Islamic history as far as the eleventh year of Herachus; the second, Islamic history to the year 658.

(1) Pre-Islamic section. It is today difficult, if not impossible, to determine the originality of the History of al-Ma'kil, for two reasons: on the one hand, the manuscripts have not been classified; on the other, the similar work of his contemporary Ibn al-Rāhīb [q.v. in Suppl.], which al-Ma'kil frequently quotes, has not yet been edited. G. Viet, who undertook an edition of the history, has given some indications as to the manuscript transmission of the earlier section, in J. Maister, Histoire des Patriarches d'Afrique, Paris 1923, 219-22, n. 2. He identified two distinct groups of manuscripts, one transmitting the original text of al-Ma'kil, the other, which he calls the vulgate, being an edition adapted according to the model of Eutychius/Sa'id b. al-Birīk (it was a manuscript of this vulgate which was utilised by al-Ma'kilī, e.g. B.N. ar. 4729).

In addition, al-Ma'kil makes frequent textual quotations from Ibn al-Rāhīb. Before the researches of A. Sidarūs, Ibn al-Rāhīb's Leben und Werk, Freiburg-i.-Br. 1972, the latter's 'Universal history' was known on-
ly in the form of an abbreviated edition which has misled more than one historian (L. Cheikho, *Fenix ibn Badh chronicon orientale*, in *CSCO*, s.v., Louvain 1903). But there is now available a complete manuscript of the *K. al-Tawārīkh*, a work dating from 1257, and the forthcoming publication of this text will no doubt make it possible to assess how much of al-Makîn’s work is to be considered original.

Whatever may prove to be the case, the al-Makîn presents universal history in the form of biographies; to the year 596 B.C., it is naturally enough the biblical account which provides the format, the biographical series beginning with Adam; after the destruction of the Temple of Solomon he traces the ancient dynasties of Asia, then those of Alexander, the Romans, the Byzantines.

The final section of the work of al-Makîn, the part contemporary with his own life, is more detailed and of vastly superior originality and interest. By an unfortunate chance, Erpenius, who edited the work in the 17th century, stopped short at the year 525/1130, with the result that the final section has remained virtually unknown until the present day and its publication by Cl. Cahen (in *BEO*, xv [1955]; cf. *Arabica*, vi, 198-9, and *al-Makîn et Ibn Wâsîl*, in *Hispano-Arabica*... *Fr. Poppe*, i, Madrid 1974, 158-67).

A characteristic apparently common to all Arabic historiography, Christian or Muslim, is that authors of both persuasions write in almost the same manner and indulge in mutual plagiarism. As has been observed, al-Makîn follows a Muslim predecessor and is utilised in his turn by *Shâhî* b. *Allâ*. The only difference is that the Christian supplements the Hegirian chronology with a Christian chronology (in this case the Era of the Martyrs) and includes in his account episodes of ecclesiastical history (which were to be borrowed by al-Makrîzî). Certain copyists continue his list of patriarchs as far as the year 720/1320. It is not known whether al-Makîn utilised the history of the patriarchs compiled by Severus b. al-Mukaffâ and his successors.

The final section of the work of al-Makîn, the part contemporary with his own life, is totally undeserving of the pejorative judgment of it expressed on the authority by Renaudot (*Hist. Patriarch. Aex.*, Paris 1713, 10); it is intellectually comparable with the works of the major historians of the period, with a particularly sensitive interest in military administration, reflecting the professional career of the author. Most important of all, the principal historians of this time, even though they deal with Egypt, are of Syrian nationality; together with the Muslims Ibn Muyassar, whose treatment of the Ayyûbids is accessible to us only through al-Nuwayrî’s version, al-Makîn is the only Egyptian historian of his generation. His work was continued by al-Mufaddî b. Abî ‘l-Fâdî b., who was of the same family but who makes no mention of him.

Also published, but erroneously, under the name of al-Makîn was a doctoral study, *al-Hâdî*, ed. Tairud Basili, Cairo, Maison Cope (cf. *Abtracta Isl.*, 1966 no. 831).

**Bibliography:** Given in the article; supplementary details concerning the early section are given by M. Plessner in *ET*, s.v.

(CL. CAHEN and R. G. COQUIN)

**MAKKA** (in English normally “Mecca”; in French “La Mecque”), the most sacred city of Islam, where the Prophet Muhammad was born and lived for about 50 years, and where the Ka’ba [q. v.] is situated.

1. The Pre-Islamic and Early Islamic Periods

**Geographical description.**—Mecca is located in the Hijâz about 72 km. inland from the Red Sea port of Jedda (*Quidda* [q. v.]), in lat. 21° 27’ N. and long. 39° 49’ E. It is now the capital of the province (manâtik idârîyya) of Makka in Su‘ûdî Arabia, and has a normal population of between 200,000 and 300,000, which may be increased by one-and-a-half or two millions at the time of the *Hadj* or annual pilgrimage.

Mecca lies in a kind of corridor between two ranges of bare steep hills, with an area in the centre rather lower than the rest. The whole corridor is the *waḍî* or the *baṭî Makka*, “the hollow of Mecca”, and the lower part is al-Baṭîh, which was doubtless the original settlement and where the Ka’ba stands. Originally some of the houses were close to the Ka’ba, but apparently there was always a free space round it, and in the mountain chain of the Sarat to the *waḍî*: southwards it constitutes the present mosque. Into the Baṭîh converging a number of side-valleys, each known as a *shîb*, and often occupied by a single clan. The outer and higher area of settlement was known as the *za’wârîh*. The situation of Mecca was advantageous for trade. Important routes led northwards to Syria (Gaza and Damascus), north-eastwards through a gap in the mountain chain of the Sarat to *Târîkh*: southwards to the Yemen; and westwards to the Red Sea, where there were sailings from Shu‘ayba (and later from *Quidda*) to Abyssinia and other places. Rainfall is scant and irregular. There may be none for four years. When it does come, it may be violent and a *sâqî* or torrent may pour down each *shîb* towards the *Haram* or sacred area round the Ka’ba. There are accounts of the flooding of the Haram from time to time. The supply of water depended on wells, of which at Zamzam beside the Ka’ba was the most famous. One of the leading men of Mecca was always charged with the *sikâyâ*, that is, with the duty of seeing there was sufficient water for the pilgrims taking part in the *Hadj*. Needless to say, there was no agriculture in the neighbourhood of Mecca. The climate of Mecca was described by the geographer al-Mukaddamî as “suffocating heat, deadly winds, clouds of flies”. The summer was noted for *ramdâ* *Makka*, “the burning of Mecca”, and the wealthy families sent their children to be brought up in the desert for a time.

**Pre-Islamic Mecca.**—Mecca had been a sacred site from very ancient times. It was apparently known to Ptolemy as *Makroba*. The Qur’ân has the name Makka in XLVIII, 24, and the alternative name Bakka in III, 96/90. It also (II, 125-7/119-21) speaks of the building of the Ka’ba by Abraham and Ishmael, but this is generally not accepted by occidental scholars, since it cannot be connected with what is otherwise known of Abraham. According to Arabian
legend, it was for long controlled by the tribe of Ḏjrum [q.v.], and then passed to Ḫuzā‘a’ [q.v.], though certain provisos of the Meccan system in a subordinate position. The term ‘system’ is appropriate since Mecca was a financial centre, and not a mere focus of trade. By about 600 A.D., the leading men were skilled in the manipulation of credit and interested in possibilities of investment along the routes they travelled, such as the mines in the territory of the tribe of Sulaym. It may be noted that one or two women were also trading on their own account and employing men as their agents; such were Khadīja [q.v.], Asmā’ bint Mukhrirra, mother of Abu Dajjal, and Hind, wife of Abu Sufyān. Among the goods carried were leather, ingots of gold and silver, gold dust (tibr), perfumes and spices, the two latter from South Arabia or India. From Syria they conveyed the products of Mediterranean industry, such as cotton, linen and silk fabrics, and also arms, cereals and oil. Some of these goods would be sold to nomadic tribesmen, others would be sold in markets at the further end of the trade route. Henri Lammens spoke of Mecca as a ‘merchant republic’, and this description fits up to a point, but the underlying political concepts were those of Arabia, not of Greece or Italy. Almost the only organ of government, apart from clan assemblies, was the mala‘ or ‘senate’. This was in fact a meeting of the chiefs and leading men of various clans, but had no executive powers. Any punitive measures could be taken only by the chief of the offender’s clan, since otherwise the lex talionis [see ḥiṣā] would be invoked. There was no president or doge, but sometimes a chief of the offender’s clan, but had no executive powers. Any punitive measures could be taken only by the chief of the offender’s clan, since otherwise the lex talionis [see ḥiṣā] would be invoked. There was no president or doge, but sometimes a chief of the offender’s clan, since otherwise the lex talionis [see ḥiṣā] would be invoked. There was no president or doge, but sometimes a chief of the offender’s clan, since otherwise the lex talionis [see ḥiṣā] would be invoked. There was no president or doge, but sometimes a chief of the offender’s clan, since otherwise the lex talionis [see ḥiṣā] would be invoked. There was no president or doge, but sometimes a chief of the offender’s clan, since otherwise the lex talionis [see ḥiṣā] would be invoked. There was no president or doge, but sometimes a chief of the offender’s clan, since otherwise the lex talionis [see ḥiṣā] would be invoked.
main neutral. Some years after the war of the Fidjar,
a man of the clan of Asad called Uthman b. al-
Hudayr entered into negotiations with the Byzan-
tines and told his fellow-Meccans that he could get
favourable trade terms for them if they accepted him
as their leader; though he was denounced by a men
of his clan as aiming at kingship, the rejection of his pro-
position was doubtless also due to the need of avoid
too close an association with the Byzantines.

In addition to the mala,' there were certain trad-
tional offices or functions, usually attached to specific
families. The sikāya or superintendence of the water-
supply, especially for pilgrims, has already been men-
tioned. The rifḍa was the provisioning of pilgrims;
the liṣat was the carrying of the standard in war; the
nast was the privilege of deciding when an intercalary
month should be inserted to keep the lunar calendar
in line with the solar year; and there were several
others.

The culture and religion of the Meccans were essen-
tially the same as those of their nomadic neighbours.
They applied the lex talionis in much the same way,
and had similar ideas about the relations of a chief or
sayyid to the full members of his clan or tribe, namely,
that he was only primus inter pares. They likewise gave
a central place to the conception of honour [see 'naq],[
though in detail Meccan ideas of honour may have
been modified by the ideas of wealth and power. Like
most nomadic Arabs, the majority of Meccans were
pagans, acknowledging many gods, but probably
having little faith in these and being mainly
materialistic in outlook. The Kurʾān, however, in a
number of passages, describes pagans who, besides
the minor deities, acknowledging Allāh as a "high
god" or supreme god, and especially his function of
creating. This form of belief is known to have been
predominant among the Semitic peoples of a whole
wide region (cf. J. Teixidor, The pagan god, Princeton
1977). In addition, besides Byzantine visitors or tem-
porary residents, one or two Meccans seem to have
become Christians, such as ʿUthmān b. al-
Hudayrī, and others are said to have been attracted to
Christianity [see Dār al-Ḥaq]. One or two, whose
business contacts were with 'Irāq, had some interest
in Persian culture.

Mecca and the beginnings of Islam.—
Although the Kurʾān mentions had from the first a
universal potential, it was originally addressed to
Meccans. The attraction of the message for many
Meccans was due to its relevance to the moral, social
and spiritual malaise which had developed in Mecca
as a result of the great increase in wealth. It is thus not
accidental that Mecca still remains the focus of the
religion of Islam. The career of Muhammad and the
early history of the religion which he proclaimed will
be found in the article MUHAMMAD. Here the relation
of these events to the town of Mecca will be briefly
noted.

Muhammad was born in Mecca into the clan of
Hašim about 570 A.D. This clan may have been more
important earlier, but was not now among the
very wealthy clans, and played a prominent part in
the Hilf al-Fudhil, which was directed against
monopolistic practices. Because Muhammad was a
posthumous child and his grandfather died when he
was about eight, he was excluded by Arabian custom
from inheriting anything from either. Most of his near
kinsmen were engaged in trade, and Muhammad ac-
companied his uncle Abū Taibī on trading journeys
to Syria. Then he was employed as a steward by the
woman merchant Khadija and subsequently married
her. This was about 595, and thereafter he seems to
have continued to trade with her capital and in part-
nership with one of her relatives. It was no doubt his
personal experience of these consequences of being an
orphan which made Muhammad specially aware of the
problems facing Meccan society; and it was about 610, after he had long meditated on these matters,
that the Kurʾānic revelation began to come to him.

The Kurʾān may be said to see the source of the
troubles of Mecca as the materialism of many Mec-
cans and their failure to believe in God and the Last
Day. In particular, it attacked the great merchants for
their undue reliance on wealth and their misuse of it
by neglecting the traditional duties of the leading men
to care for the poor and unfortunate. At the same
time, the Kurʾān summoned all men to believe in
God's power and goodness, including his position as
final Judge, and to worship him. In the years up to
614 or 613 many people responded to this summons,
including sons and younger brothers of the great mer-
chants. By 614 some of these great merchants,
especially younger ones like Abū Dājahl, had come to
feel their position threatened by Muhammad, since
his claim to receive messages from God and the
number of people attracted by his preaching might
eventually give him great political authority. A move-
ment of opposition to the new religion then appeared.
The great merchants among other prosperous kinds to Muhammad and his followers to get them to
abandon their beliefs, or at least to compromise. Some
of his followers, persecuted by their own families,
gave up to Abyssinia for a time. Muhammad himself
was able to continue preaching so long as he had the
protection of his clan. About 619, however, his uncle Abū Taibī died and was succeeded as head of the clan by
another uncle, Abū Lahab, who was in partnership
with some of the great merchants and found a pretext
for denying clan protection to Muhammad. In 622,
therefore, Muhammad accepted an invitation to go to
Medina where a great many people were ready to ac-
cept him as a prophet. His move from Mecca to
Medina was the Hidjra or emigration.

The greater part of the period between the
Hidjra and Muhammad's death was dedicated to the strug-
gle between Muhammad's supporters and the great
merchants of Mecca. After some fruitless Muslim raz-
zias against Meccan caravans, the Meccans were pro-
voked by the capture of a small caravan under their
noses, as it were, at Nakhlā early in 624. Because of
this they sent a relatively large force to protect a very
wealthy caravan returning from Syria in March 624;
and this expedition ended disastrously for them in the
battle of Badr, where they lost many of their leading
men by death or capture, including the leader of the
expedition, Abū Dājahl. Meccan affairs were guided by
Abū Sufyān for the next three years. His attempt
in 625 to avenge the defeat of Badr led to his having
the better of the fighting at Ujdūd in the oasis of
Medina, but he failed to disturb Muhammad's posi-
tion there. His next attempt in 627, with numerous
allies, was a more ignominious failure through
Muhammad's adoption of the khondak or trench and
the break-up of the alliance. Abū Sufyān then seems
to have worked for peace and reconciliation with the
Muslims, while other men still hoped to retrieve the
fortunes of Mecca, and, for example, forcibly
prevented Muhammad and 1,600 Muslims from
making the pilgrimage in 628. Nevertheless, they
made the treaty of al-Hudaybiyya [q.v.] with him as
with an equal. A breach of the terms of this treaty by
Meccan allies led to a great Muslim expedition
against Mecca with some 10,000 men. The town was
surrendered almost without a blow, and all the Mec-
cans, except a handful who were guilty of specific of-
fences against Muhammad or some Muslim, were
assured their lives and property would be safe if they
behaved honourably. For some time, Muhammad
had been aiming at reconciling the Meccans rather
than crushing them by force. When, a week or two
after the capture or death, it was learnt that there was
a large concentration of nomads to the east of Mecca,
some 2,000 Meccans took to the field with Muham-
mad and helped him to gain the victory of Hunayn
[q. v.]. Some of the pagan Meccans became Muslims
almost at once, others only after a longer period.
A young Muslim of a Meccan family was left as
governor of Mecca and it was made clear that Medina
would remain the capital. The Ka'ba had for many
years been the kibla [q. v.] or direction towards which
all Muslims turned in prayer. At the death it was purged
of idols and became a centre of Islamic worship, while
the Black Stone was retained as an object to be
reverenced. The annual Ḥajj [q. v.] was retained as an
Islamic ceremony, and this also gave special im-
portance to Mecca in Islamic eyes. Its commercial ac-
tivity appears to have dwindled away, perhaps largely
because many of the leading men moved to Medina
and subsequently found their administrative abilities
fully employed in organising an empire. After the cap-
ture of Irāk, the trade between the Indian Ocean and
the Mediterranean seems to have resumed the old
route by the Euphrates valley.
Mecca from 632 to 750.—Not much is heard
about Mecca under the first four caliphs. 'Umar and
'Uthmān were concerned with the danger of flooding
and brought Christian engineers to build barrages in
the high-living quarters. They also constructed dykes
and embankments to protect the area round the
Ka'ba. The first Umayyad caliph, Muḥammad ibn
Abū Sufyān, though mostly living in Damascus,
took an interest in his native town. He had new
buildings erected, developed agriculture in the sur-
rounding district, and improved the water-supply by
digging wells and building storage dams. The work
of flood prevention continued under the Umayyads.
In an attempt to control the sa'y, a new channel was dug
for it and barriers were erected at different levels.
Despite these improvements, the problem was not ful-
lly solved, since the Bahthā was a basin with no outlet.
In the course of operations, buildings on the bank of the
sa'y and adjoining the Ka'ba were taken down, and
the appearance of Mecca was thus considerably altered.
Mecca had again some political importance as the seat
of the rival caliph 'Abd Allāh b. al-Zubayr [q. v.]. The
succession to Muḥammad ibn Yazīd in 611/680
was disliked by many members of Kuraysh, and Ibn
al-Zubayr took advantage of such feelings to build up
a party of supporters in Mecca, and eventually had
himself proclaimed caliph there. For a time he con-
trolled most of Arabia and Irāq, but the Umayyad
'Abd al-Malik gradually consolidated his power, and
in 73/692 his general al-Hadījī al-Hardān defeated and killed
Ibn al-Zubayr, thus ending his bid for power and
restoring to Umayyad rule Mecca and the other
regions acknowledging the Zubayrids. In 63/682,
when Ibn al-Zubayr was deep in intrigue but had not yet
secured his caliphate, an Umayyad army was sent to Mecca, and during its passage there the
Ka'ba was partly destroyed by fire, probably through the
carelessness of a supporter of Ibn al-Zubayr.
Subsequently, the latter had the Ka'ba rebuilt, in-
cluding the Ḥijr within it; but this change was
reversed by al-Hadījī al-Hardān. The caliph al-Walid I is
credited with the construction of galleries circling the
vast courtyard round the Ka'ba, thus giving the mos-
que (al-mas'djid al-haram) its distinctive form.
In the period of the decline of the Umayyads, in 130/747
Mecca was briefly occupied by Abū Hamza, a
Khāridjī rebel from the Yemen, but he was soon
surprised and killed by an army sent by the caliph
Marwān II. For most of the Umayyad period, Mecca
had a sub-governor responsible to the governor of the
Hijāz who resided at Medina. It attracted wealthy
people who did not want to be involved in politics
and became a place of pleasure and ease with many poets
and musicians. There were also some religious
scholars, but fewer than at Medina.
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From the 'Abbāsid to the modern period
i. Mecca under the 'Abbāsids down to
the foundation of the Sharifate
(132-530/750-961).
Although the political centre of gravity in Islam
now lay in Baghdad, this period at first presents the
same picture as under Umayyad rule. The Harām
may be as a rule governed by 'Abbāsid princes or in-
dividuals closely connected with them (Die Chroniken
der Stadt Mekka, ed. Wusténdorf, ii, 181 ff). Sometimes
Mecca and Tā'if were under one ruler, who was at the same time leader of the
Ḥajjī, while Medina had a separate governor of its own.
Arabia had, however, from the 1st century A.H.
contained a number of 'Alid groups, who, as was their
'. Century A.H. was a basin with no outlet.
At the death it was purged of idols and became a centre of Islamic worship, while
the Black Stone was retained as an object to be
reverenced. The annual Ḥajj was retained as an
Islamc ceremony, and this also gave special im-
portance to Mecca in Islamic eyes. Its commercial ac-
tivity appears to have dwindled away, perhaps largely
because many of the leading men moved to Medina
and subsequently their administrative abilities
fully employed in organising an empire. After the cap-
ture of Irāk, the trade between the Indian Ocean and
the Mediterranean seems to have resumed the old
route by the Euphrates valley.
Mecca from 632 to 750.—Not much is heard
about Mecca under the first four caliphs. 'Umar and
'Uthmān were concerned with the danger of flooding
and brought Christian engineers to build barrages in
the high-living quarters. They also constructed dykes
and embankments to protect the area round the
Ka'ba. The first Umayyad caliph, Muḥammad ibn
Abū Sufyān, though mostly living in Damascus,
took an interest in his native town. He had new
buildings erected, developed agriculture in the sur-
rounding district, and improved the water-supply by
digging wells and building storage dams. The work
of flood prevention continued under the Umayyads.
In an attempt to control the sa'y, a new channel was dug
for it and barriers were erected at different levels.
Despite these improvements, the problem was not ful-
lly solved, since the Bahthā was a basin with no outlet.
In the course of operations, buildings on the bank of the
sa'y and adjoining the Ka'ba were taken down, and
the appearance of Mecca was thus considerably altered.
For a brief period after the death of Muḥammad ibn
Abū Sufyān, Mecca had again some political importance as the seat
of the rival caliph 'Abd Allāh b. al-Zubayr [q. v.]. The
succession to Muḥammad ibn Yazīd in 611/680
was disliked by many members of Kuraysh, and Ibn
al-Zubayr took advantage of such feelings to build up
a party of supporters in Mecca, and eventually had
himself proclaimed caliph there. For a time he con-
trolled most of Arabia and Irāq, but the Umayyad
'Abd al-Malik gradually consolidated his power, and
in 73/692 his general al-Hadījī al-Hardān defeated and killed
Ibn al-Zubayr, thus ending his bid for power and
restoring to Umayyad rule Mecca and the other
regions acknowledging the Zubayrids. In 63/682,
when Ibn al-Zubayr was deep in intrigue but had not yet
secured his caliphate, an Umayyad army was sent to Mecca, and during its passage there the
Ka'ba was partly destroyed by fire, probably through the
carelessness of a supporter of Ibn al-Zubayr.
Subsequently, the latter had the Ka'ba rebuilt, in-
cluding the Ḥijr within it; but this change was
reversed by al-Hadījī al-Hardān. The caliph al-Walid I is
disatisfaction in rioting. This attitude was all too frequently stimulated by political conditions.

In the reign of al-Mamun (198-218/817-33) it was again 'Alids, Husayn al-Asfahānī and Ibrāhīm b. Mūsā, who extended their rule over Medina, Mecca and the Yemen (al-Tabarī, iii, 981 ff.; Chron. Mecca, ii, 238), ravaged Western Arabia and plundered the treasures of the Ka'bah. How strong 'Alid influence already was at this time is evident from the fact that al-Mamun appointed two 'Alids as governors of Mecca (al-
Tabarī, iii, 1039, Chron. Mecca, ii, 191 ff.).

With the decline of the 'Abbāsid caliphate after the death of al-Mamun, a period of anarchy began in the holy land of Islam, which was frequently accompanied by scarcity or famine. It became the regular custom for a number of rulers to be represented at the Ḥudūdī the plain of 'Arafat and to have their flags unfurled; the holy city was rarely spared fighting on these occasions. The safety of the pilgrim caravans was considerably affected; it was very often 'Alids who distinguished themselves in plundering the pilgrims.

The 'Alid cause received an important reinforcement at this time by the foundation of a Hasanid dynasty in Tabaristan (al-Tabarī, iii, 1523-33, 1583 ff., 1682-5, 1693 ff., 1840, 1880, 1884 ff., 1940). In Mecca the repercussion of this event was felt in the appearance of two Hasanids (Chron. Mecca, i, 343; ii, 133). One of these was Abu '1-Futuh (384-432/994-1039) son of al-Ma'mun, which was probably induced to do this by al-Hākim's heretical innovations in Egypt. The latter, however, was soon able to reduce the new caliph's sphere of influence so much that he had hurriedly to return to Mecca where in the meanwhile one of his relatives had usurped the power.

He was forced to make terms with al-Hākim in order to be able to expel his relative.

With his son Shukr (432-53/1039-61) the dynasty of the Mūsāwīs, i.e. the descendants of Mūsā b. 'Abd Allāh b. Mūsā b. 'Abd Allāh b. Hashan b. Hasan b. 'Ali b. Abī Tālib, came to an end. He died without leaving male heirs, which caused a struggle within the family of the Hasānids with the usual evil results for Mecca. When the family of the Banū Ṣa'bā 'Abd al-Salām) went so far as to confiscate for their private use all precious metals in the house of Allāh, the ruler of Yemen, al-Ṣa'dībī (Chron. Mecca, ii, 208, 210 ff.; Ibn al-Athīr, ix, 233, 317). He was probably

The reign of his successors is also marked by the appearance of the Karmatians [see KARMATI], who entered the holy city of Mecca. In 384/994 Mecca refused homage to the Fatimid caliph. Soon afterwards, the caliph began to intervene and restored order and security in the town. This intervention by an outsider appeared more intolerable to the Hasānids than fighting among themselves. They therefore proposed to al-Ṣa'dībī that he should install one of their number as ruler and leave the town.

He chose the appointed Abu Ḥāshim Muhammād (455-87/1063-94) as Grand Sharīf. With him begins the dynasty of the:

b. hāwāshim (455-989/1063-1200), which takes its name from Abū Ḥāshim Muḥammad, a brother of the first Sharīf Da'far; the two brothers were descendants in the fourth generation from Mūsā ii, the ancestor of the Mūsāwīs.

During the early years of his reign, Abu Ḥāshim had to wage a continual struggle with the Sulaymān branch, who thought themselves humiliated by his appointment. These Sulaymānīs were descended from Sulaymān, a brother of the above-mentioned Mūsā ii.

The reign of Abu Ḥāshim is further noteworthy for the shameless way in which he offered the suzerainty, i.e. the mention in the ḥudūb as well as the change of official rite which is indicated by the wording of the adjān, to the highest bidder i.e. the Fatimid caliph or the Saltuk sultan (Chron. Mecca, ii, 253; Ibn al-Athīr, x, 67). It was very unwelcome to the Meccans that imports from Egypt stopped as soon as the official mention of the Fatimid in the ḥudūb gave way to that of the caliph. The change was repeated several times with the result that the Saltuk, tired of this comedy, sent several bodies of Turkomans to Mecca.

The feeling between saltan and Sharīf also inflicted great misery on pilgrims coming from Ṭrāk. As the leadership of the pilgrim caravans from this country had gradually been transferred from the 'Alids to Turkish officials and soldiers, Abū Ḥāshim did not hesitate occasionally to fall upon the pilgrims and plunder them (Chron. Mecca, ii, 254; Ibn al-Athīr, x, 133).

The reign of his successors is also marked by covetousness and plundering. The Spanish pilgrim Ibn Djabayr, who visited Mecca in 578/1183 and 580/1185, gives hair-raising examples of this. Even
then, however, the Hawashim were no longer absolutely their own masters, as over ten years before, the Ayyūbid dynasty had not only succeeded to the Fatimids in Egypt but was trying to get the whole of nearer Asia into their power.

The Ayyūbid ruler Salāḥ al-Dīn (Saladin)'s brother, who passed through Mecca on his way to South Arabia, abandoned his intention of abolishing the Sharifs, but the place of honour on the Ḥādhil belonged to the Ayyūbids and their names were mentioned in the ḥādhil after those of the ʿAbbasīd caliph and the Sharīf (Ibn Ḏubayr, 75, 95). The same Ayyūbid in 582/1186 also did away with the Shīʿī (here Ṣayfī, for the Sharifs had hitherto been Ṣaydīs) form of the ḥadhil in verse, as he did in his will in prose (see Snouck Hurgronje, iii, 214), had coins struck in Salāḥ al-Dīn's name and put the fear of the law into the hearts of the Sharīf's bodyguard, who had not shrunk from crimes of robbery and murder, by severely punishing their misdeeds. A further result of Ayyūbid suzerainty was that the Shāḥī rite became the predominant one.

But even the mighty Salāḥ al-Dīn could only make improvements in Mecca. He could abolish or check the worst abuses, but the general state of affairs remained as before.

iii. The rule of Katāda and his descendants down to the Wаḥḥābī period (ca. 596-1202/1200-1788).

Meanwhile, a revolution was being prepared which was destined to have more far-reaching consequences than any of its predecessors. Katāda, a descendant of the same Mūsā (see above) from whom the Mūsāwls and the Hawashim were descended, had gradually extended his influence from Yanbu' to Mecca and had gathered a considerable following in the town. According to some sources, his son Ḥanūzala made all preparations for the decisive blow on the holy city; according to others, Katāda seized the town on 27 Rajāb when the whole population was away performing a lesser ʿumra in memory of the completion of the building of the Ka'ba by ʿAbd Allāh b. al-Zubayr, which was celebrated on this day along with the festival of Muhammad's ascension to heaven. However it came about, Katāda's seizure of the town meant the coming of an able and strong-willed ruler, the ancestor of all later Sharifs. He steadfastly followed his one ambition to make his territory an independent principality. Everything was in his favour; that he did not achieve his aim was a result of the fact that the Ḥijāz was once again at the intersection of many rival lines of political interest.

Katāda began by ruining his chances with the great powers; he ill-treated the son of the Ayyūbid al-Mulk al-ʿAdil (540-615/1151-1218 [see al-Ṣālīḥ]) in brutal fashion (Chron. Mekka, ii, 263). He roused the ire of the caliph by his attitude to pilgrims from ʿIrāq. He was able, however, to appease the latter and the emir he sent to Baghdād returned with gifts from the caliph. The caliph also invited him to visit Baghdād. According to some historians, however, the Sharīf turned home again before he actually reached Baghdād. On this occasion, he is said to have expressed his policy of the "splendid isolation" of the Ḥijāz in verse, as he did in his will in prose (see Snouck Hurgronje, Qādāḥ's policy of splendid isolation, cited in Bāhirī, viii, 817). On the other hand, Katāda is said to have vigorously supported an Ṣāmīm of Ḥasanid descent in founding a kingdom in the Yemen. After the reconquest of this region by a grandson of al-ʿAdil, the Ayyūbids of Egypt, Syria, and South Arabia were mentioned in the Ḥadhil in Mecca along with the caliph and Sharīf.

Katāda's life ended in a massacre which his son Ḥasan carried out in his family to rid himself of possible rivals (Chron. Mekka, ii, 215, 263 ff.; Ibn al-ʿAdīr, xii, 262 ff.). The Ayyūbid prince Maḥmūd, however, soon put a limit to his ambition and had Mecca governed by his generals. On his death, however, power again passed into the hands of the Sharifs, whose territory was allowed a certain degree of independence by the rulers of the Yemen as a bulwark against Egypt.

About the middle of the 7th/13th century, the world of Islam assumes a new aspect as the result of the advent of persons and happenings of great importance. In 656/1258 the taking of Baghdād by the Mongol Khān Ĥūlegū put an end to the caliphate. The pilgrim caravan from ʿIrāq was no longer of any political significance. In Egypt, power passed from the Ayyūbids to the Mamlūks; Sultan Baybars [q.v.]} (658-76/1261-77) was soon the most powerful ruler in the lands of Islam. He was able to leave the government of Mecca in the hands of the Sharīf, because the latter, Abū Numāyy, was an energetic individual who ruled with firmness during the second half of the 7th/13th century (652-700/1254-1301). His long reign firmly established the power of the descendants of Katāda.

Nevertheless, the first half century after his death was almost entirely filled with fighting between different claimants to the throne. ʿAḏḏān's reign also (747-76/1346-75) was filled with political unrest, so much so that the Mamlūk Sultan is said on one occasion to have sworn to exterminate all the Sharifs. ʿAḏḏān introduced a political innovation by appointing his son and future successor Aḥmād co-regent in 762/1361, by which step he hoped to avoid a fratricidal struggle before or after his death.

A second measure of ʿAḏḏān's also deserves mention, namely the harsh treatment of the muʿākilūn and imām of the Zayidis; this shows that the reigning Sharifs had gone over to the predominant rite of al-Shāḥī and forsaken the Zaydi creed of their forefathers.

Among the sons and successors of ʿAḏḏān, special mention may be made of Ḥasan (798-829/1396-1426) because he endeavoured to extend his sway over the whole of the Ḥijāz and to guard his own financial interests carefully, at the same time being able to avoid giving his Egyptian suzerain cause to interfere.

But from 828/1425 onwards, he and his successors had to submit to a regular system of control as regards the allotment of the customs.

From the time of Ḥasan, in addition to the bodyguard of personal servants and freedmen, we find a regular army of mercenaries mentioned which was passed from one ruler to another. But the mode of life of the Sharifs, unlike that of other Oriental rulers, remained simple and in harmony with their Arabian surroundings. As a vassal of the Egyptian sultan, the Sharīf received from him every year his taḥqīʾ [q.v.] and a robe of honour. On the ceremonies associated with the accession of the Sharifs, see Snouck Hurgronje, Mekka, i, 97-8.

Of the three sons of Ḥasan who disputed the position in their father's lifetime, Barākāt [i] (7) was chosen by the sultan as co-regent; twenty years later, he succeeded his father and was able with slight interruptions to hold sway till his death in 859/1455. He had to submit to the sultan, sending a permanent garrison of 50 Turkish horsemen under an ṣāmīr to Mecca. This ṣāmīr may be regarded as the precursor of the later governors, who sometimes attained positions of considerable influence under Turkish suzerainty.

Mecca enjoyed a period of prosperity under
Barakát's son Muhammad (Chron. Mekka, ii, 341 ff.; iii, 230 ff.), whose reign (859-902/1455-97) coincided with that of Ka'ib ibn Ḥayy [q.v.] in Egypt. The latter had left a fine memorial in the many buildings he erected in Mecca.

Under Muhammad's son Barakát II (902-31/1455-1525), who displayed great ability and bravery in the usual struggle with his relatives, without getting the support he desired from Egypt (Chron. Mekka, ii, 342 ff.; iii, 244 ff.), the political situation in Islam was fundamentally altered by the Ottoman Sultan Selim's conquest of Egypt in 923/1517.

Although henceforth Constantinople had the importance for Mecca that Baghdad once had, there was little real understanding between Turks and Arabs, Mecca at first experienced a period of peace under the Sharífs Muhammad Abú Numayy (951-73/1525-66) and Hāsan (973-1009/1566-1601). Under Ottoman protection, the territory of the Sharífs was extended as far as Khaybar in the north, to Hali in the south and in the east into Najd. Dependence on Egypt still existed at the same time; when the government in Constantinople was a strong one, it was less perceptible, and vice-versa. This dependence was not only political but had also a material and religious side. The Hidjáz was dependent on corn from Egypt. The foundations of a religious and educational nature now found powerful patrons in the Sultans of Turkey.

A darker side of the Ottoman suzerainty was its intervention in the administration of justice. Since the Sharífs had adopted the Shafi'i madhhab, the Shafi'i kadi was the chief judge; this office had also remained for centuries in one family. Now the highest bidder for the office was sent every year from Istanbul to Mecca; the Meccans of course had to pay the price with interest.

With Hāsan's death, a new period of confusion and civil war began for Mecca. In the language of the historians, this circumstance makes itself apparent in the increasing use of the term Dhalli... for different groups of the descendants of Abú Numayy who dispossessed the supremacy, often having their own territory, sometimes asserting a certain degree of independence from the Grand Sharíf, while preserving a system of reciprocal protection which saved the whole family from disaster (Snouck Hurgronje, Mekka, i, 112 ff.).

The struggle for supremacy, interspersed with disputes with the officials of the sultanate, centred in the 11th/17th century mainly around the 'Abádíla, the Dhawi Zayd and the Dhawi Barakát.

Zayd (1040-76/1631-66) was an energetic individual who would not tolerate everything the Turkish officials did. But he was unable to oppose successfully a measure which deserves mention on account of its general importance. The ill-feeling between the Sunni Turks and the Shi'í Persians had been extended to Mecca as a result of an order by Sultan Murád IV to expel all Persians from the holy city and not to permit them to make the pilgrimage in future. Neither the Sharífs nor the upper classes in Mecca had any reason to be pleased with this measure; it only served the mob as a pretext to plunder well-to-do Persians. As soon as the Turkish governor had ordered them to go, the Sharífs however gave permission as before to the Shi'í to take part in the pilgrimage and to remain in the town. The Sharífs likewise favoured the Zaydis, who had also been frequently forbidden Mecca by the Turks.

The further history of Mecca down to the coming of the Wahhabís is a rather monotonous struggle of the Sharífi families among themselves (Dhawi Zayd, Dhawi Barakát, Dhawi Mas'àd) and with the Ottoman officials in the town itself or in Djuđda.

iv. The Sharífate from the Wahhabí period to its end. The Kingdom.

Although the Wahhabís [q.v.] had already made their influence perceptible under his predecessors, it was Gháilib (1788-1813) who was the first to see the movement sweeping towards his territory like a flood; but he left no stone unturned to avert the danger. He sent his armies north, east and south; his brothers and brothers-in-law all took the field; the leaders of the Syrian and Egyptian pilgrim caravans were appealed to at every pilgrimage for help, but without success. During the period of the French occupation of Egypt (1798-1801), he made a rapprochement with the French there, hoping to ensure the continuance of the corn imports from Egypt upon which the Hidjáz relied and to reduce Turkish influence there (see M. Aibir, Relations between the government of India and the Sharíf of Mecca during the French invasion of Egypt, 1798-1801, in JRAS [1965], 35-42). In 1799 Gháilib made a treaty with the amir of Dar'iyá, by which the boundaries of their territories were laid down, with the stipulation that the Wahhabís should be allowed access to the holy territory. The Hidjáz thus preserved its independence; however, and in 1803 the army of the amir Suṣí b. 'Abd al-'Azíz approached the holy city. After Gháilib had withdrawn to Djuđda, in April Suṣí entered Mecca, the inhabitants of which had announced their conversion. All kubbás were destroyed, all tobacco pipes and musical instruments burned, and the adhibin purged of praises of the Prophet.

In July, Gháilib returned to Mecca but gradually he became shut in there by enemies as with a wall. In August, the actual siege began and with it a period of famine and plague. In February of the following year, Gháilib had to submit to acknowledging Wahhabí suzerainty while retaining his own position.

The Sublime Porte had during all these happenings displayed no sign of life. It was only after the Wahhabís in 1802 sent back the pilgrim caravans from Syria and Egypt with their mahámls [q.v.], that Muhammad 'Ali [q.v.] was given instructions to deal with the Hidjáz as soon as he was finished with Egypt. It was not till 1813 that he took Mecca and there met Gháilib who made cautious advances to him. Gháilib, however, soon fell into the trap set for him by Muhammad 'Ali and his son Tunus. He was exiled to Salonika, where he lived till his death in 1816.

In the meanwhile, Muhammad 'Ali had installed Gháilib's nephew Yábyá b. Sarúr (1813-27) as Sharíf. Thus ended the first period of Wahhabí rule over Mecca, and the Hidjáz once more became dependent on Egypt. In Mecca, Muhammad 'Ali was honourably remembered because he restored the pious foundations which had fallen into ruins, revived the consignments of corn, and allotted stipends to those who had distinguished themselves in sacred lore or in other ways.

In 1827, Muhammad 'Ali had again to interfere in the domestic affairs of the Sharífs. When Yábyá had made his position untenable by the vengeance he took on one of his relatives, the viceroy deposed the Dhalli Zayd and installed one of the 'Abádíla, Muhammad, usually called Muhammad b. 'Awín (1827-51). He had first of all to go through the traditional struggle with his relatives. Trouble between him and Muhammad 'Ali's deputy resulted in both being removed to Cairo in 1836.
Here the Sharif remained till 1840 when by the treaty between Muhammad ʿAli and the Porte the Hijāz was again placed directly under the Porte. Muhammad b. ʿAwn returned to his home and rank. Ottoman suzerainty was now incorporated in the person of the wali of Djudda. Friction was inevitable between him and Muhammad b. ʿAwn; the latter's friendship with Muhammad ʿAli now proved of use to him. He earned the gratitude of the Turks for his expeditions against the Wahhābi chief ʿAyyāl in al-Riyād and against the ʿAṣīr tribes. His raids on the territory of Yemen also prepared the way for Ottoman rule over it.

In the meanwhile, the head of the Dhāwī Zayd, ʿAbd al-Muḥṭarīl (1851-56), had made good use of his friendship with the grand vizier and brought about the deposition of the ʿAbādīla in favour of the Dhāwī Zayd. ʿAbd al-Muḥṭarīl, however, did not succeed in keeping on good terms with one of the two pashas with whom he had successively to deal. In 1853 it was decided in Istanbul to cancel his appointment and to recall Muhammad b. ʿAwn. ʿAbd al-Muḥṭarīl at first refused to recognise the genuineness of the order, and he was supported by the Turkophile feeling just provoked by the prohibition of slavery. Finally, however, he had to give way to Muhammad b. ʿAwn, who in 1856 entered upon the Sharifate for the second time also. He remained in power barely two years. Between his death in March 1858 and the arrival of his successor ʿAbd Allāh in October of the same year, there took place the murder of the Christians in Dji-dāda (15 June) and the atonement for it (cf. Djudda, and Snouck Hurrj., Een rector der mekkaansche universiteit, in Bijdragen t. d. Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde van Nld.-India, 5e volgr., deel ii, 381 ff., 399 ff.).

The rule of ʿAbd Allāh (1858-77), who was much liked by his subjects, was marked by peace at home and events of far-reaching importance abroad. The opening of the Suez Canal (1869) meant on the one hand the liberation of the Hijāz from Egypt, on the other, however, more direct connection with Istanbul. The installation of telegraphic connections between the Hijāz and the rest of the world had a similar importance for commerce. The reunion of Yemen by the Turks was calculated to strengthen the impression that Arabia was now Turkish territory for ever.

The brief reign of his popular elder brother Husayn (1877-80) ended with the assassination of the Sharīf by an Afghan. The fact that the aged ʿAbd al-Muḥṭarīl (see above) was sent by the Dhāwī Zayd from Istanbul as his successor (1880-82) gave rise to an obvious suspicion.

Although the plebs saw something of a saint in this old man, his rule was soon felt to be so oppressive that the notables petitioned for his deposition (Snouck Hurrj., Mekka, i, 204 ff.). As a result in 1881, the energetic ʿOṯmān Nūrī ʿAṣwāḥ was sent with troops to the Hijāz as commander of the garrison with the task of preparing for the restoration of the ʿAbādīla. ʿAbd al-Muḥṭarīl was outwitted and taken prisoner; he was kept under guard is one of his own houses in Mecca till his death in 1886.

ʿOṯmān ʿAṣwāḥ, who was appointed wali in July 1882, hoped to see his friend ʿAbd Allāh, one of the ʿAbādīla, installed as Grand Sharīf alongside of him. ʿAwn al-Rafīʿ (1882-1905) was, however, appointed (portrait in Snouck Hurrj., Bilden aus Mekka). As the wali was an individual of great energy, who had ever done much for the public good and ʿAwn, although very retiring, was by no means insignificant, but was indeed somewhat tyrannical, trouble between them was inevitable, especially as they had the same powers on many points, e.g. the administration of justice and supervision of the safety of the pilgrim routes. After a good deal of friction, ʿOṯmān was dismissed in 1886. His successor was Dji-dāda ʿAṣwāḥ, who only held office for a short period and was succeeded by ʿAṣwāḥ ʿAṣwāḥ. Only Ahmad Rāṭīb could keep his place alongside of ʿAwn, and that by shutting his eyes to many things and being satisfied with certain material advantages. After ʿAwn's death, ʿAbd Allāh was chosen as his successor. He died, however, before he could start on the journey from Istanbul to Mecca. ʿAwn's actual successor was therefore his nephew ʿAwn (1905-8). In 1908 he and Ahmad Rāṭīb both lost their positions with the Turkish Revolution.

With Husayn (1908-1916-1924 [see Husayn b. ʿAli]), also a nephew of ʿAwn's, the last Sharīf came to power as the nominee of the young Turks in Istanbul. But for the Great War, his Sharīfate would probably have run the usual course. The fact that Turkey was now completely involved in the war induced him to declare himself independent in 1916. He endeavoured to extend his power as far as possible, first as liberator (munkidh) of the Arabs, then (22 June 1916) as king of the Hijāz or king of Arabia and finally as caliph. Very soon however, it became apparent that the ruler of Najd, ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz ʿAlī Suʿūd, like his Wahhābi forefathers, was destined to have a free hand in Arabia. On 29 September 1924 his troops took al-Tāʾif, and in October, Mecca. King Husayn fled first to ʿAkkā and from there in May 1925 to Cyprus. His son ʿAwn retired to Djudda. Ibn Suʿūd besieged this town and Medina for a year, avoiding bloodshed and complications with European powers. Both towns surrendered in December 1925.

We owe descriptions of social life in Mecca during the last decades of the pre-modern period to two Europeans, the Briton Sir Richard Burton, who as the dervish-physician Mirzā ʿAbd Allāh visited Mecca in 1853 at the time of the pilgrimage, and the Dutchman Snouck Hurrj., who lived in Mecca for some months during 1884-5 with the express aim of acquiring a knowledge of the daily life of the Meccans, but also with a special interest, as a Dutchman, in the Djāwā or Indonesians who went as pilgrims to Mecca and who often stayed there as muḥājirūn. The institution of the pilgrimage and the ceremonies connected with the various holy sites in or near the city dominated Meccan life, many of its citizens having specific roles concerning the religious rites and being organised in special guilds, such as the zamāmīyyān who distributed water from the well of Zamzam in the courtyard of the Kaʿba; the Bedouin muḥājirūn or camel brokers, who arranged transport between Djudda, Mecca, al-Tāʾif and Medina; and above all, the mutawwifūn or guides for the intending pilgrims and their conductors through the various rites (mandāk) of the Hajj (q.v.). These mutawwifūn had their connections with particular ethnic groups or geographical regions of the Islamic world (there were, in Snouck Hurrj., time, 180 guides plus hangers-on who were concerned with the Dji-dāda pilgrims alone), and their agents (uṣul-kāṭ) in Djudd would take charge of the pilgrims as soon as they disembarked. Such groups as these, together with the townspeople in general who would let out their houses or rooms, were geared to the exploitation of the pilgrims, and it was only in the rest of the year that tradesmen, scholars, lawyers, etc., could really pursue their other vocations.

At this time also, the slave trade was still of considerable importance. There were a few white Circas-
sians (Cerkes [q. v.]), but much more important for hard manual labour like building and quarrying were the black negro slaves (sudan), and, for domestic service, the somewhat lighter-skinned so-called Abyssinians (hubish). Despite the prohibitions of slave-trading imposed in their own colonial territories and on the high seas, Snouck Hurgrone further observed some slaves from British India and the Dutch East Indies, and the Mecca slave market was a flourishing one.


(A. J. Wensing - [C. E. Bosworth])

3. The Modern City

Politics and administration. ‘Ali b. al-Husayn b. ‘Ali, was declared king of al-Hijâz on 5 Rabî’ 1/1344/4 October 1924 following the abdication of his father the previous day, but the odds against his stabilising a collapsing situation were insurmountable. He therefore ordered his troops out of the capital on 14 Rabî’ 1/13 October 1924 to take up new positions in Bahra about half-way between Makka and Qiddâ. The next morning, the city was looted, not by the Ikhwan (Wahhâbîs) but by local Bedouin who found it unguarded. ‘Abd al-’Azîz b. ‘Abd al-Rahmân Al Su’ûd, the sultan of Najd and its Dependencies, was in al-Riyadh and had ordered Khâlid b. Lu’ayy to place Ibn Biqîd not to enter Makka for his own arrival, for fear of further savagery in Islam’s holiest city. However, when Khâlid and Ibn Biqîd found that the enemy had fled, they decided to move. On 17 Rabî’ 1/16 October, by which time the Bedouin had left, Ibn Biqîd ordered four Ikhwan from Ghâzaght to enter the shuttered city without weapons and wearing khâmîs clothing. As they traversed the deserted streets, they read a proclamation annecling the city and guaranteeing the safety of its inhabitants. Slowly the citizenry began to re-emerge. On the following day, Khâlid and Sulûn led their forces, all muhûmmân, into the holy city to the Haram, where the ‘umra was performed. There was some sporadic destruction of water pipes, tobacco supplies, Sharîﬁan property and domed tombs, and the Ikhwan delivered sermons. Among the revered antiquities destroyed was the reputed birthplace of the Prophet and two houses revered as those of Khâdîja and of Abu Bakr. But on the whole, good order was kept. As a Su’ûd official observed, the Ikhwan entered Makka saying “Lâ ilâha illâ Allah” and “Allahu Akbar”, not fighting and killing. Khâlid b. Lu’ayy was ‘elected’ amir and promulgated himself as the Sharîﬁan reception room to receive the submission of the civil and religious notables.

The amîr of Makka served unaided for a month-and-a-half, and had to confront both domestic and international problems almost at once. On 6 Rabî’ 2/1343/4 November 1924, the consuls resident in Qiddâ (British, Dutch, French, Iranian and Italian), who no doubt anticipated an immediate Su’ûd official intervention, the city would not find those who believe in God and the last day of the ummîs ... or the mushrikûn ... As God said (LVIII, 22) in his Holy Book... ‘Thou wilt not find those who believe in God and the last day loving those who resist God and His Prophet even though they be their fathers, sons, brothers or kin’ ... If you look at our own situation and consider our actions you will see that this is our way of defending Islam.” He enclosed a copy of ‘Abd al-’Azîz’s pro-
clamation to the people of Djudda and Makka suggesting an international conference on the future of al-Hijāz and meanwhile assuring security for all. The Hijāzis already pitted their steadfastness out against the forces and since al-Husayn had gone and since King 'Ali and the Party accepted the same kind of Islam that Sultan 'Abd al-'Azīz believed in, there was no reason to continue fighting. They asked to send delegations to Makka so that a truce could be signed pending the decision of the international conference. Khalīfīd gave them no encouragement; he wrote on 22 Rabī‘ II/20 November, “God has already purified the Holy Haram by ridding it of Husayn... We shall oppose all those who continue to support ‘Ali.” Muhammad al-Tawīl, who was the real power in the Hijāz National Party, nevertheless, requested permission to send a delegation; Khalīfīd agreed, and the delegation went to Makka the next day. Any lingering doubt as to Wahhābī intentions was removed by the ultimatum which Khalīfīd gave his visitors. They could arrest ‘Ali, get him out of the country, or join the Wahhābīs in seizing Djudda.

Sultan ‘Abd al-'Azīz had left al-Riyād with an army of 5,000 sedentarists on 13 Rabī‘ II/1343 November 1924 for Makka and arrived there in remarkably fast time on 8 Jumādā I/5 December. Upon his departure from al-Riyād he had issued a proclamation (in Wahhāba, Qizira, 253) on his purposes in going to Makka. He also, in the presence of three close advisors, Dr. ‘Abd Allāh al-Damlūdji (from al-Mawsīl), Shaykh ‘Abd Allāh Al-Saylūmān (from ‘Unayza in al-Kaṣīm, Najd), and Shaykh Ḥāfīz Wahhāba (of Egyptian origin) to study out the situation in Makka and to assist in reassuring the population. Shaykh Ḥāfīz reports (Kamsun, 63 ff.) that he delivered a number of speeches to ulama, merchants and government employees in various meetings. He stressed that ‘Abd al-'Azīz would reform corruption, end the isolation of al-Hijāz from the mainstream of the Muslim world and put the administration of the country, and especially of the Haramayn, on a sound basis. These speeches probably helped; in any case, just before ‘Abd al-'Azīz’s arrival, Shaykh Ḥāfīz received a letter from the director of the Egyptian āṣāb, ‘Abd Allāh Al-Sayy, congratulating him on the details of the event.

Sultan ‘Abd al-'Azīz himself reached al-Ṭārif on 6 Qumādā I/13 December, changed into ihrām, entered the city and then, by the Bāb al-Salām, entered the sacred mosque. No member of his house had prayed there since 1227/81812. Ibn Su‘ūd eschewed the Sharīfīi palaces and instead set up his camp outside the city in al-‘Abhāda, where for two weeks he received all and sundry. Universal report is that his humility, his unpretentiousness, his sincere apologies for what had happened at al-Ṭārif and his rejection of sycophancy (to those who tried to kiss his hand he said that his custom was only to shake hands) combined to win local hearts. The proclamation that he had issued on 12 Qumādā I 1343/9 December when he entered the city had already made a favourable impression (text in Wahhāba, Qizira, 254-5). Article 4 was as follows: “Every member of the ulama in these regions and each employee of al-Haram al-Ṣarīr or maṭāwīf with a clear title shall be entitled to his previous entitlement. We will neither add to it nor subtract anything from it, with the exception of a man against whom people bring proof of unsuitability for a post, for unlike the past situation, such practices will be forbidden. To whomever has a clear previous claim on it, we will give his right and take nothing from him.”

Having established some rapport with the citizens of Makka, Sultan ‘Abd al-'Azīz now took command of his forward troops located at al-Raṣālama about 4 km. east of Bahāra. The governance of the city rested still with the Djuddan officials and the civil administration of the city over to ‘Abd Allāh al-Damlūdji and to Ḥāfīz Wahhāba on a kind of rotating basis. He then decided he would rather have al-Damlūdji close at hand and left the administration of Makka divided so that Khalīfīd b. Lu’ayy handed al-‘Awān and military affairs and Shaykh Ḥāfīz civil matters. Soon thereafter the administration was further elaborated. The municipality was turned over to a Makkan, Shaykh Ḥāfīz Ahmad al-Subāḥi, and an embryonic consultative council was established under the chairmanship of Shaykh ‘Abd al-Kādir al-Ṣayyibī, the keeper of the key of the Ka‘ba. This simple council was the kernel of the later Madīż al-Ṣuwān. This administrative set-up continued until the capture of Djudda a year later.

The dual amirate was not harmonious. Shaykh Ḥāfīz reports perpetual conflicts between himself and Khalīfīd. It was, he says, a conflict between Bedouin and sedentary mentalities. ‘He wanted to confiscate all the houses and seize their contents because their owners had fled. Since they had only fled out of fright, I tried and in many cases succeeded in preserving them; in other cases I failed.” Smoking was a perpetual source of trouble. Ibn Su‘ūd’s Wine House and the use of force on offenders; Ḥāfīz, kindness. One of the ironies was that although smoking had been banned, cigarettes were taxed.

There were other problems. King ‘Ali, attempts at reconciliation having failed, stopped all supplies going from Djudda to Makka. Since 300-400 camel loads a day were needed, the situation became very strained. ‘Abd al-Kādir al-Ṣayyibī wrote to King ‘Ali as follows: “How far do your deeds differ from the statement of God. What is the reason for stopping our food? We are not responsible for the Nejdī Army entering Mecka; you are, for the following reasons (i) you did not settle differences with the Sultan of Nejd, (ii) when the Nejd army entered Ta‘if we asked you to evacuate our families and belongings, but you refused. You promised to protect us but you ran away. When you came to Ta‘if we asked you again not to leave but we went on protecting ourselves... and again you ran away... we would like to ask your Highness if the neighbours of the House of God are animals. We beg your Highness to leave us Jeddah.” (quotation from Baker, 214-15). ‘Ali sent one of his dilapidated aircraft to drop a leaflet in reply saying that he had left in order to prevent a repetition of the events in al-Ṭārif. ‘Abd al-'Azīz’s response to him was more concrete. He sent the Khwānī to capture Rābīgh and al-Lith thus (a) giving them something to do; (b) breaking the blockade; and (c) cutting the communications between Djudda and al-Madīnah.

In fact, the situation in Makka improved while that in Djudda slowly deteriorated. Not only did Makkans begin to return home, but native Djuddawīs themselves began to arrive in Makka. The superior administration in Makka was a noticeable factor. In April an interesting visitor arrived, Comrade Karim Khān Hakimoff, the Soviet consul in Djudda. He had been granted permission by King ‘Ali to mediate and arrived with his Iranian colleague. They were of course received by ‘Abd al-'Azīz. Reportedly, Hakimoff characterised the hostilities as resulting from imperialist plots, but he did get permission for Fu‘ād al-Ma‘āsh, King ‘Ali’s foreign minister, to come and negotiate. On 2 May, ‘Abd al-'Azīz met with al-Khāṭīb at a coffee shop midway between the
warring lines. The sultan never wavered: the former King al-Husayn now in al-`Akaba was still really nothing but the approaching pilgrims and the great press of Mekkans and Bedouins. In the midst of them was one of the Haram preachers, dressed in a couple of towels and bestriding a beautiful horse, whom he thought some 25-30,000 were Najdis. They camped apart, and Rutter notes that they took no notice of the tobacco that was on sale everywhere. "It is the smoking ... which is unlawful, not the selling of it." At `Arafat, while returning toward his tent from a visit to King `Ali, Ibn Su'd noted that "there was a lot of Masdjid `Abd al-Ihrām and Masjīd `Arafāt." Rutter and his companions "passed the burly figure of Ibn Su'd, dressed in a couple of towels and bestriding a beautiful Nejd horse which looked rather like a little animated rocking horse under his long form. He was attended by four mounted guards carrying rifles." Another of Rutter's vivid descriptions is that of the break-up of the pilgrim throng at `Arafāt: "Far out on the northern side of the plain rode the scattered hosts of the Nejd Ikhān—dim masses of hosting camelry, obscurely seen in the falling dusk. Here and there in the midst of the spreading multitude, a green standard, born aloft, suddenly flashed out from the dust-cloud, only to disappear the next moment behind the obscuring screen, which rose in spreading billows of sand. There was also a cloud of smoke, a cloud of black smoke; and in the midst of the spreading multitude, a green flag flew. Rutter met with `Abd al-`Azīz a personal mission was received by the sultan at al-Shumaysi on the edge of the sacred territory, Sir Gilbert Clayton, who was negotiating with `Abd al-`Azīz at his camp in Bahra, noted in his diary for 22 Rabi` 1/21 October the arrival of an Iranian delegation. Led by Mīrzā `Alī Akbar Khān Bahāmān, the Iranian minister in Egypt, and Mīrzā Ḥabīb Khān Huwayda, the consul-general in Iran in Palestine, its function was to investigate alleged Wahhābī desecration and destruction of shrines in Makka and al-Madīna. `Abd al-`Azīz received them most cordially and sent them on to Makka by car. The sultan said he welcomed the investigation because the charges were false. Incidentally, Clayton indicated in his diary (19 October 1925) his belief that Ibn Su'd could have captured Dqudda whenever he wanted, but that he was going slowly because _inter alia_, he wanted "to gauge more fully the effect which his attack on the Holy Places and his capture of Mecca has had on the whole Moslem nation, not only in the general sense, but in the particular sense of the Wahhābīs in Egypt." In any case, by the middle of November 1925, large numbers of Wahhābīs began to arrive in groups ranging from half-a-dozen to several hundred. The wadi from Diabal al-Nūr to the city was crowded with them and many were sent on to the front. Clearly, the sultan was preparing to storm Dqudda, but it turned out not to be necessary. Al-Madīna surrendered on 19 Dīqūmād I 1344/5 December 1925, followed two weeks later by Dqudda. On 20 Dīqūmād II 1344/5 January 1926, certain notables in Dqudda formally approached the sultan of Nadīj to ask him if he would also become king of al-Hijāz, hoping by this device to maintain the integrity of al-Hijāz. When they had left, `Abd al-`Azīz convened the ulama and other notables. They approved. On 22 Dīqūmād II 1344/7 January in Makka, Ibn Su'd read out a formal statement of his intentions pointing out that there had been almost no response to his appeal for a conference to discuss the problem of al-Hijāz. "So, as I find that the Islamic World is not concerned about this important matter, I have granted them [the people of the Hijāz] the freedom to decide what they will." The wishes of the "people" manifested themselves the same evening in the form of a petition confirming their support for `Abd al-`Azīz: "We acknowledge you, Sultan Abdulaziz, as king of Hejaz in accordance with the Holy Book and the Sunna of the Prophet and that Hejaz will be for the Hejazeen ... Mecca will be the capital and we shall be under your protection." (Baker, 230). Rutter was present in the Great Mosque for the mahāya'a: "Upon a Friday [23 Dīqūmād II/8 January] after the midday prayer, I mounted the crumbling stone steps of the school el Madrasat el Fakhrīya, which stands beside the Bāb Ibrāhīm, in order to visit an acquaintance who was employed as a schoolmaster there. As we sat sipping tea beside a window looking into the Haram, we were surprised to observe a sudden rush of people toward Bāb es-Safā. They were evidently attracted by something which was happening near that gate. Rising, we descended the steps and passed into the Haram. Making our way toward Bāb es-Safā, we came upon a great press of Mekkans and Bedouins. In the midst of them was one of the Haram preachers.
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(probably Abd al-Malik Murad) perched upon a little wooden platform or pulpit, apparently addressing the multitude. Elsewhere, a number of guards, at some distance, were able to see Ibn Sa‘ūd sitting in a prepared place near the gate. The preacher was addressing to the Sultan a speech of adulation. Presently, he made an end, and then several of the Ashraf, the Shaybi, and other prominent Makkans in turn, took the Sultan’s hand and acknowledged him King of the Hijāz. Ibn Sa‘ud received these advances with his usual cordial smile, and upon the conclusion of the ceremony he rose, and accompanied by his armed guards, made his way slowly through the crowd towards the Kaaba and proceeded to perform the towāf. Having completed this, and prayed two prostrations in the Makām Ibrāhīm, he left the Mosque and went to the Hamīdīyya where he held a general reception. Suddenly one of the old guns in the Fort of Jiyād [Adżyad], boomed and was immediately followed by another on Jebel Hindi. The troops of the garrison were saluting the new king. A hundred and one times the peace of the city was broken. Rutter reports some hostile reactions to the elevation of al-Su‘ūdi, as some Makkans dubbed their king, but contrasts most favourably the honest treatment received by pilgrims under the new dispensation.

After the hostilities over, the new king of the Hijāz remained in his new capital, Makka, and addressed himself to these major issues: the Hadjdiyya of 1344/1926, the Islamic conference which he had previously announced and which was scheduled in conjunction with it, and the administration of the kingdom. The Hadjdiyya that summer attracted 191,000, approximately an eight-fold increase over the previous year, but the Holy City was also the scene of the rather serious mahmal [q. v.] affair. The Egyptian mahmal arrived in the usual way with the kiswa [q. v.], with the retinue of civilians and soldiers including their flags and bugles, and with contributions of cash and kind much of which represented weird [q. v.] income dedicated to the Haram from Egypt. The Egyptian amir al-Hadjdiyya was Mahmūd ‘Azmī Pasha. The whole procedure was almost programmed for trouble, given the cultural differences of the Egyptians involved and especially the religious sensitivities of the Ikhānī. As Lacey (202) observed: “The glorious shoulder-borne litter smacked to them of idolatry [and] its retinue of armed guards piqued their pride...” In the event, the Ka‘ba was dressed in its new Egyptian kiswa without incident, and the ceremonies were proceeding normally, but on the eve of 5 Dhu ‘l-Hijja (some report the day of 10 Dhu ‘l-Hijja) the situation exploded. One report is that the spark was some music (= probably bugling) played by the Egyptian soldiers. Other reports indicate that the Nadjdī Bedouin simply saw the mahmal and began to shout out that it was an idol. Whatever the precise trigger event was, in the crowded mass of pilgrims between Muna and Safa, a number of pilgrims were killed and 100 wounded; 40 camels were also killed; but the carnage could easily have been much worse. Just as the Ikhānī were preparing a massive assault on the Egyptians, King ‘Abd al-‘Azīz rode up and at considerable personal risk managed to separate the two groups and to cool the hot blood. Once order was restored, the king ordered his son Fayṣal to guard the Egyptians with a detachment of Su‘ūdi troops until the end of the ceremonies. When the Hadjdiyya had ended, he ordered Mughārī b. Su‘ūd b. Djawīl to escort the Egyptians to Qiddoda with a detachment of Su‘ūdi troops, as follows: (Dīr. al-‘Ilm al-Mālikī, Kiṣwah, 237, cf. H. al-‘Ilm al-Mālikī, Kiṣwah, 16 Dhu ‘l-Hijja 1344) from ‘Abd Allāh Āl Sulaymān in Makka to Hāfiz Wahba, then serving as the king’s envoy in Cairo, makes clear, the departure of the Egyptians from Makka was scarcely willing, but the king was going to have them out, willing or not. As Lacey had summarised it (loc. cit.), “the Mahmal never trooped again in glory through the streets of Mecca”; but the incident further soured Egypto-Su‘ūdi relations to the degree that diplomatic relations were not established between the two countries as long as King Fu‘ād reigned in Cairo.

Since the fall of the city to his arms, King ‘Abd al-‘Azīz had repeatedly proclaimed his intention to convene an Islamic conference in Makka to which delegates from all Muslim countries and communities would be invited. The stated idea was to discuss the governance of Islam’s holiest sites and ceremonies, but the basic motivation was to put to rest the fears of Muslims beyond Arabia over the capability of a Su‘ūdi-Nadjdī-Wahhabī régime to care for the Harām. Initially, the conference probably attained its goal, but the results were passive not active. Egypt had declined to attend, and the mahmal had been received with distinguishing. The Egyptian delegates and attend debated with great freedom a wide variety of religious subjects but to no very particular point. On the underlying political issue, it was crystal-clear that ‘Abd al-‘Azīz was going to run the country and there was no indication of any incapacity on his part. That issue was settled without being raised.

The series of ad hoc administrative arrangements made by the king during and after the conquest now gave way to more permanent arrangements. It should be remembered that until the unification of the “dual kingdom” (on 25 Rabī‘a 1345/29 January 1927) King ‘Abd al-‘Azīz had been proclaimed king of Nadjīd (and its Dependencies) as the Kingdom of Su‘ūdi Arabia in 1932, and even beyond that time, al-Hijāz and especially its capital Makka received most of the government’s attention. It is not always easy to separate what applied: (a) to Makka as a city, (b) to al-Hijāz as a separate entity including Makka, and (c) to both the Kingdom of al-Hijāz and the Kingdom of Nadjīd, equally including Makka. The evolution of advisory or quasi-legislative councils was as follows. Immediately after the Su‘ūdi occupation of Makka (7 Dhumādār I 1343/19 December 1924), ‘Abd al-‘Azīz convened a partly elected, partly appointed body of notables called al-Majlis al-Abīl (the national council). It was elected and then it was re-elected on 11 Muharram 1344/1 August 1925. Representation was on the basis of town quarters, and included prominent merchants and ulema, but in addition, the king appointed a number equal to the elected members and also appointed the presiding officer; indeed, no elected member could take his seat without ‘Abd al-‘Azīz’s approval. After the second election, this group came to be known as Majlis al-‘Ashāra (consultative council). After the Islamic conference ended, this arrangement was significantly changed. A national (Hijāzī) council—a kind of constituent assembly—with 30 Makkan members was convened to study an organic statute (al-Tawīlim al-AsSayiyā li-l-‘Ummālika l-‘Ilmālā) known as al-Diwan al-‘Unāmiyya (the general assembly), it accepted on 21 Safar 1345/11 December 1925 Ibn Sa‘ūd’s draft of the organic statute which specified that Makka was the capital of the kingdom, that administration of the kingdom was “in the hand of King ‘Abd al-‘Azīz,”
and that a na'im (deputy general, viceroy) would be appointed on behalf of the king. Faysal b. 'Abd al-'Aziz, the king's second living son, was appointed na'im. Under his chairmanship and in accordance with the statute, a new Madžlis al-Shârâ' of 13 members (five from Makka), this time all appointed, was convened. Various administrative and budgetary matters were routinely discussed by it. (For the rapid evolution of the Madžlis al-Shârâ', see Nallino, 33-5, 235-6 and M.T. Sâdîk, 21-47.) The Madžlis al-Shârâ' had the power to limit its real powers were, did play a major role as a sounding board in al-Hijâz for various government policies. It has never been dissolved and even under the very much changed situation caused by oil price increases in 1973, it apparently still meets ceremonially from time to time.

One should also note that the Madžlis al-Shârâ', meeting in Makka on 16 Muḥarram 1352/11 May 1933, recognized the king's oldest living son, Su'ud b. 'Abd al-'Aziz, as heir designate (wali al-'ašâb). The prince himself was not present, and Faysal b. 'Abd al-'Aziz received the bay'a on his behalf. The decree was read aloud in the Harrâm and the ministers, notables and ordinary people filed by to present their congratulations. The organic statute also established arrangements for local government and national departments; all of the latter were in Makka. Nor did this situation change radically with the proclamation of the Unified Kingdom of Saudi Arabia in 1351/1932. As late as 1952, the Minister of Health and Interior (H.R.H. Prince 'Abd Allâh b. Faysal b. 'Abd al-'Aziz) and the ministry officials were in Makka as was the Ministry of Finance under 'Abd Allâh Āl Sulaymân Āl Ḥamdân and the Directorates General of Education, P.T.T., Public Security, awlîâ', and other central government agencies. It may be noted here that Faysal was named Minister of Foreign Affairs in 1349/1930, but also that his father continued to make all important decisions in all matters as long as he was vigorous.

Initial branches (originally called ašrâm, sing. kism) of the new government, each under a director (mudîr) were: ašlî'î a-affairs, internal affairs, foreign affairs, financial affairs, supervision of public services and the police force. Courts, awlîâ', and mosques, including the Makkan Harrâm, were under the ašlî'î branch; municipal matters were under internal affairs. It should also be noted that a Madžlis committee composed of the heads of all departments concerned with pilgrimage matters plus members nominated by the king was formed under the chairmanship of the viceroy. Finally, one may note that the titles of departments, their heads and the loci of responsibility all evolved over time. For example, in 1350/1932 a Council of Agents (Madžlis al-Wukâlah) was announced, and for the first time the germ of the idea of ministerial responsibility was introduced.

Makka was one of only five cities in the Hijâz that had had a municipality in Ottoman and Hashimite times. The municipality was re-established by the Su'ud regime in 1343/1926 with its own organizational structure. Three years later, its powers and responsibilities were increased and its name was changed to Āmînât al-'Āsîma. According to Hamza, the underlying idea of the king was to turn purely local matters over to local people. Further organizational adjustments were made in 1357/1938. The budget was in reality under the control of the king and his deputy general, but formally it was under the purview of the Madžlis al-Shârâ'. Once the budget was approved, the municipality apparently enjoyed a certain independence in administering it. It was able to levy local fees (waṣâm). Figures are very incomplete, but in 1345/1926-7 the municipal budget totaled SR 158,800 and in 1360/1949-50 SR 4,034,000. Municipality responsibilities included city administration, cleaning, lighting, supervision of establishments, roads, installation of awnings, condemnation and destruction of properties, land registration, price regulation (for necessities), cleanliness of food preparers, slaughter houses, weights and measures, supervision of elections of guilds of industries and trades and of their activities, supervision of burial procedures, kindness to animals and fines. No other municipality in the land had such broad responsibilities.

The one area where Najdís played an important role in the Makkan scene after the conquest was in organised religion. As early as Diwânadâ Il 1343/January 1925, conferences between the Wahhâbí ulama of Najd and the local ulema of Makka were going forward with minimal difficulty. Shortly after the conquest, 'Abd al-'Azîz transferred 'Abd Allâh b. Bûlayhîd (1284-1359/1867 to 1940-1) from the kadhî of Hâshîl to that of Makka, where he remained for about two years. He was succeeded by 'Abd Allâh b. Hassan b. Husayn b. 'Allî b. Husayn b. Muhammad b. 'Abd al-Wâhâb. Philby, writing around 1369/1950, referred to him as the "archbishop of Mecca" and Ramaco, Royal Family... still refers to him with this same title. 'Abd Allâh b. Su'ud was appointed in 1371/July 1952. Yet care was taken not to alienate the local ulema. For example, when the Hijâzí Hay'at al-Ahmâr bi'l-Mudîrîrq wa'l-Nahy an al-Munkar was established in 1345/1926, 'Abd Allâh al-Shaybânî was made chairman of the committee. The function of the Hay'a was in general to supervise morals, encourage prayer, control mezuzins and imâns of mosques, and report infractions of the shari'a (details in Nallino, 110-2.) In general, the influence of the ulema was high and they were deferred to. The king could not dispose of shari'a questions on his own and regularly referred them to either a kadhî or to the full "bench" of the Makkan or Riyâdí ulema. The king's direct influence over this largely autonomous group was through the power of appointment, but he was of course influential indirectly.

Makka was one of only three cities in al-Hijâz that had had police at the time of the Su'udî takeover; however, since King 'Allî had taken them all to Dquladà as part of his military forces, none were immediately available. According to Rutter, a squad of powerful black slaves belonging to 'Abd al-'Azîz kept order. Makka was also the seat of police administration. A police academy was started in 1353/1933-4 and, at that time at least, the police supervised the orphanage and an old persons' home which had 44 residents. In 1953-5, a new government building was constructed in Djarawal as the main headquarters for the police, and in 1385/1965-6 a police emergency squad was established which responded to the emergency telephone number of 99. In the first decades after the conquest, police were almost all recruited from Asîr (g.v.) and Najd. By the mid-1930s, they wore European-style uniforms and numbered 33 officers and 896 other ranks. As long as it was necessary, the police force also included a special squad called Kalam Taftîsh al-Râkîb (section for the inspection of slaves). Executions were usually carried out on Fridays after the noon prayer between the Hamidiya (government) house and the southern corner of the Harrâm. Philby, Jubilees, 118-20) details a triple execution in 1931 over which Faysal presided from a window in the madžlis of al-Hamidiya, where a group of notables had also gathered. There was a large crowd of commoners in
the street. When the beheadings were over, the police tied the corpses “each with its head by its side” to the railings of the building until sundown. The lowest was the summary court (mahkamat al-musir al-musta'qila) presided over by a single kadi with jurisdiction over petty civil cases and criminal cases not involving execution or loss of limb. The higher court (mahkamat al-qadi, al-susup) had a kadi as president plus two of his colleagues. In cases involving loss of limb or execution, the sentence had to be pronounced by the full court. The appeals court sat only in Makka and was presided over by a president and four other ulama. It functioned as a court of appeals (criminal cases) and of cassation (civil cases). Appeals have to be filed within 20 days and if the court refuses to take the case, the verdict of the lower court stands.

The president, who was Shaykh 'Abd Allah b. Hasan Al al-Shaykh, also administers the whole system and supervises all courts and kadi's. There has also been, since 1350-1/1932, an inspector of courts. Notaries (sing. kāthī al-'udūd) were instituted in 1347/1928-9, and Hamza reports that in Makka at the time he was writing the incumbent was 'Urābi Sidjini.

Immediately after the conquest, the government overprinted “Sultanate of Najdji and al-Hijāz” on the Hāżlimī stamps, but Su 'udī ones were soon in use and the Su 'udī government joined the International Postal Union of Berne in 1345-6/1927. In 1357-8/1939 Makka’s post office was one of only four (the others being at Ḍūqqada, al-Madīna and Yānu'Bi) in the country that could handle all operations specified by the international conventions including the telegraph. There was a daily service to Ḍūqqada and al-Tā'if and a twice-weekly service to al-Madīna.

In 1384/1964-5, Makka’s post office, which was handling in that year's hajj 350,000 letters daily, became a postal centre independent of Ḍūqqada. Rent control was imposed at the time of the conquest and was still in force as late as 1374-5. There was a customs office in the city which, like its counterpart in al-Madīna, was presumably a branch of the main office in Ḍūqqada. Wafq administration in Makka reported directly to the viceroy. Early directors of the Directorate of Aukāf were Muhammad Sa'id Abu 'l-Khayr (1343/1924-8) and Majdī al-Kurdi (1347/1929-31). By a royal decree of 27 Dhu '1- Ḥijād 1354/21 March 1936 the Makkan Directorate of Aukāf was changed into a directorate general to which the other aukāf directorates of al-Hijāz would report. Sayyid 'Abd al-Walāḥ Nā'īb al-Haram was appointed director general.

As far as fire fighting is concerned, Rutter (228) describes a reasonably effective volunteer system in use before modern systems were adopted. He comments that in case of fire “the neighbours regard it as a point of honour to render all the assistance in their power, and official notice of the occurrence is taken by the police, some of whom also turn out and help.” The first student mission sent abroad to train in fire fighting and life-saving methods was some time before 1367/1947-8.

One may at this point reasonably inquire as to whether Makkan acceptance of Su 'udī hegemony in the pre-oil period. Leaving aside ḏīhāwān discontent at the regime and some slight separatist sentiments in Makka and discounting near-by tribal unhappiness (“taxing” pilgrims was no longer possible), there was general acceptance of the régime and great pleasure at the total security and basic fairness. There was also some unhappiness which doubtless increased with the very strong circumstances of the geopolitics of general world-wide depression. In 1345-6/1927 Husayn Hādir al-Dabābah, whose father had been Minister of Finance both under King al-Husayn and under King 'Ali and who himself headed a business house, established in Makka an anti-Su 'udī “Hijāz liberation organisation” called Anđumuni Ḥibz al-Abār. Its basic platform opposed any monarch in al-Hijāz. Husayn was exiled in 1346-7/1928, but he probably left behind a clandestine cell of his party which also maintained an open operation in Egypt. We get another glimpse of anti-Su 'udī feeling in Makka in 1354-5/1936 from the report of a Muslim Indian employee of the British legation in Ḍūqqada named Iḥsān Allāh. According to him, dissatisfaction was widespread, older conservative merchants and ulama wished for an Egyptian takeover with British support, whereas middle-aged merchants and government officials simply viewed the government as backward, a “set of old fools”; younger businessmen, army officers, and pilots longed for an Atatürk [q.v.] or a Mussolini. Iḥsān notes, however, that there was no action and that the preferred way to seek relief was by working for Hijāz interests through the Muṣliha intelligence reports. These were notoriously unreliable, but it would have been surprising had there not been some level of discontent. With the coming of oil, separatist feelings doubtless disappeared, and Makka participated to the full in the extraordinary development that the Kingdom enjoyed as a whole. The extraordinary events of 1400/1979 were the only dramatic break in the standard rhythms of the city’s life.

Seizure of the Haram. Not since the followers of Hamdān Karmat [q.v.] seized Makka and carried the Black Stone back to their headquarters in al-ʿAhsā’ [q.v.] had there been such an astonishing event as that which unfolded in the Ḍūqqada at dawn on Tuesday, 1 Ṣuhrār 1440/20 November 1979. It was of worldwide interest not only because of its intrinsic importance for one of the world’s major religions, but also against the background of the Soviet-American global rivalry, of the recent revolution in Iran, and of the general religious fervour surging through the Muslim world.

The events can be quickly told. The Haram may have had 50,000 people in it, which is not many for a structure designed to accommodate 300,000. It had more than usual at that hour because the day was the first of the new Islamic century and thus deserved some special observance. The imām, Shaykh Muḥammad b. Subayyyīl, had gone to the microphone to lead the prayer, but he was then pushed aside. Several dozens of men produced rifles from their robes; firing broke out, the worshippers ran, and the armed men moved quickly to seal the 29 gates. Many people were wounded in these first exchanges, and a number were killed. Meanwhile two men, subsequently identified as Ḏūḥaymīn (“little glowerer”) b. Muḥammad al-'Utabī and Muḥammad b. 'Abd Allāh al-Kaḥṭānī, were at the microphone proclaiming that the latter was the Ṭaḥā. The rebels, a number of whose grandfathers had been killed while fighting as ḏīhāwān against 'Abd al-'Azīz in 1347-8/1929, who considered themselves neo-ḳūhāwī, and who numbered in all some 230 including women and children, let the worshippers pass and then gathered at the Haram, the holy sanctuary, with the hostages. With apparent presence of mind, Shaykh Muḥammad had removed his clerical garb and made
His way to a telephone in his office according to some reports—a public phone according to others—and notified the chief of the security service that something was happening. He managed to slip out with the other worshippers. At the beginning of the ensuing siege, the rebels used the powerful public address system, which had speakers in the 90 m. high minarets and which was designed to be heard in the streets and plazas outside the mosque, to proclaim their message that the Mahdi was going to usher in justice throughout earth and that the Mahdi and his men had to seek shelter and protection in al-Haram al-Sharif because they were everywhere persecuted. They had no recourse except the Haram. Attacks on the House of Su‘iđ and its alleged policies and practices were virulent; the rebels opposed working women, television, football, consumption of alcohol, royal trips to European and other pleasure spots, royal involvement in business, and the encouragement of foreigners who came to Arabia and corrupted Islamic morality.

Details of names and business contracts were specified. The amir of Makka came in for particular attack. Meanwhile, Su‘iđ Arabia was alive with rumours, some officially encouraged, to the effect that the Djuhaymān was a homosexual, that he was a drug addict, a drunkard, etc.

The report of the Su‘iđ government was hesitant at first but never in doubt. Prince Fahd b. Abd al-Azīz, the heir designate, was out of the country at the time. Prince ‘Abd Allah b. ‘Abd al-Ma‘ālī was second in line to the throne and was on vacation in Morocco. The king, Khālid b. Abd al-Azīz, was awakened at seven in the morning and informed of what had happened. He immediately ordered that all communication with the outside world be cut. The ensuing communications blackout was so total that it was reported that even Prince Fahd had been unable to find out what was going on. In Makka a police car, which may have been the first concrete reaction, drove toward the mosque to investigate. It was promptly fired on and left. Later the amir drove up to try to assess the situation, only to have his driver shot in the head. The men inside were evidently well armed and roused. By mid-afternoon, the 600-man special security force was in Makka and national guard, police, and army units were being airlifted in from Tabūk [q. v.] in the north and the ‘Azīzīyyah [q. v.] in the south. Prince Sulṭān b. ‘Abd al-Azīz, the minister of defence; Prince Nā‘af b. ‘Abd al-Azīz, the minister of interior; and Prince Turqī b. Fayṣal b. ‘Abd al-Azīz, the chief of external intelligence, all arrived in Makka. In al-Riyāḑ, the king had simultaneously called together the senior ulema in order to get a fatwā authorising the use of force in the Haram, since force there is by definition forbidden. The fatwā approving the action was apparently issued immediately but not published for several days. Authority was found in the aya of the Kur‘ān: ‘Do not fight them near the Holy Mosque until they fight you inside it, and if they fight you, you must kill them, for that is the punishment of the unbelievers’ (II, 149).

By Tuesday evening the siege was on, and the rebels had no way to escape, despite the fact that they had secretly and ingeniously cached large supplies of weaponry, ammunition and food in the mosque. Electricity and all other services to the mosque were cut, but Djuhaymān’s snipers covered the open ground around the mosque. Horrified by what was going on, some national guardsmen (mudhābidān) wanted to storm the mosque, but the king had ordered that casualties be minimised. The situation was extremely delicate, for Prince Sulṭān could hardly order heavy weaponry to destroy the mosque and Bayt Allāh. Ultimately, Prince Sulṭān suggested on the mas‘ād which justs out from the mosque enclosure like an open thumb from a closed fist (see plan). According to some, an “artillery barrage” was laid down, but when the troops advanced, they suffered heavy losses and accomplished little. There was considerable confusion on the government side and some lack of coordination among the various services. At one point, two soldiers reportedly ran firing into the courtyard in order to be shot down and die as martyrs. Others were reported to have been unhappy at being called on to fight in the mosque. Since the national guardsmen were tribal, and it had become known that the leaders of the insurrection were tribal, suspicion of the national guardsmen arose. Sulṭān tried another approach involving a disastrous helicopter attack into the courtyard. It failed; the soldiers were wonched down in daylight, and most died. When government soldiers died, the rebels are said to have exclaimed amr Allāh (“at the order of God”), when one of their own died, therefore they shot or burned off his face—a job the women mostly performed—to conceal his identity. In a very difficult situation, friendly governments including the American, French and Pakistani were asked for diplomatic help. (See “The Day and the Night” (Holder and Johns, 324.) By Friday, 4 Muharram/23 November, however, the superiority of the government forces began to tell. Using tear gas, they forced an entrance into the mosque including the second storey, and they drove the rebel marksmen from two of the minarets. Once inside, government forces were able to rake Djuhaymān’s people, and despite a desperate pillar-to-pillar defence backed by barricades of mattresses, carpets and anything else that could be found, the rebels were gradually pushed down toward the maze-like complex of basement rooms. By Monday, 7 Muharram/26 November the government had gained control of everything above ground. But the fighting continued in nightmarish conditions below ground even though the number of the rebels was by then much reduced. By Wednesday the courtyard had been searched, carpeted and cleaned to broadcast prayers live on TV and to begin to calm down the city and the country.

Below ground, difficult fighting continued. The rebels were few and their supplies soon scant, but accompanied in some cases by their women and children they fought desperately. Gas, flooding, and burning tires were all tried in an effort to flush them out—without success. The fate of Muhammad b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Kahtānī is not clear. Some reports indicate that he was killed early in the fighting; others that, in the depths of despair, Djuhaymān had shot him. With many wounded, the hour of the rebels had come. At an hour-and-a-half after midnight on Wednesday 16 Muharram/5 December Djuhaymān led his people out. “It is said that as they emerged, many weeping and too tired to stand, muttering constantly, spat on and reviled, one of the band turned to a National Guardsman and asked: ‘What of the army of the north?’” (Holder and Johns, 526.) But many had to be individually overpowered. Djuhaymān is reported to have been kicked and struggling even as his arms were pinned. Su‘iđ TV covered this scene, and Djuhaymān “stared defiantly at the cameras, thrusting forward his matted beard, his eyes fierce and piercing like a cornered beast of prey.” (Lacey, 487.)

The investigation and trial of the rebels did not take long. On Wednesday a.m., 21 Safar 1400/9 January
1980 (not following the Friday noon prayer as was customary) in eight different Saudi cities amongst which they had been divided, 63 of the rebels were beheaded. Their citizenship was as follows: Su'ūdīs 41, Egyptians 10, South Yamanis 6, Kuwaytis 3, North Yamanis 1, Sudanese 1 and 'Irākis 1. Twenty-three women and thirteen children had surrendered along with their men. The women were given two years in prison and the children were turned over to welfare centres. The authorities found no evidence of foreign involvement. In addition, 19 who had supplied arms were jailed, while another 38 so accused were freed. The government casualty count listed 127 troops killed and 461 wounded, rebel dead as 117, and dead worshippers as 12 or more (all killed the first morning). Popular reaction to these extraordinary events was uniformly hostile to the rebels as defilers of God and his house. The only reported approval is by other members of the 'Utyaya tribe, who reportedly admired the fact that Qubayyān had in no way buckled under during interrogation.

Population and Society. Consistent population figures for Makka are not easy to find. Those that follow are perhaps suggestive:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Estimated population</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Su'ūdī-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharifian war</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1923</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>Rutter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1932</td>
<td>60,000*</td>
<td>Rutter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>100,000*</td>
<td>Wahba, Dqvaza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>Western Arabia in the Red Sea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>Philby, Su'ūdī Arabia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>71,998</td>
<td>'Abd al-Raḥmān Šādīk al-Šarīf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>112,000</td>
<td>'Abd al-Raḥmān Šādīk al-Šarīf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>198,186</td>
<td>'Abd al-Raḥmān Šādīk al-Šarīf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>200,000 plus</td>
<td>Nyrop</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Excluding women

Incidentally, the population density for Makka district (not the city) has been estimated as 12 per km². The age distribution in the city for 1974 was estimated to be as follows (in percentage):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Makka</th>
<th>Kingdom of Su'ūdī Arabia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 10</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - 29</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 49</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 50</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given the fact that Makka has for centuries been the centre for a pilgrimage that was often slow and tortuous, and given the desire of the pious to live and die near Bayt Allah, it is natural and has been observed by many that the population is a highly mixed one. Faces from Java, the Indian sub-continent and sub-Saharan Africa are noticeable everywhere. Almost every cast of feature on the face of the earth can be found. And the process continues; Nyrop (140) estimated that 20% of the population consisted of foreign nationals in the early 1960s—a figure which is particularly remarkable when one reflects that the non-Muslim foreigners who flocked to other Arabian cities in that era were absent from Makka. In a way, this has constituted an important benefit for Makka because the city is the continual recipient of new blood.

Outsiders have frequently complained about the dreads of needy families and also helps victims of accidents and calamities. It proved to be a model for similar funds in other cities in Su'ūdī Arabia. Actual Makkan manners and customs seem unexceptionable (as the comments above about cooperative neighbourly firefighting suggest), and Rutter, who gives many interesting details of life in Makka just after the Wahhabī conquest, specifically states that the city is not as immoral as it is pictured and that for example, Makkans use foul language much less than do Egyptians.

Marriages were arranged by the prospective bridegroom's father or other relative, who negotiated with the prospective bride's parents. Both normally give their consent. Once the dowry and other details have been agreed, the bridegroom's mother or other female relative, who usually gives the consent, prepares a feast to which the groom and his friends are invited. Two witnesses are required, but there is usually a crowd. After instruction by the šaykh, the girl's father takes the groom's hand and states that he is giving him his daughter in marriage for a dowry of the agreed amount. The groom accepts this contract and the parties are at that point married. No women are present. Neither party has seen the other unless accidently or as children. Consummation, if the individuals are old enough, is usually about a month later at the bride's house. The same night, she is escorted quietly by her family to the groom's house, and the whole procedure ends the evening after that
with a party at the groom’s house to which relatives of both families male and female are invited. The sexes are, however, still segregated on this occasion. In Hurair’s day the women were polygynous and many slave concubines, but little divorce. He thought Makkan women, for whom silver was the commonest jewelry, were generally fairer than the men and notes that many women could play the lute and drum. They also smoked a great deal. Prostitution was never seen by him. A week after the birth of a child, the father invites his and his wife’s relatives for the ceremony naming the infant. Again, the women are upstairs and the men down. When all have assembled, the father goes up and brings the child down on a cushion and places it on the floor while saying things like ma shah Allah [q.v.]—but not too vigorously lest devils be attracted. The father arranges the child so that his head is toward the Ka’ba and his feet away from it. The father kneels, says al-adhān bi-Allah min al-Shayān al-ragālīn, then bends over the child’s head with his mouth close to the right ear of the infant and repeats the adhān [q.v.] three times. He then says: “I name thee so-and-so.” “The child is now a Muslim. The guests repeat the name, invoke God’s blessing, and each puts a coin under the pillow. Another person then rings an iron pestle against a brass mortar. This is the signal to the women upstairs that the child has been named. They respond with ululations (trilling) of joy. With that, the father picks the infant up, the guests kiss it on the cheek, and the father takes it back upstairs to the women. He redescends with a tray full of sweets. On the 40th day after birth, every child is taken to the Haram and placed for a moment on the threshold of the Ka’ba. Other aspects of child rearing, at least up to Rutter’s time, included the use of foster mothers by the wealthy and the ahgār’s turning their male children over to Bedouin foster mothers for the three-fold purpose of developing their independent spirit, learning the “pure” language of the desert and creating an indissoluble alliance with the tribe. Up to the age of four, clothes worn are scanty and sketchy. Starting at five, boys go to kutūbās [q.v.] and girls are veiled. Boys are circumcised at six or seven, and female circumcision is also practised. Rutter characterises children as generally submissive and respectful. Rutter thought that life expectancy was not great because of the lack of movement of air during the heat of the long summer and because of the high humidity during the wet season (November-February). Death is marked by brief keening, after which the women friends of the family come to comfort the bereaved women. The body is washed, then carried on a bier without a coffin and placed on the pavement of the matāfī in front of the door of the Ka’ba. The mourners stand, and one repeats the burial prayers. The bier is then lifted, taken out the appropriately named Djama’-iz Gate to the Ma‘li Cemetery north of the Haram. Mourners and even passers-by rapidly rotate in carrying the bier. Burial is in shallow graves, and the shrouds have commonly been soaked in Zamzam water. After the burial, male friends pay a brief visit of condolence to the males of the deceased’s family. There are often Kur’ān readings on the 7th and 40th days after death. As to recreation, there was little sport, but impromptu wrestling and foot races sometimes occurred. Singing, the lute, the reed pipe and drums were popular both in homes and in the open air coffee houses just outside of town, but all music was done in the evenings. Numa’r of the Mekkans,” wrote Rutter (375), “is the great quadrangle of the Haram. Here friends meet by accident or appointment, sit and talk of religious or secular matters, read, sleep, perform the towāf in company, have their letters written (those of them who are illiterate) by the public writers who sit near Bāb es-Salām, or feed the sacred pigeons.” There are, incidentally, many pigeons and they enjoyed a beneficial wa‘f for the supply of the grain. They had drinking troughs and two officials to serve them, one to dispense their grain and the other to fill the water troughs. Popular belief is that no bird ever perches on the roof of the Ka’ba. Rutter himself says that in his month of sleeping on a roof overlooking the Ka’ba, even when the courtyard and the makāmān of the birds were covered with birds, the roof of the Ka’ba was bare. Another popular belief concerns those who fall asleep in the Haram. Should their feet point toward the Ka’ba, they are sharply turned around to conform with custom. There were other pleasures. One of the greatest was repairing to the outdoor, half-picnic, half-tea or coffee house sites out of town. Rutter describes one in a ravine at the southeast edge of Adiyād where a small stream of clear water often flows. Many groups would go there with samovars and waterpipes (dhibās). At sunset, after performing ablutions in the stream, all would pray. There was a singer, some of whose lays were religious, others, amorous. Along with these latter went clapping and dancing. In the Ahl al-Ṣahābiyya, male and female may have been served and pederasty practiced. Incidentally, he comments that King al-Husayn had already stopped the open drinking and prostitution of Ottoman times. Rutter also provides (291-4) an interesting account of a visit to the oasis and farms of al-Husayniyya about 20 km southeast of the city (and see Nallino’s reference (202) to similar visits to al-Santūsyya, 20 km northeast of the capital). He also paints a picture of how Makkans spend a week or two on the upland (2,000 m) plain of al-Hada overlooking the escarpment to the west of al-Ta‘if. The largest house there belonged to the Ka’ba key-keeper, al-Shaybī. Religious occasions also formed part of the rhythm of participation in the life of the city. Twice yearly in Rājāb and Dhul-‘Ka‘da there occurs the ritual of washing the Ka’ba and washing the qur’ān, which was also performed on special occasions to constitute major festivals. All the important people and important visiting pilgrims attend and a big crowd gathers. Al-Shaybī provides the water in a large bottle and brooms which the dignitaries use for the purpose. There are some distinctly un-Islamic folk practices, such as people washing themselves in the used washing water and actually also drinking it. During Ramadān, there is much recitation of the Kur’ān. One hears it as one walks down the street. Purely secular “clubs” also existed in the form of coffee houses which provided tea, light food and dhibās. One of their characteristics is the high (about 1 m) wood-framed platforms about two m. long with rush-work surface. Characteristically, the mat work is done by Sudanese. These high mats are used as chairs, on which three or four can sit, or used as beds. The cafés have linen available if the latter use is required. These establishments are open day and night. Al-Kurdi indicates that there were two Ottoman-era hamāmāns [q.v.], but that the first, which had been near Bāb al-Umar, was torn down to make way for the mosque expansion and the second, in al-Kašshiyya quarter, was closed—a victim no doubt of private residential bathrooms and showers. Finally, some mention must be made of slaves. King ‘Abd al-‘Azīz had agreed as early as 1345/1927 to cooperate with the British government in suppressing the international slave trade, but slavery as such
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was not outlawed in Su c udl Arabia until 1382/1962.
In 1365/1946 Hafiz Wahba described it (Djazira, 32-3)
as a reasonably flourishing institution. Makka was the
largest slave market in Arabia—possibly because it
was secure from prying non-Muslim eyes. Meccans
trained male slaves (sing. cabd) and female slaves
(sing, d^driyd] well for household duties, and Wahba
quotes prices as being £60 for a male and £120 for a
female. Ethiopians were considered the best because
they were more loyal and more sincere in their work.
He indicates that they worked mostly in domestic
chores or in gardens, but that Bedouin chiefs also acquired them as bodyguards. Djariyas he notes were
also used for other things. Manumission is an act of
piety, and Shaykh Hafiz says that hardly a master
died who did not free some of his slaves and leave
them a legacy. Apparently non-slave servants were
very difficult to find, and Shaykh Hafiz opined that a
sudden prohibition of slavery would cause a revolution. He also notes that the trade was declining.
The coming of the Suc udl regime also had an important impact on the top of the social structure in
that the privileged position formerly held by the shartfs
was eliminated. Merchants, ulema and mutawwifun
stood high on the local social scale, with pride of place
perhaps going to the Shayba family.
Because of the cosmopolitan nature of the population, city quarters seem not to have had quite the
same degree of near water-tight ethnic or religious
compactness that is found in some other cities, but
quarters did and do exist. Some generalised comments applying mostly to the pre-oil period follow.
Djarwal, an extensive mixed area northwest of the
Haram, was the site of many offices and the garages of
motor transport companies. It is also the quarter in
which Philby lived, the quarter where c Abd Allah Al
Sulayman, the Minister of Finance under King cAbd
al- c Aziz, had his palace, and the quarter in which immigrants from west and central Africa used to live—
mostly in hovels. Writing in the early 1960s, al-Kurdl
indicates (ii, 264) that the Djarwal and al-Misfala
quarters had heavy concentrations of bidonvilles inhabited by poor Sudanese and Pakistanis. Their shanty dwellings were, however, being replaced by
modern buildings. Al-Shubayka, to the west and a little south of the Haram, was, pre-World War II, mainly populated by Central Asian, Indian and East
Indian mutawwifun. Adjyad, southeast of the Haram,
was the old Ottoman quarter sometimes called
"government quarter." It continued in Su c udi times
to contain a number of important institutions, including the first modern hospital, the Egyptian takiyya,
the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Ministry of
Finance, the public security office, al-Ma^had al-^Ilmi
al-Sucudi, the Kiswat al-Kacba factory), the Egyptian
Bank and the Directorate of Education. Adjyad is
dominated by an imposing looking Ottoman fort,
Kalcat Adjyad, which is perched on the heights to the
south of it. The quarter is said to have the best climate
and the best views in the city. It was also the location
of most of the better older houses and hotels. Pre-oil
city quarters numbered 15 in all, as follows: Suk alLayl, Shicb CA1T, Shi c b c Amir, al-Sulaymaniyya, alMu c abada, Djarwal, al-Naka, al-Falk, al-Karara, alShamiyya, Adjyad, al-Kashashiyya, al-Shubayka,
Harat al-Bab and al-Misfala. There are also eleven
modern outlying quarters: al- c Utaybiyya, alHindawiyya, al- c Aziziyya (earlier known as Hawd alBakar), al-Shishsha, al-Rawda, al-Khanisa, al-Zahir,
al-Tanbudawi, al-Rasifa, al-Mish c aliyya and alNuzha. Some of these are dubbed hayy\ others, hdra;
and the last three mahalla. Each quarter has an cumda
as its administrative head.
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The importance and centrality of the Haram dictated that areas immediately adjacent to it were of
high importance and prestige, at least as long as the
pilgrim business was the main source of revenue.
Thus before the extension of the mosque, there were
a number of suks which surrounded it or nearly so.
These included al-Suwayka just north of the northern
corner which was the drapery and perfume bazaar;
Suk al-cAb!d the slave market; al-Suk al-Saghlr ca.
100 m southeast of Bab Ibrahim, which was in the
main water course and often washed out in floods;
Suk al-Habb the grain market some 700 m north of
the mosque; and finally the fruit market, also to the
north, which was simply called al-Halaka, the market.
Al-Masc a formerly was paved and covered during the
early days of cAbd al-cAz!z' reign, but it was still a
public street with book and stationery stores at the
southern (al-Safa) end and stalls selling items for
pilgrims along the rest of it. Another transient
demographic feature that may be noticed is that in
pre-oil days, the camps used by pilgrims were on the
outskirts of the city nearest the direction from which
they came, i.e., those coming from Syria camped
north of the city, etc.
With the broader economic and transportation
possibilities available since World War II (and
especially after the oil price increases of 1973 and
beyond) and with the number of pilgrims swelling to
almost two million (with attendant traffic and other
problems), centre city has probably become less
desirable.
The p h y s i c a l C i t y . Constrained as it is by the
wadi courses and low mountains of its location, the
size and physical appearance of Makka has changed
dramatically in the six decades since the Wahhabis
most recently captured it. It should be borne in mind
that the Haram is in the widest part of the central,
south-flowing wadi and that main streets follow wadi
valleys. Before the most recent enormous enlargement
of the mosque structure, a noticeable feature was what
Philby called "oratory houses." These surrounded
the entire periphery and abutted on the mosque itself.
They had first floor balconies on the roof of the mosque's surrounding colonnade and were more or less
considered an integral part of the mosque. Since the
inhabitants of these houses could pray at home while
observing the Prophet's injuction that whoever lives
near the mosque should pray in it, they were in high
demand at high rentals. On the other hand, the
residents were said to have run up rather large
hospitality bills! In the pre-oil era, Makkan buildings
were mostly built of local dark grey granite, but by
and large they gave no great impression of grandeur.
The larger ran to about four storeys. Even before
modernisation, major streets in Makka were fairly
wide. King al-Husayn had electrified the Haram during his brief reign, but probably it was not until after
the second World War that streets were lighted electrically. Previously they were lighted, on special occasions only, by oil lamps attached to the corners of
houses. Al-Husayn's palace had been located northeast of the Haram in al-Ghazza, but when King cAbd
al-cAz!z built his own palace, he chose a site well to the
north in al-Mu c abada, where incidentally, the pre-oil
wireless station was also built in the immediate vicinity of the king's palace. At the present time
(1405/1985) this tradition continues, for the amlrate,
the municipality secretariat, its technical units and the
main courthouse are all located at that site. Expansion
of the city in the period before there were adequate
roads tended to be along the Djudda road.
Modernisation in the oil era has brought completely
different architectural approaches and materials, and
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Fig. 1. Makka in the 1980s: built-up areas. After Fārisī.

much of the old has been swept away. Air conditioners are everywhere, cement and reinforced concrete reign, and buildings of up to 13 or more storeys high are everywhere visible. City planning in Suʿūdī Arabia has become pervasive, and the master plan studies and designs for Makka were projected to be ready for implementation in 1976. Given the pilgrimage, traffic circulation had to be a major part of the plan. Key features of the traffic plan were: a series of broad open plazas around the Haram, a major north-south road which essentially followed the main wadi bottom, a set of four concentric ring roads (none of which had been completed by 1402-3/1982-3), and a remarkable complex of roads leading to Muna, Muzdalifa, and ʿArafat. Especially to be noted is the extensive tunnelling under Makka’s rocky crags for a number of these roads, not excluding a major "pedestrian way" for pilgrims which goes due east from al-Safā before bending southwest toward ʿArafat. About one kilometer of the "pedestrian way" is a tunnel (Nafak al-Sadd) under Djabal Abi Kubays, the north-south running mountain east of the Haram. In addition to the roads themselves—all built to international standards with clover-leaf intersections, overpasses and the like—there are vast systematic parking areas, helicopter pads and other facilities. Makka may have some areas left without modern amenities such as running water and electricity, but essentially it is a modern city with all the assets and problems that modern implies. The growth in the area of the built-up section of Makka can only be roughly estimated, but according to Rutter’s map (facing p. 117), the maximum length of the built-up section on the north-south axis was about 3 km; on the east-west axis it was about 2¾ km. Fārisī’s map (1402-3/1982-3) indicates a north-south axis of about 8 km and an east-west of just under 5½ km. This massive growth does not include very extensive new built up areas such as al-Faysaliyya and al-ʿAziziyya—the latter reaching all the way to Muzdalifa.

Economy. The economy of Makka consists of only two basic factors, commerce and industry concerned with the local market, and the pilgrimage. Agriculture is essentially non-existent in Makka. Food was imported: fruit from al-Ṭaʾif, vegetables largely from the Wādi Fāṣima and a few other oases.
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such as al-Husaynīya. They included egg plant, radishes, tomatoes, vegetable marrows, spinach, Egyptian clover (bisrat) for fodder and hibiscus. Makka itself had to content itself with a few date trees (birsim) for fodder and hibiscus.

The importance of the Ḥudūdī for the economy of Makka through most of the city’s history is simple. As Rutter has put it, “[Makkans] have no means of earning a living but by serving the hajjis.” Fifty years later, D. Long confirms that “the Hajj constitutes the largest single period of commercial activity during the year,” and that no one in the country is unaffected thereby. Indeed, once al-Hijāz had been conquered, Ḥudūdī income was supposed to finance Najdī in addition to the Holy Land. The money came in different ways. A direct tax, instituted by Ḥāfīz Aḥmad Aḥmad between 1345-6/1927, was seven gold rupees ($16.80). In addition there was a kind of service charge embodied “landing and service fee,” which amounted to $1.5 ($7.20) in the early thirties. As late as 1972, this charge, now called “fee for general services” was SR 63 ($11.88). There were also taxes on external motor transport, for example SR 7.5 (36.00) on the round trip car hire fare between Makka and al-Madina in the 1920s, reduced to SR 6.00 (28.00) in 1951. In addition to direct levies, the government received indirect income from licence fees charged those who served the pilgrims, from customs duties on goods imported for re-sale to pilgrims and from other indirect levies. As D. Long (much followed in this section) has noted, when the world-wide depression struck, King Ḥāfīz Aḥmad al-Azīz, despite his successful efforts to eliminate gross exploitation of the pilgrims, was forced to impose fees on the pilgrims in order to maintain the solvency of the government. Later, oil income essentially eliminated government dependence on pilgrim fees, and in 1371/1952 the king abolished the head tax altogether. That the government continued to be sensitive to the public relation aspects of any fees at all, is made clear by the official Ḥudūdī instructions for 1972 (quoted by Long) to the effect that such charges only cover the actual costs of necessary services. For Makka, the Ḥudūdī has of course continued to be a major source of cash income. On the other hand, from a national Su‘ūdī viewpoint, servicing the pilgrims became a major expenditure category far exceeding
the income generated, though one should note that in recent years the national airline, Saudia, derived some 12% of its revenue from Hadjī-generated customers. D. Long has also made detailed estimates (101-5) of the effect of the Hadjī on the private sector in Džudda, al-Madīna and especially Makka. Roughly, he estimates that in 1972 pilgrims paid the guilds (mustaṣṣawウィnīn, wukalad′ and zamāzīma) a total of $7.9 million in fees, a figure which excludes gratuities. Lodging during the late 1960s cost each pilgrim an average of $60, for a total housing income of $40 million. The transportation syndicate’s income based on fares paid by land and air pilgrims for internal transportation is estimated at $11 million. All these estimates are for gross income. Net income is difficult to calculate, especially because fixed costs of capital items, such as accommodation at Mūnā and ʿArafāt which is only filled for a few days a year, are normally not counted. Makkān merchants continue to see the two months of pilgrimage business as more or less their whole year’s business, and as in the case of holiday expenditures in other countries the merchants raise their prices, despite government attempts to protect the pilgrims. Animals for ritual slaughter approximately double in value. The foreign provenance of pilgrim-specific goods continued in later years. Cheap ($1 to $10 each), European-manufactured prayer rugs sell a million or more each year, but it may be noted that in the 1970s prayer beads were manufactured by a local Makkān plastics factory. In more general categories, Swiss and Japanese watches move briskly; most textiles still come from Asia, though expensive ones may be from Europe; United States products predominate among cosmetics, better quality canned foods and drugs; wheat is almost exclusively American; whilst China has predominated in cheap fountain pens, parasols and cheaper canned goods. One final point is that many non-Suʿūdī pilgrims who can afford them purchase luxury consumer items which are either heavily taxed or unavailable in their own countries. Foreign exchange trading also constitutes a brisk business for the Makkān banks—all nationalised by about 1400/1979-80. Long notices another economic factor, that more and more foreign pilgrims have come in the sixties, seventies and early eighties, but the shift in mode of travel has been equally dramatic as the chart below shows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Mode of Travel</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1381/1961</td>
<td>Land 32%  Sea 43%  Air 25%</td>
<td>216,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1391/1971</td>
<td>30  20  50</td>
<td>479,339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1403/1982</td>
<td>22  6  72</td>
<td>1,003,911</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The dramatic increase in numbers and equally dramatic shift to air travel have meant that the average length of stay has decreased from two to three, or even more, months to an average stay of only a few weeks. Purchases of food and rentals for lodging have declined proportionately with the decrease in time, and in addition, because of baggage limitations on air travel, gift items have tended toward the watch and away from bulky items. Sales to pilgrims as a proportion of total sales by Meccan merchants have also declined. Long (based on Džudda information) estimates that the decline from 35% in 1381/1961 to about 25% in 1391/1971—still highly significant. Based on an estimate of per capita expenditures of ca. $230, Long estimates that gross sales by Suʿūdī merchants to foreign pilgrims aggregated $35 million from the Hadjī. If one adds Suʿūdī pilgrims, the figure rises to $90 million. His estimate of Hadjī income from all sources for the 1391/1971 Hadjī was ca. $213 million. It is not easy to know the proportion of this total which went to Makka and Makkans, but the number has to be quite significant locally when one considers the size of the city and the concentrated nature of the business.
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the roofs of the Makām Ibrāhīm and of al-Makām al-Hanafi. The Zamzam building was much beautified, the stoners of the Ka'ba were pointed, and Bāb Ibrāhīm was widened and beautified. Moreover, determined to do something to protect worshippers from the fierce sun, 4Abd al-'Azīz, for the 1346 Hādji, ordered 4Abd Allāh Al Sulaymān to erect all around the inside of the cloister a massive wooden frame to which heavy canvas was fixed as an awning. Once the pilgrims had left, this canopy was removed. But apparently there were some serious structural problems, for in 1354/1935-6 a more general study was undertaken. The order for this created a special four-man committee (4Abd Allāh b. 4Abd al-Kadr al-Shaybi of the Madīlis al-Shirā, chairman, Sulaymān Azhar, Assistant Director of awkāf; Hāghim b. Sulaymān, Administrator of the Haram (nāb al-Haram); and 4Alli Multi of the Makka municipality). Its mission was to carry out a general survey and then make recommendations for repairs and restoration. The committee recommendations (details in Bāsālāmā, 285) included such things as disassembling walls and rebuilding them, using cement for mortar. Costs for this work, which began in Ramadān, were split between the Directorate of awkāf and King 4Abd al-'Azīz.

The electrification of the mosque had been instituted under the Hāghimite al-Husayn, but was steadily improved under 4Abd al-'Azīz with generous outside support. In 1346/1927-8 Hādji 4Dāwūd Atba (?) of Rangoon donated a 300 kilowatt generator, and as a result the king was able to increase the number of bulbs from al-Husayn's 300 to 1,000. In 1349/1930-1 new generating equipment was acquired so that "a reader could read his book by electric lights anywhere in the mosque" (Bāsālāmā, 257). In addition, large free-standing, brass electric candelabra mounted on reinforced concrete columns 3 m high were placed in the mosque and six other brass candelabra were mounted on al-Hutaym, the semi-circular wall enclosing the Ḥadjar Ismā'īl. An even larger contribution was made in 1353/1934-5 by Qaṣīm Nawāb Bahādur Dr. al-Hādji Sir Muḥammad Muzammil Allah Khan (1865-1938) of Bhikhupur, India, who presented much more elaborate equipment to the mosque. It consisted of a 52 h.p. engine, a 220 volt, 34 kilowatt generator and required that the mosque engineer (Ismā'īl al-Dḥāhib) go to India in order to familiarise himself with it. He stayed there several months and, interestingly, returned with additional contributions in kind (elaborate candelabra put on the gates, on the makdms, and on the Zamzam dome) from Muslim philanthropists in Čawnpore, Lucknow and Karachi. Toward the end of 1354/1935-6, all was in working order and "the Maṭīf was as though in sunlight." Microphones and loudspeakers were first used in the mosque in 1366/1948-9.

Attention should now be turned to several specific features of the mosque area.

Al-Masā⃣. — Firstly, it may be noted that the Hāghimite al-Husayn was the first person in Islamic history to improve physically the running place, in effect a street at that time, between al-Safā and al-Marwa when in 1339/1920-1 he ordered 4Abd al-Wahhāb al-Kazzāz to erect a cover over it. A steel structure with wooden roof was built to the general benefit of all. This continued in use for many years, with some later improvements made by the municipality (then directed by 4Abdāb b. Kattān) at the order of King 4Abd al-'Azīz. The king also undertook another major improvement early in his reign (1345/1926-7) when he ordered al-Masā⃣, which was rough

Fig. 4. Plan of the Haram in late Ottoman, Hāghimite and early Suqūṭī times. After Snouck Hurgronje, Rutter and Western Arabia and the Red Sea.


Fig. 5. Boundary of the Haram area. After Bünck and Maps of hajj.
ground, to be paved. To oversee the work, a high-
level unit was constituted within the administration of the Aminat al-'Aqsa, that is, the municipality. It was presided over by Abdul Wah-
hab b. Ahmad, the Naib al-Haram, and included his former assistant Muhammad Surur al-Sabbân, later Director (Minister) of Finance, along with the ubiqui-
tous ʿAbd Allâh Al Sulaymân (as the king’s representative), several members of the Maqâlis al-
Shârâ‘ and some technical people. The decision was reached to use square granite stones mortared with lime. Initial expenses were to be covered by the Aminat al-‘Aqsa and subsequent ones from the na-
tional treasury (bayt al-mâl). Once protruding living rock had been levelled, the work began ceremonially with a large gathering that saw H. R. H. Prince Faysal b. ʿAbd al-‘Azîz lay the “corner stone” and heard invocations from the khâtib of the mosque. This enterprise, completed before the Hajj of 1345, resulted in the first paved street in the history of the city.

Zâmâm. — In the early repairs carried out under the Dihlawî’s direction, the king paid special attention to the well of Zamam and the two-chambered building above it. Two new sabîlts [q.v.] were con-
structed, one of six taps near Bûb Kubbât Zamâm, the other of three near the Hajrât al-Aghâwar, in ad-
dition, the older Ottoman sabîl was renovated. All this was supervised by a local architect with fine calligraphic inscriptions including the phrase “Imâm [sic] ʿAbd al-‘Azîz b. ʿAbd al-Rahmân al-Suîd [sic] built this sabîl.”

Khiswa. — With the outbreak of World War I, the kiswa came as it had for many years previously from Egypt. When the Ottoman Empire entered the war on the side of Germany, the authorities in Makka as-
sumed that British-controlled Egypt would no longer send the kiswa and so they ordered one to be made in Istanbul. It was a particularly fine one and was dispatch-
ated by train to al-Madîna, thence to be taken to Makka. In the event, the Egyptian government did send the kiswa, bearing the embroidered name of Hus-
sayn Kâmil, sultan of Egypt as well as that of Sultan Muhammad Râshîd. The Istanbul-manufactured kiswa remained in al-Madîna, and the Cairo-manufactured one (with the Egyptian guard, the wheat ra-
tion, medical mission, zama (traditional funds for-
warded from Egypt), alms, oblivion and kiswa back from Makka to Djudda. With only a very short time left before the hajj, al-Husayn cabled to the amîr of al-
Madîna immediately to forward the Ottoman kiswa stored there to Râbîg (q.v.). Simultaneously, he dispatched the steamship Rashîd to proceed from Djudda to Râbîg. All worked well, and the Ottoman kiswa reached Makka in time to be “dressed” on the Ka‘ba by the deadline date of 10 Dhu ’l-Hijja. Subsequently, al-Husayn ordered a kiswa woven in al-‘Trak, lest the dispute with Egypt not be settled by the 1342/1923 hajj; however, in that year the Egyp-
tian kiswa arrived and was used as usual. When the hajj of 1343/1924 approached, ʿAbd al-‘Azîz ruled Makka, and relations with Egypt had become so bad that Egypt did not send the kiswa. Luckily, the king had a fall-back position, namely, the kiswa that King Azîz b. Muhammad b. Ahmad, this time to have sent the kiswa bearing the embroidered name of Hu-
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happen came on 5 Muḥarram 1375/24 August 1955 when it was announced that all the equipment and machinery which had been used on the now completed enlargement in al-Madinah would be moved to Makka. A month later (6 Safar/24 September) a royal decree established: (1) a Higher Committee chaired by Fāysal b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz, the heir designate, to supervise the planning; (2) an executive committee to supervise implementation; and (3) a committee to assess values of expropriated property. Later, the first two were merged into a higher executive committee with King Suʿūd b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz as chairman and the minister of finance as vice chairman. The basic concept of the final design was little short of inspired, and may be considered an extension of the design concept developed for the enlargement of the mosque in al-Madinah. It consisted of two ideas: (1) to maintain the old mosque intact and surround it by the new construction; and (2) to incorporate al-Masāʾa fully into the mosque complex.

Work began in Rabīʿ I 1375/November 1955 with road diversions, cutting of cables and pipes, land clearing and other diversionary work, and was concentrated in the Adhāyād and al-Masāʾa areas. A foundation-stone ceremony was held five- and-a-half months later in front of Bāb Umm Hānī with the king and several dignitaries in attendance, and this marked the beginning of construction. Incidentally, by ḥadīth time, pilgrims were able to perform the sawʿy undisturbed by hawkers and traffic for the very first time. Work concentrated in Stage I on the southeastern side of the mosque and also on the al-Masāʾa "thumb." This latter, completed, is 394.5 m long. The ground floor is 12 m high and the second story, 6 m. The road that now passes by the mosque, with a special lane for the handicapped and ensures one-way traffic in each direction. There is no basement under al-Masāʾa, but a full one under the rest of the new construction. A particular problem was the floods which sweep south down the wadi systems, around both sides of the mosque (but especially on the east).

To deal with this problem an underground conduit 5 m wide and 4.6 m deep was run under the road now known as Shāriʿ al-Masqūd al-Harām (formerly Shāriʿ al-Mašāl) starting in al-Kaḥāshāyya quarter then under the area of al-Safā, and under Shāriʿ al-Hīḏrā where, well south of the mosque, it resurfaces in the Misfala quarter. Among the buildings removed in this phase of the work were those of the old general post, the Ministry of Education and the Egyptian takṣija; in addition, there was some other non-mosque construction carried out as a part of the whole project, including a three-story building near al-Safā to house government offices and the mosque-project offices and just northwest of al-Marwa a group of buildings with office and apartments on the upper floors. In Stage II, work continued in a counter-clockwise direction. Special note may be made of the demolition of the cells along the Bāb al-Salām and Bāb Adhāyād façades, where the zamāzima used to store water for pilgrims, and the construction of replacement cells under the old ones. Not as lucky were the madrasas adjoining the mosque on the Adhāyād façade; they were simply demolished. Public fountains were also built on the new exterior façades as the work progressed. In Stage III, the southwest and northwest arcades and façades were built. The work was completed in 1398/1978.

All walls of the new construction are covered with local marble. The marble came from quarries in Wādī Fāṭima, Madrakā and Farsān. The quarries were developed by Muhammad b. Lādūn, who had also started a marble dressing factory in 1950 in preparation for the enlargement of the mosque in al-Madinah. He identified the quarries by asking local Bedouin to bring him samples and then by purchasing the most promising land from the government. The equipment in the factory was all Italian, and a force of nine Italian marble specialists directed and trained a total work force of 294 Suʿūdīs and others on a three-shift, round-the-clock basis. According to the Italian technicians, the marble is much harder than the famous Italian Carrara marble. Another feature of the marble operations was the production of "artificial marble." Remnant pieces and chips of marble from the main operation were sent to a crushing plant in Dūddā, where they were ground into carefully graded pellets. To these were added waste from the cutting operations. This material was then mixed with a binding agent and poured into a variety of moulds of decorative panels. There were 800 different moulds "the patterns for which were created by a master of the art from Carrara." The mosque project as a whole called for processing 250,000 m² of marble.

Some over-all statistics and other information on the new structure follow:

1. Areas of old building

| Area of new building, including al-Masāʾa | 131,041 m² |
| Total | 160,168 m² |

2. The building can accommodate an estimated 300,000 worshippers with a clear view of the Kaʿba.

3. The old gate names were retained for the new gates except for the new Bāb al-Malik Suʿūd (probably subsequently renamed Bāb al-Malik).

4. There are six main stairways and seven subsidiary ones. Stairs leading directly form the street have gentle slopes in order to make it easier for elderly pilgrims.

5. There are seven minarets, 90 m high each. (The old minarets are one feature that did not survive; they also numbered seven.)

6. By Radjab 182/December 1962, demolition of 768 houses and 928 stores and shops had been carried out against indemnities of SR 239,615,300.

7. The work force in 1382/1962 was:

- 6 architect-engineers
- 208 administrative employees
- 150 skilled workers
- 50 unskilled workers (maximum) 3,000

8. The total cost of the mosque expansion is estimated at $155 million.

9. The width of the streets around the new mosque is 30 m, with large plazas in front of the main gates. There is one final aspect of the mosque enlargement and renovation that deserves mention, sc. Zamzām. In 1383/1963-4, the building that had long covered it was torn down and the space was levelled. Access to the well is now below ground down an ample sloping marble staircase; there is no above-ground structure whatsoever.

Like other shrines, al-Masqūd al-Harām has its servants and its administration. In late Ottoman days the administration was headed by the wāli of Makka who was, therefore, the nominal šaykh al-Haram, and it depended financially on the naqib (wakil) in Istanbul. The operational head was the naqib al-Haram (deputy of the Haram) who was appointed by the sultan. The ʿAbāsimte contribution was to institute a special security force whose assignment was to watch out for thieves and corruption and also to provide needed ser-
vices such as "lost and found." Once he assumed power, King 'Abd al-'Aziz appointed the nā'th al-Haram, and he also established a three-man administrative council (Majlīs Idrās al-Haram al-Sharīf) over which the nā'th presided. Financially, since income ceased coming from many wakfs after the Su'ūdī takeover, King 'Abd al-'Aziz ordered the financing of all services to come from the public treasury. He also initially doubled the salaries of those who served. His own wakf department had support of the Haram building as one of its main charges. According to Rutter, below the nā'th came the "opener of God's House" (sādim), who, since pre-Islamic times had always been from the Shayba (nībha: Shaybī) family. Not the least of the perquisites of the sādim was the right to cut the kiswa up after the Ḥaḍḍ and to sell the small pieces to pilgrims as religious tokens. Incidentally, a member of the Banū Shayba could not become nā'th al-Haram. Below the "opener" were two or three lieutenants who supervised the numerous lesser personnages and the actual workers. All, according to Rutter, took special pride in this work. Rutter's estimate is that the total work force declined to 400 during the Wahhabi invasion but that in better times it rose to as many as 800. This latter figure or, colloquially, tawdshiya, (pi. agds) notes that the place was either Africans or of African origin and are teachers, 50 muezzins, plus hundreds of sweepers, laborers, providers of water and other needs, 30 drawers (zamazamī, pl. zamazamīn). The Majfī, the circular inner area around the Ka'ba, was in the care of 50 black eunuchs who also doubled as mosque police. They were either Africans or of African origin and are called aghs or, colloquially, twadhī (pl. twadhīyā, sc. eunuchs). Their chief ranked directly below the Shaybī. They wore distinctive clothes and were diligent in instantly removing any litter. The rationale or three lieutenants who supervised the numerous lieutenants for having eunuchs was that, if women became involved in any incident in the mosque or had to be ejected, the aghs could deal with them without impropriety. They apparently had large incomes (especially from awkfī in al-Basra) and maintained expensive establishments including "wives" and slave girls as well as slave boys. They all lived in al-Haqla where they could deal with them without impropriety. The middle-class Makkans also invariably rise when addressed by an Agha, and treat him in every way as a superior' (Rutter, 251). Others give a lower estimate for the numbers of mosque employees. Hamza (Bilād, 217) writing in 1355/1936-7 numbers as follows: meuezzins 14, eunuchs 41, supervisors 80, water drawers 10, sweepers 20 and doormen 30. His list does not include teachers or preachers. Al-Kurdi (iv, 249), writing in the 1960s, notes that there are 26 eunuchs including their shaybī and their nāfīb. He also notes that the aghs have their own internal organisation (nizām) and that amongst themselves they use special nicknames.

There are, naturally enough, numerous religious sites in Makka other than al-Masjid al-Haram. Brief remarks: 1. Mawlid al-Nabī (the Prophet's birth-place), located in the Shi'b 'Ali ravine near Sūk al-Layl. First the dome and minaret and later the whole structure were torn down by the Wuhḥābīs. The place is still pointed out. 2. Mawlid Sayyidatnā Fāṭima (the birthplace of our Lady Fāṭima). Same remarks. 3. Masjid al-Arkām b. al-Arkām. The home of a Companion of the Prophet and reputed site of 'Umar's ac-

ceptance of Islam. Destroyed during the recent expansion of al-Haram, its location is now a parking lot east of al-Mas'ā. 4. In Rutter's time the small mosques marking the houses of other Companions had mostly already been destroyed. 5. Cemetery of al-Mašā. It is located about 1 km due north of al-Haram. In it are buried Amina, the Prophet's mother; Khadhīja, his first wife; 'Abd Manāf, his great-great grandfather; 'Abd al-Muṭṭalib, his grandfather and guardian; and hosts of Muslims, famous and unknown, from the earliest days until the present. In the first flush of the occupation, Wuhḥābī zealots destroyed the small domes which covered some of the most famous sites, and those guardians who had sought alms from pious visitors were faced with other work. As in the case of al-Baḳī' cemetery in al-Madīna, bodies decompose quickly (six months) in al-Mašā, and there is 'continuous' burial in the same place. 6. Masjid al-Qīm (also called Masjid al-Bay'a' and Masjid al-Haras). It is on Sharī al-Haram next to al-Mašā cemetery and marks the reposed place (see Kur'ān, XLVI, 29) where a party of gīsīn, having heard the Prophet chanting the Kur'ān were converted to Islam. An older Ottoman building was replaced by a modern mosque in 1399/1978-9. 7. Ġhār Hīrā'. Site of the first revelation (XCIV, 1-3), the cave of Hīrā' is near the top of the mountain from which the Prophet received the first revelation. The mountain is more commonly called Djabal al-Nūr today. It lies about 5.2 km northeast of al-Haram al-Sharīf—a steep climb to the top. The Wuhḥābīs pulled down the dome which earlier had ornamented it. 8. Ġhār Thawar. Seven km south-southeast of al-Masjid al-Haram lies the cave on the top of Djabal Thawar in which the Prophet took refuge with Abū Bakr at the beginning of the hajj; a difficult ascent. al-Tānīm. Seven km north of al-Masjid al-Haram on Sharī al-Tānīm which turns into Tarīk al-Madīna. This is the limit of the sacred area in this direction, and it is the place where Makkans often go to don the ihram when they want to perform the 'umra. They go there not because it is necessary for them but because it is the place where the Prophet, returning from al-Madīna, and was a permanent picnic spot, al-Tānīm in the 1980s has become a suburban quarter. There is a small mosque called Masjidī al-Umra. 11. Masjidī al-Khayf. A mosque in Munā in which (at least formerly) were several large vaults which were opened for the reception of bodies in plague years. It is especially meritorious for prayer on the 11 th of Dāḥā and has been rebuilt and enlarged by the Su'ūdīs. The new mosque has many columns, splendid carpets and a permanent imām. 12. Masjidī Ibrāhīm or, more commonly today, Masjidī Bilāl. Formerly outside the city on the slope of Djabal 'Abī Kūbās 250 m due east of the Kāba; now a built-up area. 13. Masjidī al-Namira. Also known as Masjidī Ibrāhīm al-Khālīf and as Masjidī 'Arafa. It is located almost 2 km west of Djabal al-Raḥma in the plain of 'Arafa and takes its name from a low mountain about 2 km further west. 14. Al-Kurdi estimates (iv, 269) that in all there are 150 mosques in Makka, but he adds that Friday prayers are only allowed to be performed in 15 of them (not counting al-Haram) in 1375/1955-6. This relaxation of the traditional restriction on performing the Friday noon prayers only in al-Haram was in response to the growth of the city and the disruption of al-Masjid al-Haram by the new construction there. The 15 mosques (with their locations) are as follows: Masjidī (thereafter, M.) al-Qīm (al-Sulaymān)ī, M. al-Djumayya (al-Mu'ābāda), M. al-Amīra Hassa (al-Hudjīn), M. Hamdān al-Farāh (al-'Utaybiyya),
War II, during which the camel gave way to the motor vehicle; the increasing Su'di regulation of what D. Long has called the Hajdj service industry; and the Hajdj in the era of mass air transport.

1. The Hajdj in the era of camel and car. In general, what must be emphasised is that the security which the Su'udian brought to the Hajdj transformed the pilgrimage. No longer were pilgrims subjected to capricious "taxes" or thinly veiled threats of much worse were they passed through tribal areas. No longer was the exploitive tendencies of merchants, transporters, mutawweef and officials allowed to run unchecked and unheeded. The policy was to make the pilgrimage as dignified and comfortable a spiritual experience as possible. King 'Abd al-'Aziz turned his attention to the improvement of the lot of the pilgrims as he first entered Makka. It has been already noted that, when the king entered the city, his initial decree confirmed all mutawweefin "with a clear title" in their positions. The organic statute of 1345/1926 established a committee, Lajnat Idras al-Hadjdj (committee on administering the Hajdj), to assist the viceroy, Faysal b. 'Abd al-'Aziz, in supervising the pilgrimage. The committee was to include the heads of all government departments in charge of the pilgrimage, a number of qualified notables, which latter category was probably intended to include senior members of the mutawweef organisation. The committee was vested with investigatory powers, and all aspects of the pilgrimage were within its purview. But the king remained the final authority, as Article 16 makes clear: "All regulations made by the Pilgrimage Committee should be endorsed by the Agent-General [viceroy] after they have been sanctioned by His Majesty the King:" (quoted in Long, 55).

Philby reports (Pilgrim, 20 ff.) in some detail on the 1349/1931 pilgrimage. The king personally supervised matters like an officer in his command post. The royal party itself travelled in 300 automobiles, but it was not until 1352/1934 that ordinary citizens were allowed on as passengers to go to the Arafat. Houses in Minä were being rented for £40 for the four or five days of the Hajdj, but again note that they were used for only some of the 350 days of the lunar year. The government discouraged various extravagant practices and did not allow access to the summit of Djabal al-Rahama; guards were posted about half-way up. Exactly at sunset on 9 Dhu '1-Hijja, the return to Makka begins, and on arrival at Muzdalifah the worshippers find a city which had not been there when the pilgrims passed through on the previous day. The pilgrimage is attended by various kinds of difficulties, for the regime which is responsible, not excluding political difficulties. Philby notes (Jubilee, 160) that during the 1349/1931 Hajdj, the king felt it necessary discreetly to stop Amän Alläh Khan [q. v. in Suppl.], the former king of Afghanistan, from making political propaganda for his cause with Afghan pilgrims. 'Abd al-'Aziz's policy was that any Muslim was welcome, but that the occasion was for religious not political purposes. A different, attempted political use of the pilgrimage occurred during the 1353/1935. As the king and his eldest son Suûd were performing the taawil al-fidha (circumambulation of the Ka'ba) on 10 Dhu '1-Ka'da, three Yamanis, hopefully wanting to revenge themselves injured in the Su'udian-Yaman war the previous year, fell on King 'Abd al-'Aziz and on Suûd b. 'Abd al-'Aziz with daggers. Both received light wounds, but the assailants were shot dead.

The pilgrimage is also a socio-political affair, and
King 'Abd al-'Aziz and his successors have extended their hospitality generously and advantageously. 'Abbas Hamada, who was a delegate from al-Ahram and whose account of his pilgrimage in 1354/1936 contains many interesting observations, vividly retells his reception by the king. He and others were invited to a royal dinner on the night of 6 Dhu '1-Hijija. They gathered in front of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs to wait for cars to take them to al-Mu'abada palace. A little before sunset, the group left. Paraphrasing and skipping, his account reads (70-3):

"We were let off in front of a great palace built like a strong military fort outside Makka to the northeast in al-Mu'abada. Opposite the palace lies Djabal Durud, on the summit of which was a fort. When I entered the outside door, I found the royal guard on Durud, on the summit of which was a fort. When I entered the outer door, I found the royal guard on both sides armed to the teeth wearing splendid Arab dress. Most of them were slaves of the king. I walked until I entered a large reception hall furnished with splendid oriental carpets. When all the visitors had assembled, excellent Arabian coffee was passed around several times. During this stage, the chief of the diwan was going around and greeting people warmly. When the muezzin called out sunset prayer time, we hastened to the mosque inside the palace. After praying, we climbed to the upper floor where superb Arab food was spread out for the guests. It combined the best of Eastern and Western European. H. R. H. Prince Su'ud b. 'Abd al-'Aziz, the heir designate, sat at one table; Prince Faysal b. 'Abd al-'Aziz, at another; and the chief of the royal diwan at a third. After the meal, we went into an area reserved for receptions and then to the main royal reception hall where King 'Abd al-'Aziz ibn al-Su'ud was surrounded by ulema, princes, ministers and Eastern leaders who had come to Makka for the pilgrimage. When all had gathered, 'Abd al-'Aziz delivered an Islamic sermon. His talk reminded me of the Orthodox caliphs. When he finished, various speakers and poets rose to praise him. I got up and gave my speech [text, which is not without interest, at pp. 71-3]. We all left full of thanks, praise, and loyalty." 

Nor was that dinner the only time Hamada was entertained, for a week later he was invited to lunch at the royal palace. A little before sunset, the group left. (For the guild of adilâ, see art. AL-MADINA; for the now defunct guild of camel brokers, makharîdân, sing. makharidâ; "dispatcher"). The task of the makharidân is to assist the pilgrim while in Makka, by supplying his material needs and in performing the rites of the pilgrimage. In the year immediately following the Su'ud conquest, the makharidân functioned much as they had in previous times. They delegated many of their responsibilities to assistants, who were called sabT (boy) if apprentices and daT (guide; unrelated to the diwan of al-Madinah) if experienced. In Rutter's time was to keep a register of each pilgrim who died, along with a list of their attitudes. Malaysians, for example, like to be housed near the Masjid al-Haram and are willing to pay handsomely for the privilege. Thus a mutawwif with a house there will rent it to a mutawwif of Malaysians and put his own group in cheaper quarters. Rutter notes (149) that particular national groups have their own attitudes. The guild of adilâ, for example, like to be housed near the Masjid al-Haram and are willing to pay handsomely for the privilege. Thus a mutawwif with a house there will rent it to a mutawwif of Malaysians and put his own group in cheaper quarters. Rutter's own mutawwif was the model for this generalisation. Aside from his own living quarters, he had rented his house to a mutawwif of Malaysians for a three-month period for £30 per year. Incidentally, Rutter reports that in the previous year 1342/1924 his mutawwif had had 1,000 clients whereas in the starving year of 1343/1925 he had only one. Rutter gives the important part of the mutawwif's work was to keep a register of each pilgrim who died, along with a list of his or her effects. Twenty-seven of this mutawwif's 1,000 clients had died during the 1342/1924 pilgrimage. Most had been destitute or had possessed only a pound or two. The mutawwif were organised according to the areas from which their clients came, and frequently the mutawwif was originally from the same area. Thus he spoke the language and knew the characteristics of his customers who in turn would, if warranted, report favourably on him when they returned home.
formed sub-guilds (Long’s term, 30) which rigidly excluded other mutawwifun. These sub-guilds were called ʿaddaʿi (sing. ʿaddaʿa), and each was headed by a ʿadday al-mutawwifun. The title of the over-all guild leader was ʿadday al-mutawwifun. He both represented the guild to the authorities and also had the responsibility of seeing that government regulations were applied. The normal pool for admitting new members was those proven assistants who were members of the family of a mutawwif. ‘In cases of an interloper, however, the mutawwifun would rise to a man to prevent him from becoming established. The few outsiders who persisted were called jarrārī (those who drag [someone] along) and dealt primarily with Hājjīs too poor to hire the services of a bona fide mutawwif’ (Long, 30).

The final decision on admissibility lay with the ʿadday al-mutawwifun. Some mutawwifun were large operators, with recruiters who travelled annually to the country or countries of specialisation; others were much smaller. Long (31) estimates that in the mid-1930s, there may have been 500 mutawwifun who, with helpers and apprentices, would have totalled ‘several thousand.’ The mutawwifun were compensated for their work in a variety of ways, although it should be noted that in theory there was no charge for guiding the pilgrim in the actual performance of his duties. In fact, there were no set fees and the pilgrims were expected to pay a guiding agreement according to their means. Should a pilgrim be too poor to pay, a mutawwif would help him with the rites without pay; however, according to Rutter (446), ‘such an act is rarely done out of kindness. It is done in order to sustain the delusion that rites performed without the guidance of a mutawwif are valueless in the sight of Allah—for such is the impious connection advanced by the fraternity of guides for their own financial advantage.’ Yet such a flexible system doubtless cut both ways, especially for the apprentices and guides, and some at least worked hard for little. Additional sources of income were rentals, commissions for referring clients to various associated merchants, zamāzima, coffee shops, etc. It should also be realised that the government got a ‘cut’ of mutawwif income by issuing licenses (sing. takrir) to the mutawwifun. In theory, these licenses had issued good for life, but prior to the Suʿūdī take-over, revalidation fees of various sorts had caused the system to break down. The zamāzima are basically organised in the same way as the mutawwifun. Membership is hereditary, members employ young helpers, they have their own ʿadday, and they also specialise by the country or area of their clients’ origin. As indicated above, they normally have client-sharing relationships with the ʿaddaʿa of mutawwifun, specialising in the same linguistic or national group as themselves. Many are bi- or multilingual. The basic function of the zamāzima is to distribute the sacred water of Zamzam to those who desire it, whether in the mosque precincts or at home, where it was delivered twice a day to those who ordered it. Naturally, business was much greater during the Ḥaddīj. Selling water in containers to be taken home by a pilgrim was also a most important part of their business. Although in principle anyone could draw his own water, the practice was hardly encouraged by the zamāzima, and in addition, they performed a considerable service during the long hot periods by cooling the otherwise warm water in porous earthenware jars. The members of the guild of the ʿadday ʿInwakūlā of ʿAṣwad have formal relationships with the Makkan mutawwifun for whom they do it in fact work as agents.

Regulation of the guilds began shortly after the oc-
with a similar organisation. Hamza’s estimate then is for a total of 1,400 Makkan guildsmen, not counting
‘Arafat and Minā. For this purpose a second card is issued showing the site of his tent in ‘Arafat and
Minā. According to the regulation, “cards shall in-
clude the number of the plot, place, square, and street.” In
addition, the mutawwif must erect signs giving the
same information “so that the Hajjis may see clearly
their places in ‘Arafat and Minā” (Long, 41-2); and 5.
to assist the pilgrim in arranging his ongoing travel.
Three days before departing from Makka, the
pilgrim’s name “is submitted to the Hajj Ministry for
inclusion on a departure list and for checking reserva-
tions and tickets. Passports, tickets, and reservations
are then returned to the Hajji” (Long, 42). The zam-
zami had under the 1965 regulations two respon-
sibilities: 1. to supply pilgrims with Zamzam water
within al-Masāijd al-Ḥarmūn and twice a day in their
rooms; and 2. to help them during prayers, i.e.,
to supply water for ablutions. All guildsmen are respon-
sible for carrying out set procedures to help lost
pilgrims, to report suspected disease to health officials
and to deal with death. Finally, the government has
to regulate the quality of the guildsmen’s
helps. Long indicates (45-6) that the royal decree of
1965 “states that every employee must be of good
conduct, physically fit, of suitable age to perform his
required services, and competent and licensed for that
service. It further stipulates that: ‘The mutawwif...and
zamzami, for their part must take the necessary
steps to supervise the said persons during their work
and guarantee good performance. Each is to be sup-
plied with a card containing all the [required] infor-
mation including the name of his employer.’”

3. The Hadjij in the era of air travel. The pilgrimage
entered its latest phase in the wake of World War II
with the simultaneous appearance of air travel and of
air-conditioned hotels. The number of pilgrims who
were able to undertake the pilgrimage increased dra-
"atically. To meet the increased demand, the
Muslim government liberalised the fees and increased
income. The first pilgrimage flights were in chartered ex-military transports; in the
1980s, almost all pilgrims came by “wide-bodied”
jets, and the number have increased dramatically as
noted above. One might start this section on the post-
war period by reporting that the direct tax imposed by
the king in 1345/1927 was lifted in 1371/1952, by
which year oil income had exceeded Hadjij income.
The circumstances were as follows. ’Abd al-’Aziz, just
a year before his death, was heard to say: “The goal
of my life is to lift the Hadjij fees from the Muslims.”
One of his oldest advisors, Shaykh Yusuf Yasīn, who
was present, said: “The king almost immediately
turned to me and said, ‘Telegraph Ibn Sulaymān
[’Abd Allāh Al Sulaymān, Minister of Finance] to
abolish the pilgrims’ fees.’ So I wired him in the
king’s name as directed. He replied to the king, ‘O
Long of Life: Thirty million riyals—from what shall I
compensate them in the budget?’ ‘’Abd al-’Aziz
replied to him: ‘Dabbir nafsaka (“solve your own pro-
blems!”)’” The fees were abolished forthwith. (See
al-Zirikli, 1416.) Other positive moves followed. By
1376/1956-7, the Ministry of Health had built a large
modern hospital in Minā, including specialised sun-
stroke facilities, even though the town really existed
only a few days a year. Al-Kurdi describes (ii, 194) the
government’s provision of shaded rest areas and ice
water taps along the way between Minā and ‘Arafat
(in addition to the numerous coffee houses which
serve fruit and other food as well as drinks). There
were also important administrative changes. In
1383/1964 following Faysal’s accession to the
throne, direct supervision of the Hadjij was reli-
quished by the new king and devolved upon the amir
of Makka. For the pilgrimage of 1385/1966, the old
committee was superseded by a new Supreme Hadjij
Committee (Lagūnī al-Hadjij al-’Ulyā). “Chaired by
the amir, its members include the mayors of Jiddah and Makka; the senior representatives in the Hijaz; the representatives of the local police, customs, quarantine, and other offices" (Long, p. 56). All policy on the ever-more complicated Hajj operation was set, under the over-all supervision of the king, by this committee. Another new aspect of the Hajj is the growth of hotels. The city now boasts not less than 25 hotels, and several of them belong to major international chains; many meet international standards. To give a small insight into the way things have changed in the latest phase, it is enough to mention that at ʿArafat there are lost children's tents stocked with toys to divert them until their parents claim them. It is also pertinent to note that in 1974, the kiswa factory employed 80 craftsmen who wove 2,500 feet of material on hand looms. The finished cloth weighs about 5,000 lbs.

The annual traffic problem may be the most challenging in the world. An excellent picture is provided by the following extended quotation: "In order to get some idea of the magnitude of the traffic problem at ʿArafat during the nafrakh, one might picture about twelve [major] football games all getting out at the same time, with all the fans heading for the same place; only, in the case of the Hajj, there is a multitude of different languages, types of vehicles, and many foreign drivers not familiar with the road system. In order to cope with this situation, special cadres of traffic police are trained for the Hajj and are given extra assistance by the Saudi army. In recent years such modern devices as closed circuit television have also been installed to help guide the traffic flow. Moreover, Hajjis traveling overland are required to use designated routes on entering al-Madinah, Makka, Muzdalifah, and Minā; the vehicles must be parked in designated places until the Hajjis are scheduled to depart. While in these cities and at ʿArafat the Hajjis must utilize Saudi transportation (for which they have paid anyway).

Despite all these measures the traffic situation can still be quite hazardous. In 1968 a multimotor traffic jam developed during the nafrakh, and some Hajjis were delayed as much as twenty hours trying to get from ʿArafat to Muzdalifah. Making matters worse, an exceptionally large number of Saudis attended the Hajj because of the special religious significance of Standing Day falling on Friday and because of the extension of the highway system throughout the kingdom. Not subject to the parking regulations for non-Saudi Hajjis, many took their private autos to ʿArafat. In addition many Turkish buses, which had been allowed to drive to ʿArafat because they contained sleeping and eating facilities, broke down during the long tie-ups, further contributing to the traffic jam. Sixteen new, black-and-white-checked police cars especially marked for the purpose, were wrecked as they sought to cross lanes of moving or stalled traffic. In the post-Hajj evaluation by the Supreme Hajj Committee, traffic control was a major topic, and since then no such major tie-ups have been reported" (Long, 64). It is clear that, in totally changed circumstances, pilgrimage to the Bayt Allah in Makka is a continuing, vital process not only for Muslims around the world but most especially for Makka al-Mukarrama.

Education and cultural life. Formal education, traditional or modern, was little developed in Makka in late Ottoman and Ḥājjīmīme times. The first major attempt to improve the situation had been made by the distinguished public-spirited Djudda merchant, Muhammad ʿAlī Zaynayl Rūdā, who founded the Madrasat al-Falah in Makka in 1330/1911-12 as he had done at a school of the same name in Djudda in 1326/1908-9. He is reported to have spent $400,000 of his own money on these two schools before the world depression of 1929 forced him to curtail his support, at which point ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz assigned a share of the Djudda customs' duties to support the institutions. These two schools, the best in the land, had enormous influence through their graduates, even though they followed the archaic principles of excessive reliance on memorisation with little emphasis on independent thought. There were also in pre-Ḥājjīmīme days some Indian religious institutes, and of course, Islamic sciences were taught in al-Madrasa al-Rūyāa as well as agricultural and military schools. By the time of the Suʿūdī occupation, the city counted one public elementary (ibtidāʿī) and 5 public preparatory (taḥdirī) schools. Private schools in addition to al-Falah included 20 Kur̲ān schools (kutāb) and perhaps 5 other private schools. Rutter noted that a good deal of study went on among the pilgrims and opined that the Makkans were better educated than the contemporary Egyptians. Hamāda, writing a decade later, agrees about the first point, for he says that during his pilgrimage hundreds of pilgrims gathered nightly to hear the lesson given by the imām, Shaykh Muhammad ʿAbū Sabīḥ ʿAbd al-Ẓāhir. He taught tafsīr [q.v.] according to Ibn Kathīr [q.v.], but Hamāda complains that his lecture wandered, often to the question of intercession with God—a sensitive point for the Wahhābīs—and wishes that he would concentrate on subjects of more interest to his listeners. He also comments that the majority of the population were illiterate and opines that the highest diploma awarded by the Falāh school, the ṣimīyya, was equivalent to the ibtidāʿīyya of al-Azhar in Cairo.

In any case, King ʿĀbd al-ʿAzīz moved rapidly in the field of education as in other areas. In 1344-5/1926 he established al-Maʿād al-ʿImām al-Suʿūdī (Science Institute). In 1348-50 a modernist institute in mathematics, science and physical sciences, including language and linguistics, as also for social, natural and physical sciences as well as physical education. In 1356-7/1938, the Maʿād was divided into four departments, ʿaqrāʿa, calligraphy, teacher training, and secondary instruction. The faculty was largely Egyptian, and by 1935 was giving instruction in the English language. In addition, by that time the government had established other schools, the Khayrīyya, ʿAzīziyya, Suʿūdīyya and Faysālīyya, in addition to starting student missions abroad. These developments were praised by Hamāda. Another development in the growth of education in Makka was the establishment in 1352/1932 of the Dār al-Ḥadīth (the hadīth academy) by Imām Muhammad ʿAbū Sabīḥ ʿAbd al-Ẓāhir. Ḥadīth was the only subject taught, and that at a relatively low level. Based on Hamza's summary (220-2), Makka schools in about 1354/1935 were as shown in the table overleaf. Thus, based on a population of perhaps 80,000, there were some 5,000 students enrolled in schools. Many of the teachers were "foreigners," Egyptians, Southeast Asians, Muslims from British India and Central Asians, but then many in the population as a whole were people of non-Arabian origin. Students in many of these schools were received students based on the financial capability of the several schools.

Educational facilities continued to expand, especially after oil income began to flow on a significant scale...
after World War II. Secondary school education developed as follows. The first school to become a regular secondary school was the ‘Aziziyya, which had been upgraded to that status in 1355-6/1937. By 1363-4/1944, the number had grown to four with total enrollments of 368. Nine years later, there were 12 secondary schools with 1,617 students, and by 1381-2/1962 there were 18 with 2,770 pupils. The first institution of higher learning was established in 1370/1949-50, namely, the Kulliyat al-Shari‘a (shari‘a college), which subsequently became the Faculty of Shari‘a of King ‘Abd al-‘Aziz University, most faculties of which are in Djudda. According to Thomas’s survey (published 1968) the Faculty of Shari‘a was comprised of departments of Shari‘a; Arabic language and literature; and history and Islamic civilisation. The undergraduate programme lasts four years and grants a bachelor’s degree. Master’s degrees and doctorates are also granted. (For curricular details, see Thomas, 68-70.) A College of Education followed in 1370-1/1951. Its departments in the mid-60s were: education and psychology; geography; English; mathematics; and physics. It only granted the bachelor’s degree in the 1960s, but planned to develop masters’ and doctoral programs. (For curricular details, see Thomas, 74-7.) In 1981 the university faculties in Makka were constituted into a separate university called Djami‘at Umm al-Kura, which included four faculties; Shari‘a and Islamic studies; science; Arabic language; and education, to which last there was also attached a centre for the English language. In 1379-80/1960 another higher institution was created, the police academy, which required a secondary school certificate for admission. By 1386/1966-7 there was also in existence Ma‘had al-Nur (the Institute of Light), a school for the blind and deaf, which counted 87 students. It may also be noted that an intermediate vocational school teaching auto mechanics, shop, electronics, printing and book binding had opened.

An official survey of the academic year 1386-7/1966-7 (from Kingdom of Su‘üd’i Arabia, Ministry of Finance, passim) reveals the picture for institutions which are part of the Ministry of Education shown on the facing page. There is little information available on female education. According to Hamada, girls in the 1930s only attended kuttab‘s taught by fakhs and after the first few years had to continue study at home. He also comments on the generally low level of women’s knowledge and deprecates the use of female diviners (sing, ‘arrifa) for medical purposes. But Hamada also notes that even in his day, young men were seeking more educated wives, and he calls on the government to support female education and in particular to replace the fakhs with “enlightened” teachers. The chart above indicates that, although female education has expanded a great deal, it has continued to lag behind male.

In the 1970s and the 1980s, educational expansion has continued on a large scale. One estimate—possibly high—is that in 1402/1982 there were 15 secondary schools in Makka.

Educational administration of Makkan institutions followed general trends in the country. The Department of Education was established in 1344/1926 under the direction of Sālih Ṣafā‘a, and regulations for it were issued by the government of al-Hidżaz in Muḥarram 1346/July 1927. ‘Intā‘ ala‘, these gave the department its own policy board (ma‘dī‘īs). The budget was £5,665. In Muḥarram 1357/March 1938 a vice-regal decree (amr sdm) was issued which thoroughly reorganised the department now called Mudiriyat al-Mu‘ā rif al-‘Amma. All education except military fell under its aegis. Four departments were established: policy board, secretariat, inspectorate, and instruc-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>No. of teachers</th>
<th>No. of students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Ma‘had al-‘Ilmi al-Su‘üd‘i</td>
<td>elementary &amp; preparatory</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-‘Aziziyya</td>
<td>preparatory</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Rahmāniyya</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Su‘üd‘iyya</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Fayṣaliyya</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Muḥammadīyya</td>
<td>elementary</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Khālidiyya</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Night Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Department supervised orphanage</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sub-total</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>1,698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Falāh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Fakhrīyya</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Sawlatīyya</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Fā‘izīn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Māhī</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Tarakī al-‘Ilmi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-‘Uktmiyya al-Djāwīyya</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Indūnisiyyā</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dār al-Ḥadīth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 kuttab‘s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sub-total</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>No. of institutions</th>
<th>No. of Su'udî teachers</th>
<th>No. of non-Su'udî teachers</th>
<th>Total teachers</th>
<th>No. of students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>18,654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>2,768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate/secondary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher training institutes of elementary schools</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>343</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher training institutes for secondary schools in Makka</th>
<th>No. of students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commercial intermediate school</td>
<td>2,226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult education</td>
<td>16,87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute for blind</td>
<td>9,982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private schools</td>
<td>1,563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public girls schools</td>
<td>9,882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private girls schools</td>
<td>1,984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty of Shari'a</td>
<td>737</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 130 39,520

nctional office (details in Nallino, 44-7). These new regulations brought private education under full government control. They specified that the principal had to be a Su'udî citizen and that preference in hiring teachers should also go to citizens. Foreign nationals had to be approved by the Department of Education. In curricular terms, those private schools which received government support were required to teach Su'udî science to any one of the four recognisable madhdabs. In the religious institutions, kadim [e.g.] was forbidden and ijtihâd was limited to the Hanbali madhhab. Little budgetary information on the schools of Makka is available. Directors of the department were as follows: Sâlih Şläta, Muhammad Kâmil al-Kâşâb (of Damascus, who served only briefly), Mâjdâl al-Kurdi, Hâizr Wahba (in addition to his other duties; his deputy, who ran the department, was Ibrahim al-Shirî, a graduate of Dar al-Ulûm in Cairo), Muhammad Amîn Fûda (1424-1929/1289-9 to 1934-3), Tâhir al-Dabbagh (until 1378/1959), Muhammad b. 'Abd al-Azîz al-Mâini (of Nadjî origin). It may be mentioned that when independent, fully-formed ministries were established at the end of 1347/1927-8, the districts were divided into a Ministry of Education. Subsequently, the ministry was divided into a Ministry of Education (Wizârat al-Ma'ârif, under Dr. 'Abd al-Âzîz al-Khuwayjîr from approximately 1351/1931 to the present, 1405/1925) and a Ministry of Higher Education (Wizârat al-Talîm al-Mîslîli, under Shaykh Hasan b. 'Abd Allâh b. Hasan al-Shâykh from approximately 1975 to the present).

The most important library in Makka is the Haram Library (Maktabat al-Haram) as it became known in 1357/1938. The basis of the collection was 3,653 volumes donated by Sultan 'Abd al-Medjîd. These were placed under a dome behind the Zamzam building, but were badly damaged during the flood of 1278/1861-2. The sultan then ordered the construction of a madrasa/library next to the Egyptian takiyya (by the southern corner of the Haram), but died before its completion. In 1290/1871-2 the dome above Báb al-Durayba was used to house the remains of the damaged library. New accretions began; Shâfrî 'Abd al-Muttaib b. Ghalib (d. 1303/1886) donated waqf books, to which were added those of Shaykh Sâlih Ijîrdî, and still other volumes brought from different mosques and ribâts. In 1336/1917-8 another addition was made by waqf from Shaykh 'Abd al-Hakk al-Hindi. A more important accretion occurred in 1346/1927-8 under the new Su'udî régime when the 1,362-volume library of Muhammad Rûghûd Pasha al-Shirîwâni (d. 1292/1875-6), a former Ottoman waqf of al-Hijâz, was added to the growing collection. By 1380/1963 the collection was officially estimated as 200,000 volumes used in the course of the year by 100,000 readers. The main public library, founded in 1350/1931-2, contained 500,000 volumes and was used by 400,000 people per year. Other libraries include: 1. The Dhiblî library results from a combination of the library of Shaykh 'Abd al-Sattar al-Dhiblî (1286-1355/1868-70 to 1936-7) composed of 1714 volumes with that of Shaykh 'Abd al-Wahhâb al-Dhiblî which in fact had been collected by Shaykh 'Abd al-Djaïbûr (i?, the Dhiblî). It is said to have many choice items. 2. The Ma'djîdiyya library was assembled by Shaykh Muhammad Mâjid al-Kurdi, sometime director of the Department of Education, and consists of 7,000 volumes of rare printed works and manuscripts. Shaykh Mâjid not only acquired the books but systematically organised and indexed them. After al-Kurdi's death, 'Abd al-Kattân purchased the library from al-Kurdi's children and set it up in the building that he had built. Although al-Kattân died in 1370/1950, the library was moved to the building and was attached to the waqf libraries of the Ministry of Hajj and Awkâf. 3. Another library reputed to contain manuscripts and rare printed works is that of Shaykh Hasan b. 'Abd al-Shukûr, a "Javan" Shaykh. 4. Other libraries are those of 'Abd Allâh b. Muhammad Gâzi , al-Madrasa al-Sawlîtiyya, Madrasat al-Falâbû, Sulaymân b. 'Abd al-Rahîm al-Sânî (d. 1389/1969), Muhammad Ibrahim al-Qazzawî (brother of the poet laureate), Muhammad Surûr al-Sabbûn, al-'Amûdî, Ibrahim Fûda, Ahmad 'Abd al-Qâhirî Attar, and the late distinguished writer 'Abd al-Kudsiis al-Annâsî (Section on libraries basically from al-Ziriklî, iii, 1035-7.)

Presses and publishing in Makka have been rather restricted. The first press was brought to the city ca.
Newspapers and magazines published in Makka in modern times...
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one or two incidental aspects of cultural life in the city. Bookstores were formerly clustered around the Haram near its gates. When the enlargement of the mosque took place, they were forced to move and relocate in scattered directions. Of 12 listed by al-Kurdi (ii, 138, 148), four belonged to the Al Bāz and three to the Al Faddā families, but al-Kurdi reports that only two were sought by scholars and students. The first was Maktabat al-Haram al-Makki, which was, he opines, founded "a number of centuries ago" by an Ottoman sultan. Originally it was located facing Masjām "in a room above a small dome," but when the Ottoman mosque renovation (?) by Sultan ʿAbd al-Medjīd took place, it was relocated inside the mosque at Bāb al-Duraybah. When the Suʿūdi expansion took place, the store was once again moved to a special place near Bāb al-Salām. The second, Maktabat Makka al-Mukarrama, he describes as newly-established. Information on the time spent in remembering calligraphy is not commonly given. Muhammad Tāhir al-Kurdi, whose history has often been cited in this article, started the calligraphy for a Kurʾān in 1362/1943-4. He published it, as Masāf Makka al-Mukarrama in 1369/1949-50. Some mention should also be made of the wakf-established ṭabāt of Makka, best defined perhaps as hospices. Some were for students; others for the poor and the wayfarer. They were, according to al-Kurdi (ii, 149), "numerous," and not a few were for women. Established for the most part by wakfs, they usually provided students with single rooms. They were generally located adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of the Haram. Then the Suʿūdi régimes pulled everything down around the mosque to make way for the enlargement, the ṭabāt of course went. Some were paid compensation compensation compensation compensation and hence rebuilt elsewhere; others were not, and hence have disappeared forever. Al-Kurdi remembers six of the latter, and claims that none was less than 400 years old. (For details of the Italo-Muslim hospice in Makka, al-Ribdāt al-Qalāt al-Isldmi, see Nallino, 109-10.)

Makka has not failed to produce its share of modern writers, some of whom were primarily poets, others prose authors. Many had other work, often in publishing, journalism and printing. Many of the names that follow (based on Nallino, 132-7), who based his work in turn on ʿAbd al-Makṣūd and Balkhayr al-Wāḥy al-sahra* (b. Makka 1323/1905), have appeared earlier in this article: 1. Ahmad Ibrāhīm al-Ghazzawī (b. Makka 1318/1900-1). A poet, he studied at the al-Sawlatiyya and al-Falah schools and held public positions both under the Ḥākimī and the Suʿūdi régimes. A member of the Maqdis al-Shirāzī in 1936. Was designated "poet of the king" (gāʾir al-malik; poet laureate, in Philby's words) in 1932. (For a sample of his verse see al-Zirikli, ii, 675-6.) 2. Ahmad SībāʾI b. Makka 1323/1905-6). Traveled abroad and studied two years at the Coptic High School in Alexandria. On his return, he taught in schools and then became the director of the radio station in 1334/1915-6. His Taʾrīkh Makka ("History of Makka"), the most judicious, comprehensive history of the city, was first published in 1372/1953. The sixth edition appeared in 1404/1984, a year after he was judged first in the state prize of honour (gāʾir al-dawla al-takdīmī). 3. Amin b. ʿĀkīl (b. Makka 1329/1911). Amin studied at al-Falāḥ and then moved with his family to Mukalla in South Yemen, where he continued to study. He also was in Lahij for a year-and-a-half and then returned to Makka and completed his studies at al-Falāḥ. In 1351/1932, along with a group of Ḥājījīs, he was briefly exiled in al-Riyād on political grounds. His middle was prose. 4. Husayn Khaznadār (b. Makka 1317/1916-17). He studied at al-Ḥāshiyriyya school and finished his studies at al-Falāḥ: a poet. 5. Husayn Sarḥān (b. Makka 1334/1913-16). A member of al-Rūsān section of the ʿUṭayba tribe, he also studied at al-Falāḥ and was a poet. 6. Husayn Sarrābī (b. Makka 1330-1/1912-13). Primary studies at al-Falāḥ, secondary in Jordan, he received his B.A. from the American University of Beirut in 1936; a poet. 7. ʿAbd al-Wahhāb ʿAṣi (b. Makka 1323/1905). He studied at al-Falāḥ and then at al-ʿĀzīz. A poet and prose writer of some note, he was also editor-in-chief of Sawt al-Ḥājījīs. In 1932 he was imprisoned for political reasons and exiled in Najd for two months. On his return, he joined the Ministry of Finance and in time became head of the correspondence section. 8. ʿAbd Allāh ʿUmar Bālkhāyir (b. al-Ḥādrāmawt 1333/1914-15). He soon moved with his father to Makka, studied at al-Falāḥ and then at the American University of Beirut. Co-author of Wāḥy al-sahra* (with Muhammad Saʿīd [b. ʿAbd al-Makṣūd; Cairo, 1355[1936]-7), an anthology of prose and poetry by then living Ḥājījīs authors, this talented young man was diverted from writing into government service. He became the translator from English of world-wide radio reporting for King ʿAbd al-ʿĀzīz during World War II and rose to be Minister of Information under King ʿAbd al-ʿĀzīz. 9. ʿAbd al-ʿĀzīz. When the latter was deposed, Shaykh ʿAbd Allāh retired and in the 1980s has begun to write again. 9. ʿUmar ʿArab (b. Makka 1319/1901-2). Upon completing his studies, ʿArab taught in South Yemen and subsequently at al-Maʿḥād al-Suʿūdī al-Ḥilmi. Prose was his forte. 10. ʿAbd al-Salām ʿUmar (b. Makka 1327/1909-10) studied at al-Falāḥ and also taught there until he took a post with the Ministry of Finance in the correspondence department, to which a number of writers—given the very high levels of illiteracy in the country—gravitated. ʿAbd al-Salām wrote prose. 11. ʿUmar ʿArab (b. Makka 1318/1900). Having studied in a kutāb and then at al-Falāḥ, he taught at al-Falāḥ school in Djuḍda, became secretary of the municipal council of Makka, was then appointed to be Minister of Information under King ʿAbd al-ʿĀzīz during World War II and rose to be Minister of Information under King ʿAbd al-ʿĀzīz. 12. Muhammad b. Surūr al-Sabbān (b. al-Kunfudhā 1316/1899) moved with his family first to Djuḍda then to Makka, where he enrolled in al-Khayyāt school. At first he became a merchant and then, under the Ḥākimīs, accountant of the Makkan municipal government. He retained this post under the Suʿūdi régime. He was imprisoned on political grounds but released after the fall of Djuḍda to ʿAbd al-ʿĀzīz. Thereafter, he became assistant to the head (amin) of the municipality of Makka, but in 1346/1927 he was incarcerated in al-Riyād for more than a year. After his release, he became head of the correspondence department in the Ministry of Finance, of which he ultimately became the minister. He was the author of Adab al-Ḥājījīs (Cairo 1344/1925-6), an anthology of Ḥājījīs authors. 13. Muhammad Saʿīd al-ʿAmūdī (b. Makka 1323/1905-6), attended a kutāb and al-Falāḥ school. After a stint in commerce, he was employed by the ʿAyn Zubayda authority. After several other posts, he became head of the correspondence department of the Department of Posts and Telegrams. He was also editor of Sawt al-Ḥājījīs. Al-ʿAmūdī wrote both prose and poetry. 14. Muhammad Ḥasan Fākī (b. Makka 1316/1904) attended a kutāb and al-ʿĀzīz school in Djuḍda and that of Makka. He taught at the latter for three years, and he also became editor of Sawt al-Ḥājījīs. This poet and prose author was also chief of
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the contracts' department in the Ministry of Finance. 15. Muhammad Hasan Kutubi (b. Makka 1329/1911) studied at al-Falah and was a member of the mission that Muhammad 1Ali Zayn al-Rijđ sent at his own expense to Bombay, India, for the study of religious science. After receiving his diploma there, Kutubi returned and he also became director of Sawt al-Hidżāz. In addition, he taught courses for prospective kāfaṣ at al-Ma'had al-Imām al-Su'ūdī and later became director of public schools in al-Taif. 16. Muhammad Tāhir b. Abd al-Kādir b. Mahmūd al-Kurdi (b. Makka ca. 1323/1904-5). Al-Kurdi attended al-Falah Makka school, and after graduation entered al-Azhār in 1340/1921-2. That trip was the first of many to Egypt. He was a member of the executive committee on replacing the roof of the Ka’ba and on enlarging the Great Mosque. His works number more than 40, not all of which have been published. Among the published works are Makām 1Ibrāhim 1ayasy '1-Sulām (Cairo 1367/1947-8), Maṣāhif Makka al-Makāramā (1369/1949-50), Ta’rīkh al-Kurān wa-gharābī 'isma wa-hukmihi, al-Tafsir al-Makki, a book (title unknown) on calligraphy, and al-Ta’rīkh al-Kawim li-Makka wa-Bayt Allāh al-Kurīm, 4 vols. (Makka 1385/1965); a third volume is promised. His work is traditional in conception, but scrupulous and comprehensive.

Health care. Because of the Hajdj and its attendant problems, health facilities in Makka are of more than passing importance. In the late Ottoman and Hashimite periods, there were two "hospitals" one in Adjyad and the other in al-Madā’. They had about five doctors between them, and al-Kurdi reports (ii, 225) that the equipment was satisfactory. These doctors were all foreign—Indians, Indonesians, Algerians, etc. There was one non-profess pharmacy near al-Marwa and other shops which sold drugs on a casual basis. In a general way, observers noted that the combination of primitive sanitary facilities, low standards of personal hygiene and an oppressively hot climate were unhealthy, although Ruter said that vermin were almost non-existent as a result of the heat and summer dryness. Mosquitoes were apparently common enough but non-malaria bearing. Shortly after ‘Abd al-‘Aziz reached Makka, he deputed his personal physician, Dr. Mahmūd Hamdī Hamdūa, to re-establish the medical services, and among his first acts was the appointment of doctors to the Department of Health and the reopening of the Adiyād hospital. The hospital reportedly (Hamza, 200) had 275 beds and its facilities included an operating room, X-ray department, microscope room, pharmacy, obstetrics department and an outpatient clinic. It may be pointed out that it had become normal over the years for countries with large Muslim populations, and hence many pilgrims, to dispatch medical teams to Makka at Hajj time. In 1345/1927 the regulations for the health department (Muḥāfaẓat al-Ṣihha al-‘Imma) were established, and by the mid-1930s the spectrum of medical facilities in addition to the Adiyād hospital included the following:

1. a mental hospital.
2. a contagious disease hospital.
3. a brand new hospital in al-Shuḥāda’ section with completely up-to-date equipment.
4. the Egyptian hospital in Dār al-Takīyya al-Misrīyya—the official Egyptian presence in Makka.
5. an emergency aid society (Qan‘ah wa-l-hal-lā‘) founded 1355/1936, which held a conference on hygiene and first aid and which owned its own ambulances and motor cycles. In its first year it treated 922 victims of misfortunes, almost all of them in its own facilities. The king, heri designate, and viceroy all contributed to this society, and it was authorised to levy a special 1/4 piastre stamp on top of the regular postage for the support of its activities. This society probably came into existence because of needs arising from the 1934 Su’ūdī war against the Yaman. It grew into the Red Crescent society of the whole country (Philby, Pilgrim, 39); 6. a school for midwives. Philby estimated that during the pilgrimage of 1349/1931, there were 40 deaths out of total pilgrims numbering 100,000, and in 1352/1934, 15 deaths out of 80,000 pilgrims. In the post-World War II period, there was predictably a great increase in facilities, and to the above list must be added: 7. The Dr. Ahmad Zāhir hospital with 400 beds and 16 doctors. 8. an obstetrical hospital. 9. an eye hospital. 10. a bāhirzāra (schisotomiasis) control station (1975). 11. a venereal disease control demonstration centre. As noted earlier, various governments send medical missions to Makka during the Hajj season. Hamādā reported (69) that in the 1930s, the Egyptian mission consisted of two units, one in Ḥarāt al-Bāb near Djarwal, the other in the permanent Egyptian mission building (al-Takīyya al-Misrīyya), which used to face al-Masqūd al-Haḍām before it was torn down to make way for the mosque enlargement. The latter unit was in addition to the permanent Egyptian medical service in the same building. In 1355-6/1937, the countries sending missions to Egypt, Indonesia, the Dutch East Indies, Algeria, Afghanistan and the USSR. They contributed a total of ten doctors plus pharmacists, assistants and supplies to the available medical services. During the same period, Hamza noted (200) that at Hajj time there were a total of 13 government hospitals and clinics spread between Makka and ‘Arāfāt. Physicians, nurses and orderlies were hired on a temporary basis to man them. Reading from Fārisī’s map, one finds that the latest indications are as follows: there were six hospitals, seven clinics (mustawaṣṣ) and three medical centres (markaz tibbī) in Makka proper and ten dispensaries in Miina, one hospital in Muzdalifā, and one medical centre in ‘Arafa. These latter doubly function only during the Hajj.

Communications. By 1985 Makka, like other Su’ūdī cities, was possessed of the most modern telephone, telex, radio and TV communications. Its roads were of the most modern design, and it was linked to the rest of the country by first-class highways, many of them divided and of limited access. Since Djaruda, which has one of the world’s largest and most modern airports, is only some 60 km away and since a major airport at Makka would be difficult, both because of the terrain and because of the problem of non-Muslims being in proximity to the haram area, there is no important airport in Makka. It may, however, be noted that a Djaruda-Makka service had been authorised in 1936 to Misr Air (now Egypt Air). It was cancelled following an accident in 1938. In a similar vein, a railroad project from Djaruda to Makka was authorised by a royal decree in 1351/1933 with a concession granted to ‘Abd al-Kādir al-Djilānī. It was revoked 18 months later because of his failure to carry it out.

The modernisation of communications has been dramatically rapid. Rutter describes (455) how in 1925 camel caravans for al-Madinah assembled in an open space called Shaykh Mahmūd on the western edge of Djarwal; a camel in Djarwal in 1985 would be about as common as a horse in Paris. The use of cars spread very rapidly after the Su’ūdīs’ conquest and the development of the Djaruda-Makka road was a natural early priority because of the pilgrimage traffic. It
was first asphalted in the period just before the outbreak of World War II.

Telecommunications were early emphasised by King Abd al-Aziz because they represented a means of control as well as a convenience. In King al-Husayn’s time, there had been about 20 telephones in the city—all reserved for high officials and probably only functional within the city. By 1936, subscribers in Makka had grown to 450 (slightly over half of all those in Su‘udi Arabia), and lines had been extended to Qudadda and al-Tabyrinth (but not al-Riyad or al-Madina). Hamza also reports (230-1) that, in addition to the regular telephones, there were “automatic” (?) telephones which were used by officials. Of this type, 50 were in Makka. After World War II, the first telephone training mission (10 persons) was sent abroad in 1367/1947-8. By 1383/1963-6, Makka had 5,000 telephones but service was still through operators. Dial phones were introduced soon after this, and within a dozen years there was fully automatic direct-dial service anywhere in the world.

There had been limited radio communication within the Hijāz under the Hāshimites. In 1348/1929, using Philby as an intermediary (for details see Jubilee, 173-4; Days, 286-9; Su‘udi Arabia, 316-17), the king contracted with the Marconi company for wireless stations, and the first of these was in Makka. That of Makka was of 25 kw power (as was al-Riyad), and by the spring of 1932 the network was fully functional. Soon after World War II, by contract with the German Siemens company, this network was greatly expanded and improved. Radio communication has been used at various key points in directing the pilgrimage since about 1370/1950. Public radio broadcasts were initiated on yaum al-wukuf ("standing day") during the pilgrimage in 1368/1949 with jubilee, 172) as the opening words. Initial power was only 3 kw, but with the creation of the Directorate General of Broadcasting, Press and Publications (by a decree of 1374/1955) under ‘Abd Allah ‘Umar Bālkhyār, there was rapid improvement. Within less than a year, power had increased to 10 kw, and it was boosted in 1377/1957 to 50 kw, making Radio Makka one of the most powerful in the Near East at that time.

Later, power was increased still more to 450 kw. In keeping with Wahhābī tradition, music was initially kept off the air, but it was gradually introduced. TV in Makka began service in 1386/1966-7 and has since become a pervasive part of life there as everywhere else in the world.

Water supply. Before oil-induced modernisation, the water supply of Makka came from two basic sources. The first was local wells. The water of these, of which Zamzam is one, was generally brackish, and they were located in houses. The second was fresh or sweet water most of which came from ‘Ayn Zubayda by man-made underground channels of the kanawdt [see kanawdt] type. Locally, the system is called manawat. A very sporadic third source was rainfall which, although it brought the threat of destructive floods, was eagerly collected in every way possible. Water distribution was by hand. A man carried two 20 litre petrol tins (tanakā) attached to the ends of a stout pole on his shoulders to the individual houses of those who could afford such service. Philby noted (Forty years, 172) that in the 1930s, 8 gallons cost one penny. His monthly bill seldom exceeded five shillings. The mass of the people went individually to get their own water at one of the small reservoirs or cisterns (bāzān). Of these in Rutter’s time, there were seven in the city and one each in Minā, Muzdaliqā and ‘Arafā. The water for all of these came from ‘Ayn Zubayda.

The immediate source of the ‘Ayn Zubayda water is the mountains (Djabal Sa‘d and Djabal Kabkāb) which lie a few kilometers east of Djabal al-Haram or about 20 km east southeast of Makka. The most important source is a spring in the mountains, ‘Ayn Hunayn, which according to Rutter is a two-hour walk from the Wādī Na‘mān plain. Several other small springs are led to the beginning of the subterranean aqueduct which starts at the foot of the mountain. The aqueduct is attributed to Zubayda (q. v.), the wife of Hārūn al-Rashīd, but in all probability it far predates her, and she should be credited with improvement of the system rather than creation of it. Like other kanawāt, the ‘Ayn Zubayda system is characterised by access wells (jātākhāt) at intervals of about one km which are marked by circular erections around them. King ‘Abd al-Aziz did not lack interest in the water supply system, and made personal financial contributions from time to time. Philby reports (Jubilee, 116-17) an expedition of autumn 1930 when he and his party drove out to inspect work in progress at one of the access wells which was being cleaned. A thorough cleaning of the whole system had been ordered because flow had been declining as a result of inadequate maintenance in the prior, disturbed years. A pit some 30 m deep had been dug ‘at the bottom of which the top [of the] pit’s rim is washed out by new manholes which are being seen.” Philby theorised that the valley silt had built up at a rate of about 3 m a century. In any case, the new pit was surfaced with masonry and the channel between it and the next pit thoroughly cleaned. When the whole process was completed, the flow of water in Makka increased greatly, although Philby notes that the growth of private gardens in the suburbs was putting pressure on supplies. The ‘Ayn Zubayda system (as well as other lesser ones) was so important to the city that a separate ‘Ayn Zubayda administrative authority had been created. Its budget came from the government and fell under the purview of the Madīsī al-Sharā‘ī. In addition, pilgrims often made pious contributions to the upkeep of the system. Hamāda notes (77) that supervision of it had to be increased during pilgrimage season because flow was greater at those times. Later, power was increased still more to 450 kw. In keeping with Wahhābī tradition, music was initially kept off the air, but it was gradually introduced. TV in Makka began service in 1386/1966-7 and has since become a pervasive part of life there as everywhere else in the world.

Floods in Makka have been a danger since earliest times. Al-Kurdi counts a total of 89 historic ones, including several in the Su‘udi period. The most severe was in 1360/1942 which it rained for several hours. Water reached the sill of the Ka‘ba’s door, and prayers and tawwaf were cancelled. The streets of the city were filled with mud, and there was severe damage to stocks in stores. Tombs in al-Mal‘ālā were washed out and houses were destroyed (al-Kurdi, ii, 200). Philby also reports (Su‘udi Arabia, 320) a flood in 1950 which reached a depth of seven feet in the mosque. Soon thereafter the improved modern technologies and cannot find any research on the construction of dams, one on the Wādī Ibrāhīm, which is the main source of floods, the other across the Wādī al-Zāhir, which threatens the northern and western sections. These dams were helpful, and the great underground conduit built in connection with the mosque enlarge-
ment may have permanently ameliorated the problem of floods.

Bibliography: Fundamental works on Su`udî Arabi including Makka in the 1920s, 30s, and 40s are those of F. Hamza, C. Nallino, H. St. J. B. Philby, and H. Wahba. Muhammad Surûr al-Šábbân, Adâb al-Šâhid al-Šâhid, Cairo 1344/1926 (not consulted; unavailable); E. Rutter, The Holy cities of Arabia, London and New York 1930 (most important source on Makka in immediate wake of Su`u`û`i take-over); Muhammad Sa`îd `Abd al-Mâskûd and `Abd Allâh `Umar al-Ša`îlî, Wâhî al-`aţsâdîr, Cairo 1354/1936 (important for literature, uncors.-


Since Muslims over the centuries have faced the world.

Introduction.

In Kur`ân, II, 144, Muslims are enjoined to face the sacred precincts in Mecca during their prayers. The Ka`bâ was adopted by Muhammad as a physical focus of the new Muslim community, and the direction of prayer, kiblah, was to serve as the sacred direction in Islam until the present day.

Since Muslims over the centuries have faced the Ka`bâ during prayer, mosques are oriented so that the prayer wall faces the Ka`bâ. The mînah or prayer-niche in the mosque indicates the kiblah, or local direction of Mecca. Islamic tradition further prescribes that certain acts such as burial of the dead, recitation of the Kur`ân, announcing the call to prayer, and the ritual slaughter of animals for food, are performed in the kiblah, whereas expectation and bodily functions should be performed in the perpendicular direction. Thus for close to fourteen centuries,
Muslims have been spiritually and physically oriented towards the Ka'ba and the holy city of Mecca in their daily lives, and the kibla or sacred direction is of fundamental importance in Islam [see KA'BA and KIBLA, i. Ritual and legal aspects].

A statement attributed to the Prophet asserts that the Ka'ba is the kibla for people in the sacred mosque which surrounds the Ka'ba, the Mosque is the kibla for the people in the sacred precincts (haram) of the city of Mecca and its environs, and the sacred precincts are the kibla for people in the whole world. To 'Aisha and 'Ali b. Abi Talib, as well as to other early authorities, is attributed the assertion that Mecca is the centre of the world. The early Islamic traditions with Mecca as the centre and navel of the world constitute an integral part of Islamic cosmography over the centuries (see Wensinck, Navel of the earth, 36), although they do not feature in the most popular treatise on the subject from the late mediaeval period, namely, that of al-Suyūṭī [q.v.]; see Heinen, Islamic cosmology.

From the 3rd/9th century onwards, schemes were devised in which the world was divided into sectors (dhībā or hadd) about the Ka'ba. This sacred geography had several manifestations, but the different schemes proposed shared a common feature, described by al-Makrizī, "The Ka'ba with respect to the inhabited parts of the world is like the centre of a circle with respect to the circle itself. All regions face the Ka'ba, surrounding it as a circle surrounds its centre, and each region faces a particular part of the Ka'ba" (Khīṣāt, i, 257-8).

Islamic sacred geography was quite separate and distinct from the mainstream Islamic tradition of modern cartography. It was, however, closely associated with Islam. The term kibla, and the associated verb istakbala for standing in the kibla, appear to derive from the name of the east wind, the kabāl. These terms correspond to the situation where one is standing with the north wind (al-gamāl) on one's left (ghamāl) and the Yemen on one's right (jamān); see Chehlood, Pre-eminence of the right, 248-53; King, Astronomical alignments, 307-9.

In other such traditions recorded in the Islamic sources, the limits of the directions from which the winds blow were defined in terms of the rising and setting of such stars and star-groups as Canopus, the Pleiades, and the stars of the handle of the Plough (which in tropical latitudes do rise and set), or in terms of cardinal directions of wind-marshalling (al-marsha, namely, south, east, north and west) or the cardinal winds themselves.

It appears that in the time of the Prophet, the four corners of the Ka'ba were already named according to the geographical regions which they faced and which the Meccans knew from their trading ventures: namely, Syria, 'Irāk, Yemen, and the West. As we shall see, a division of the world into four regions about the Ka'ba is attested in one of the earliest sources for sacred geography, the early authority of Ibn 'Abbas (roughly equal) sectors. Each of these eight-sector schemes were indeed proposed. However, in some schemes, the sectors were associated with segments of the perimeter of the Ka'ba, the walls being divided by such features as the waterspout (miṣāb) on the north-western wall and the door on the north-eastern wall (see Fig. 1).

The directions of sunrise and sunset at midsummer, midwinter and the equinoxes, together with the north and south points, define eight (unequal) sectors of the horizon, and, together with the directions perpendicular to the solstitial directions, define 12 (roughly equal) sectors. Each of these eight- and 12-sector schemes was used in the sacred geography of Islam.

The determination of the sacred direction

The article KIBLA, ii. Astronomical aspects, ignores the means which were used in popular practice for determining the sacred direction, since at the time when it was written, these had not yet been investigated. It is appropriate to consider them before turning to the topic of sacred geography per se.

From the 3rd/9th century onwards, Muslim astronomers working in the tradition of classical astronomy devised methods to compute the kibla for any locality from the available geographical data. For them, the kibla was the direction of the great circle joining the locality to Mecca, measured as an angle to the local meridian. The determination of the kibla according to this definition is a non-trivial problem of mathematical geography, whose solution involves the application of complicated trigonometrical formulae or geometrical constructions. Lists of kibla values for different localities and tables displaying the kibla for each
degree of longitude and latitude difference from Mecca were available. Details of this activity are given in kibla. ii. Astronomical aspects. However, mathematical methods were not available to the Muslims before the late 2nd/8th and early 3rd/9th centuries. And what is more important, even in later centuries, the kibla was not generally found by computation anyway.

In some circles, the practice of the Prophet in Medina was imitated: he had prayed southwards towards Mecca, and there were those who were content to follow his example and pray towards the south wherever they were, be it in Andalusia or Central Asia. Others followed the practice of the first generations of Muslims who laid out the first mosques in different parts of the new Islamic commonwealth. Some of these mosques were converted from earlier religious edifices, the orientation of which was considered acceptable for the kibla; such was the case, for example, in Jerusalem and Damascus, where the kibla adopted was roughly due south.

Other early mosques were laid out in directions defined by astronomical horizon phenomena, such as the risings and settings of the sun at the equinoxes or solstices and of various prominent stars or star groups; such was the case, for example, in Egypt and Central Asia, where the earliest mosques were aligned towards winter sunrise and winter sunset, respectively. The directions known as kiblat al-sahāba, the “kibla of the Companions”, remained popular over the centuries, their acceptability ensured by the Prophetic dictum: “My Companions are like stars to be guided by: whenever you follow their example you will be rightly guided”.

Astronomical alignments were used for the kibla because the first generations of Muslims who were familiar with the Ka’ba knew that when they stood in front of the edifice, they were facing a particular astronomical direction. In order to face the appropriate part of the Ka’ba which was associated with their ultimate geographical location, they used the same astronomically-defined direction for the kibla as they would have been standing directly in front of that particular segment of the perimeter of the Ka’ba. This notion of the kibla is, of course, quite different from that used by the astronomers. Such simple methods for finding the kibla by astronomical horizon phenomena (called dalā‘ī) are outlined both in legal texts and in treatises dealing with folk astronomy. In the mediaeval sources, we also find kibla directions expressed in terms of wind directions: as noted above, several wind schemes, defined in terms of solar or stellar risings and settings, were part of the folk astronomy and meteorology of pre-Islamic Arabia.

The non-mathematical tradition of folk astronomy practiced by Muslims in the mediaeval period was based solely on observable phenomena, such as the risings and settings of celestial bodies and their passages across the sky, and also involved the association of meteorological phenomena, such as the winds, with phenomena in the sky [see ANWAZ, MANAZIL, MATLA‘ and MA‘]. Adapted primarily from pre-Islamic Arabia, folk astronomy flourished alongside mathematical astronomy over the centuries, but was far more widely known and practised. Even the legal scholars accepted it because of Kurzan, XVI, 16, “… and by the stars [men] shall be guided”. There were four main applications of this traditional astronomical folklore: (1) the regulation of the Muslim lunar calendar; (2) the determination of the times of the five daily prayers, which are astronomically defined; (3) finding the kibla by non-mathematical procedures; and (4) the organisation of agricultural activities in the solar calendar (see King, Ethnoastronomy, and Varisco, Agricultural almanacs).

Historical evidence of clashes between the two traditions is rare. Al-Biruni made some disparaging remarks about those who sought to find the kibla by means of the winds and the lunar mansions (Kitab Tahdid nihaydt al-amdkin, tr. J. Ali as The determination of the coordinates of cities, Beirut 1967, 12 [slightly modified]: “When [some people] were asked to determine the direction of the kibla, they became perplexed because the solution of the problem was beyond their scientific powers. You see that they have been discussing completely irrelevant phenomena such as the directions from which the winds blow and the risings of the lunar mansions”.

But the legal scholars made equally disparaging and far more historically significant remarks about the scientists. According to the 7th/13th century Yemeni legal scholar al-Asbahi (ms. Cairo Dar al-Kutub, mkdò 984, 1, fol. 6a-b): “The astronomers have taken their knowledge from Euclid, [the authors of] the Sindhind, Aristotle and other philosophers, and all of them were infidels”.

It is quite apparent from the orientations of mediaeval mosques that astronomers were seldom consulted in their construction. Indeed, from the available architectural and also textual evidence, it is clear that in mediaeval times several different and often widely-divergent kiblas were accepted in specific cities and regions. Among the legal scholars there were those who favoured facing the Ka’ba directly (SYM AL-KA’BA), usually with some traditionally acceptable astronomical alignment such as winter sunrise, and others who said that facing the general direction of the Ka’ba (DQI HAT AL-KA’BA) was sufficient (see Pl. 1).
Thus, for example, there were legal scholars in mediaeval Cordova who maintained that the entire south-eastern quadrant could serve as the kibla (see King, Qibla in Cordova, 372, 374).

Islamic sacred geography

The earliest known Ka'ba-centred geographical scheme is recorded in the Kitāb al-Masāliḳ wa 'l-Mannālīḳ, ed. de Goeje, 5, of the 3rd/9th century scholar Ibn Khurradadhbih [q. v.]. Even if the scheme is not original to him, there is no reason to suppose that it is any later than his time. In this scheme, represented in Fig. 2, the region between North-West Africa and Northern Syria is associated with the north-west wall of the Ka'ba and has a kibla which varies from east to south. The region between Armenia and Kashmir is associated with the north-east wall of the Ka'ba and has a kibla which varies from south to west. A third region, India, Tibet and China, is associated with the Black Stone in the eastern corner of the Ka'ba, and, for this reason, is stated to have a kibla a little north of west. A fourth region, the Yemen, is associated with the southern corner of the Ka'ba and has a kibla of due north.

Fig. 2. A simple scheme of sacred geography in the published text of the Kitāb al-Masāliḳ of Ibn Khurradadhbih.

The 4th/10th century legal scholar Ibn al-Kāṣṣ wrote a treatise entitled Dala'il al-kibla which is unfortunately not extant in its entirety. The Beirut ms. is lost, and the Istanbul and Cairo mss. (Veľuďudin 2455,2 and Dār al-Kutub, miṣrāṭ 1201) are quite different in content. In the Istanbul copy, Ibn al-Kāṣṣ states that the world is centred on the Ka'ba and then presents a traditional Ptolemaic survey of the seven climates [see 181.13]. In the Cairo copy, he surveys the different stars and star-groups used for finding the kibla.

The principal scholar involved in the development of sacred geography was Muḥammad b. Surākhī al-'Aṣrī, a Yemeni fakih who studied in Basra and died in the Yemen in 410/1019. Little is known about this individual, and none of his works are known to survive in their original form. However, from quotations in later works, it appears that he devised a total of three distinct schemes, with eight, 11 and 12 sectors around the Ka'ba. In each scheme, several prescriptions for finding the kibla in each region are outlined. Ibn Surākhī explains in words and without recourse to any diagrams how one should stand with respect to the risings or settings of some four stars and the four winds; the actual direction which these prescriptions are intended to help one face is not specifically stated. Thus, for example, people in ʿIrāk and Iran should face the north-east wall of the Ka'ba, and to achieve this one should stand so that the stars of the Plough rise behind one's right ear, the lunar mansion al-Hanā'a rises directly behind one's back, the Pole Star is at one's right shoulder, the East wind blows at one's left shoulder, and the West wind blows at one's right cheek, and so on (see Table 1). Ibn Surākhī did not actually point out that the kibla in ʿIrāk was toward winter sunset.

Ibn Surākhī's eight-sector scheme is known from the writings of one Ibn Rahlī, a legal scholar of Mecca in the 5th/11th century, who wrote a treatise on folk astronomy (extant in the unique Berlin ms. Ahlwardt 5664; see especially fols. 23a-25b). Several significant regions of the Muslim world were omitted from this scheme. A similar but more refined eight-sector scheme is proposed by the 7th/13th century Libyan philologist Ibn al-Aḍdāṭā [q. v.] (Kitāb al-Aṣmān, . . ., ed. I. Hassen, 120-35). Here eight sectors are neatly associated with the four walls and the four corners of the Ka'ba, and the kiblas in each region are defined in terms of the cardinal directions and sunrise and sunset at the solstices. A cruder scheme based on the same notion is proposed by the 6th/12th century Egyptian legal scholar al-Dimyātī (ms. Damascus, Zāhiryya 5579, fol. 14a). He represents the Ka'ba by a circle and associates each of the eight regions around the Ka'ba with a wind (see Pl. 2).

Yet another eight-sector scheme is presented in an anonymous treatise preserved in a 12th/18th century Ottoman Egyptian manuscript (Cairo, Tal'at, maqāmāt, 811.6, fols. 59a-61a (see Pl. 3). From internal evidence, it is clear that this scheme, in which the kiblas are actually defined in terms of the stars which rise or set behind one's back when one is standing in the kibla and in terms of the Pole Star, was already at least five centuries old when it was copied in this manuscript. For example, various 7th/13th century Yemeni astronomical sources contain 12-sector schemes based on precisely the same eight kibla directions. In the eight-sector scheme, Palestine had been omitted and two regions were associated with two entire walls of the Ka'ba. The individual who first developed this particular 12-sector scheme added a sector for Palestine and three more for segments of those two walls.

Ibn Surākhī's 11-sector scheme is known from an 8th/14th (?) century Egyptian treatise (ms. Milan Ambrosiana, II.75 (A73), 20, fols. 174a-177b), and in it he has simply added three sectors to his eight-sector scheme and modified the prescriptions for finding the kibla. His 12-sector scheme is yet more refined. It was used by al-Dimyātī in his Kitāb al-Tahjīf fi ma'rāfāt dala'il al-kibla (ms. Oxford, Bodleian Marsh 592, fols. 97b-101b, and 126a-28a), who complained that Ibn Surākhī had placed Damascus and Medina in the same sector, and so he himself presented a 13-sector scheme, subdividing the sector for Syria and the Hijāż. Ibn Surākhī's 12-sector scheme was also used by the 7th/13th century Yemeni astronomer al-Farsī in his treatise on folk astronomy. The unique copy of this work (ms. Milan Ambrosiana X73 sup.) includes diagrams of Ibn Surākhī's 12-sector scheme and the different 12-sector scheme discussed above (see Pl. 4).
Table 1: Kibla indicators in the eight- and eleven-sector schemes of Ibn Suraka

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Scheme</th>
<th>Season</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Medina, Palestine</td>
<td>8-sector</td>
<td>Winter sunset at right ear</td>
<td>PS at right shoulder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Qazira, Armenia</td>
<td>8-sector</td>
<td>Winter sunset at bone behind left ear</td>
<td>PS at right shoulder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. C. 'Irāk, N. Iran, Transoxania</td>
<td>8-sector</td>
<td>Winter sunset at right ear</td>
<td>PS at right shoulder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. S. 'Irāk, S. Iran, China</td>
<td>8-sector</td>
<td>Winter sunset at right ear</td>
<td>PS at right shoulder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Sind, India, Afghanistan</td>
<td>8-sector</td>
<td>Winter sunset at right ear</td>
<td>PS at right shoulder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Yemen, Hadramawt</td>
<td>8-sector</td>
<td>Winter sunset at right ear</td>
<td>PS at right shoulder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Andalucia, Maghrib, Iberia, Ethiopia</td>
<td>8-sector</td>
<td>Winter sun rise at bone behind left ear</td>
<td>PS at right shoulder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Egypt, coast of Maghrib and Iberia</td>
<td>8-sector</td>
<td>Winter sunrise at right ear</td>
<td>PS at right shoulder</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**
- BN = Banat Na', PS = Pole Star
- SW = south wind, WW = west wind
- EW = east wind, NW = north wind
- VE = Venus, Mars
- Sirius and Venus rising at left eye
- Pleiades and Capella rising at right eye
- Canopus, Vega, Capella rising at right ear
- Canopus rising in front
- Canopus rising behind left ear
- Canopus setting behind left ear
- Canopus rising at right eye
- Canopus setting behind right ear
- Canopus setting at right shoulder
- Capella rising behind right ear
- Capella setting behind right ear
- Capella setting at right shoulder
- Sirius rising behind left ear
- Sirius setting behind left ear
- Sirius setting at left shoulder
- Sirius rising at left shoulder
- Sirius setting at left shoulder
- Sirius setting in front
- Sirius setting at right shoulder
- Sirius setting in front
Several sources contain schemes in which the prescriptions for finding the kibla in each region of the world are based only on the Pole Star (al-Dhulayy or al-Kufi). Although the earliest known scheme of this kind dates from the 6th/12th century, others must have been in circulation prior to this time, since al-Biruni (Tahdid, tr. Ali, 13, modified) wrote: "Of the majority of people [who write about the kibla in non-mathematical terms], none are closer to the truth than those who use (i'tabatul bi') the Pole Star known as al-Dhulayy. By means of its fixed position, the direction of a person travelling can be specified approximately."

The most detailed scheme of this kind is recorded by the 7th/13th century Egyptian legal scholar Shihab al-Din al-Karaft [q.v.] in his Dhalikhra, ed. Cairo, 1, 489-508; in this, some nine regions of the world are identified and instructions for finding the kibla are given as follows: "[The inhabitants of] Sind and India stand with [the Pole star] at their [right] cheeks and they face due west, etc." See Fig. 3 for a simplified version of this kind of scheme.

Fig. 3. A simple scheme for using the Pole Star to face Mecca recorded in a late Ottoman Egyptian text, typical of much earlier prescription for finding the kibla.

At least one of the 12-sector schemes mentioned above must have been in circulation outside the Yemen before the 7th/13th century, because it was copied by the geographer Yahya al-Bakhtari, tr. Jwaideh, 51), who worked in Syria in ca. 600/1200.

The instructions for finding the kibla are omitted from his diagram. A similar diagram is presented in al-Kazwini’s Athar al-bilad, 76, (see Fig. 4), and the same scheme is described in words in al-Kalkashandi, Subh, iv, 251-5. Another such simple 12-sector scheme occurs in the cosmography Kharidat al-‘ajlih of the 9th/15th century Syrian writer Ibn al-Wardi [q.v.], a work which was exceedingly popular in later centuries. In some copies of this, a diagram of an eight-sector scheme is presented. In others, diagrams of 18-, 34-, 35-, or 36-sectors schemes occur. In one manuscript of a Turkish translation of his treatise (ms. Istanbul Topkapi, Turkish 1390 = Bagdat 179), there is a diagram of a scheme with 72 sectors. In the published edition of the Arabic text (Cairo 1863, 70-1), extremely corrupt versions of both the 12- and the eight-sector schemes are included.

These simple diagrams were often much abused by ignorant copyists, and even in elegantly copied manuscripts we find the corners of the Ka’ba mislabelled and the localities around the Ka’ba confused. In some copies of the works of al-Kazwini and Ibn al-Wardi containing the 12-sector scheme, Medina occurs in more than one sector. In other copies, one of these two sectors has been suppressed and only 11 sectors appear around the Ka’ba (see Pl. 5).

Yet another scheme occurs in the navigational atlas of the 10th/16th century Tunisian scholar ‘Alfi al-Sharafi al-Safakusi (see Pl. 6). There are 40 mihrabs around the Ka’ba, represented by a square with its corners facing in the cardinal directions, and also by the fact that the scheme is superimposed upon a 32-division wind-rose, a device used by Arab sailors to find directions at sea by the risings and settings of the stars. Even though al-Safakusi had compiled maps of the Mediterranean coast, the order and arrangement of localities around the Ka’ba in his diagram in each of the available copies (ms. Paris, B.N. ar. 2273 and Oxford, Bodleian Marsh 294) are rather inaccurate. Again, no kibla indications are presented.

Mainly through the writings of al-Kazwini and Ibn al-Wardi, these simplified 12-sector schemes were copied right up to the 19th century. By then, their original compiler had long been forgotten, and Muslim scholars interested in the sciences were starting to use Western geographical concepts and coordinates anyway. In most regions of the Islamic world, traditional kibla directions which had been used over the centuries were abandoned for a new direction computed for the locality in question using modern geographical coordinates.

The orientation of Islamic religious architecture

A variety of different kibla values was used in each of the major centres of Islamic civilisation (see King, Sacred direction). In any one locality, there were kiblas advocated by religious tradition, including both cardinal directions and astronomical alignments advocated in texts on folk astronomy or legal texts, as well as the directions computed by the astronomers (by both accurate and approximate mathematical procedures). This situation explains the diversity of mosque orientations in any given region of the Islamic world. However, since very few medieval mosques have been surveyed properly for their orientations, it is not yet possible to classify them, and for the present
In Cordova, for example, as we know from a 6th/12th century treatise on the astrolabe, some mosques were laid out towards winter sunrise (roughly 30° S. of E.), because it was thought that this would make their kibla walls parallel to the north-west wall of the Ka'ba. The Grand Mosque there faces a direction perpendicular to summer sunrise (roughly 30° E. of S.), for the very same reason: this explains why it faces the deserts of Arabia rather than the deserts of Arabia. In fact, the axis of the Mosque is “parallel” to the main axis of the Ka'ba.

In Samarkand, as we know from a 5th/11th century legal treatise, the main mosque was oriented towards winter sunset, in order that it should face the north-east wall of the Ka'ba. Other mosques in Samarkand were built facing due west because the road to Mecca left Samarkand towards the west, and yet others were built facing due south because the Prophet, when he was in Medina, had said that the kibla was due south, and some religious authorities interpreted this as being universally valid.

Similar situations could be cited for other mediaeval cities. In some of these, the kibla, or rather, the various different directions accepted for the kibla, have played an important role in the development of the entire city in mediaeval times. Investigations of the orientations of Islamic cities are still in an early phase. However, the city of Cairo represents a particularly interesting case of a city oriented towards the Ka'ba.

The first mosque in Egypt was built in Fustat in the 1st/7th century facing due east, and then a few years later was altered to face winter sunrise (about 27° S. of E.). The first direction was probably chosen to ensure that the Mosque faced the Western Corner of the Ka'ba, the second to ensure that it faced the north-western wall, but these reasons are not mentioned in the historical sources. When the new city of al-Qahirah was founded in the 4th/10th century, it was built with a roughly orthogonal street plan alongside the Pharaonic canal linking the Nile with the Red Sea. Now, quite fortuitously, it happened that the canal was perpendicular to the direction of winter sunrise. Thus the entire city was oriented in the “kibla of the Companions”. The Fātimids who built al-Qahirah erected the first mosques in the new city (the Mosque of al-Ḥakim and the Azhar Mosque) in the kibla of the astronomy, which at 25° S. of E. was 10° south of the kibla of the Companions. Thus their mosques were skew to the street plan.

The Mamluks built their mosques and madrasas in such a way that the exteriors were in line with the street plan and the interiors skew to the exteriors and in line with the kibla of the astronomers. When they laid out the “City of the Dead” outside Cairo, they aligned the street and the mausolea with the kibla of the astronomers, which in the other main area of greater Cairo known as al-Qarâfa, both the streets and the mosques follow a southerly kibla orientation. Al-Maqrīzī discussed the problem of the different orientations of mosques in Egypt, but without reference to the street plan of Cairo. Now that the methods used in mediaeval times for finding the kibla are understood, the orientation of mediaeval Islamic religious architecture in particular and cities in general is a subject which calls for further investigation.

Concluding remarks

This purely Islamic development of a sacred geography featuring the world centred on the Ka'ba, provided a simple practical means for Muslims to face the Ka'ba in prayer. For the pious, to whom the “science of the ancients” was anathema, this tradition constituted an acceptable alternative to the mathematical kibla determinations of the astronomers. As noted above, it was actually approved of by the legal scholars, not least because of Korâ an XVI, 16. The number and variety of the texts in which this sacred geography is attested indicate that it was widely known from the 4th/10th century onwards, if not among the scientific community. The broad spectra of kibla values accepted at different times in different places attest to the multiplicity of ways used by Muslims to face the Ka'ba over the centuries, and all of this activity was inspired by the belief that the Ka'ba, as the centre of the world and the focus of Muslim worship, was a physical pointer to the presence of God.


On the possibility of a kibla towards the east before the adoption of the kibla towards the Ka'ba, see W. Barthold, Die Orientierung der ersten muham- madanischen Moscheen, in Istanbuls, xviii (1929), 245-50, and King, Astronomical alignments, 30, for this tradition.

The orientation of Islamic religious architecture, see King, op. cit., and on the situations in Cordova, Cairo and Samarkand, see three sundials from Islamic Andalusia, Appx. A: Some medieval values of the Qibla at Cordova, in Jnsl. for the Hist. of Arabic Science, ii (1978), 370-87; Architecture and astronomy:
the ventilators of medieval Cairo and their secrets, in JAOS, civ (1984), 97-133; Al-Bazdawion the Qibla in Transoxiana, in JHAS, vii (1983), 3-38. In 1983, a treatise on the problems associated with the kibla in early Islamic Iran by the 5th/11th century legal scholar and mathematician 'Abd al-Kahir al-Baghdadi was published in Msila [see MASILA].

Of his principal ancestors, Muhammad b. Ahmad al-Makkari had been chief kadi of Fas and one of the teachers of the famous Liain al-Din Ibn al-Khatib [q.v.], who on 15 Rabii 1 A.H. 1010/13 October 1601 gave him an ijazat (text in al-Makkari's Rawda, 305:12) authorising him to teach the Muwatta, the two Sahih of al-Bukhari and Muslim, the Shaf'ite of the Kadi 'Iyad and his own works, to the spreading of which he must have contributed greatly (see M. A. Zouber, Ahmad b. Shahin; in this last city too, his daughter and a wife (to whom he gave, in the above-mentioned version of this monumental work still remains to be published at Leiden from 1855 to 1861 under the title of Analecutes sur l'histoire et la litterature des Arabes d'Espagne, by R. Doey, G. Dugat, I. Krehl and W. Wright. In 1840, D. Pascual de Gayangos mentioned above, a complete Arabic text of the Nafh al-tib was first printed at Bulak in 1279, at Cairo in 1302 and 1304 in 4 volumes, then at Cairo in 1367/1949 in 10 volumes and finally, by 'Ihsan 'Abbâs at Beirut in 1968 (8 volumes). Although various texts given by al-Makkari have been translated, in addition to the work of D. Pascual de Gayangos mentioned above, a complete version of this monumental work still remains to be done.

Another important work of this author is the Azhar al-riyad fi akhbr 'Iyad, a long monograph on the Kadi 'Iyad (476-544/1083-1149 [q.v.]), which is enriched by numerous pieces of information on scholars of Morocco and al-Andalus, and by citations from otherwise lost works. Of this work, the autograph ms. (incomplete) is in the Royal Library in Rabat (no. 784), and there is a good ms. in the General Library of Rabat (no. 229 K); this has been the object of an edition begun in Tunis (1322/1904), and then 3 volumes have been published in Cairo in 1359-61/1939-42; the vols. iv and v at al-Muhammadiyya in 1977-80. A third work by al-Makkari, the Rawdat al-asl al-7'irat al-anafs fi akhbr man labkhib min al-3'am al- hadaratayn Marrakush wa-Fas, contains biographies of scholars and other Moroccan personalities, together, like the preceding two works, various other texts, in

In spite of his long stay in the East, it was in Morocco that al-Makkari collected the essential materials for his work as the historian and biographer of Muslim Spain, especially at Marrakush, in the library of Sa'dian Sultans (now preserved in part in the Bibliothèque nationale de France, see Lévi-Provencal, Les manuscrits arabes de l'Escorial, iii, Paris 1928, pp. viii-x). Indeed, his masterpiece, written at Cairo in 1038/1629 to the suggestion of Ibn Shâhîn, is a long monograph on Muslim Spain and on the famous encyclopaedist of Granada, Liain al-Din Ibn al-Khatib, Nafl al-tib min khitab al-ulama wa-shfi'a waziratih Liain al-Din Ibn al-Khatib, an immense compilation of historical and literary information, poems, letters and quotations very often taken from works now lost. It is this that gives the Nafl al-tib an inestimable value and puts it in the first rank for our sources of Muslim Spain from the conquest to the last days of the Reconquista.

The Nafl al-tib consists of two quite distinct parts, a monograph on the history and literature of Muslim Spain and the monograph on Ibn al-Khatib. The first part is divided as follows: 1. Physical geography of al-Andalus. 2. Conquest of al-Andalus by the Arabs, period of the governors. 3. History of the Umayyad caliphs and of the petty dynasts (Mu'âakk al-su'ud). 4. Description of Cordova, its history and its monuments. 5. Spanish Arabs who made the journey to the East during the days of Ibn al-Khatib; an immense compilation of historical and literary information, poems, letters and quotations very often taken from works now lost. It is this that gives the Nafl al-tib an inestimable value and puts it in the first rank for our sources of Muslim Spain from the conquest to the last days of the Reconquista.

The second part contains: 1. Origin and biography of the ancestors of Ibn al-Khatib. 2. Biography of Ibn al-Khatib. 3. Biographies of his teachers. 4. Letters in rhymed prose of the chancellors of Granada and of Fas, sent or received by Ibn al-Khatib (makhdubat). 5. Selection of his work in prose and verse. 5. Analytical list of his works.

The first part was published at Leiden from 1855 to 1861 under the title of Analecutes sur l'histoire et la litterature des Arabes d'Espagne, by R. Doey, G. Dugat, I. Krehl and W. Wright. In 1840, D. Pascual de Gayangos published in English, at London, under the title The history of the Muhammadan dynasties in Spain, a version adapted from the part of the first half which deals with the history of Muslim Spain. The complete Arabic text of the Nafl al-tib was first printed at Bulâk in 1279, at Cairo in 1302 and 1304 in 4 volumes, then at Cairo in 1367/1949 in 10 volumes and finally, by 'Ihsan 'Abbâs at Beirut in 1968 (8 volumes). Although various texts given by al-Makkari have been translated, in addition to the work of D. Pascual de Gayangos mentioned above, a complete version of this monumental work still remains to be done.

Another important work of this author is the Azhar al-riyad fi akhbr 'Iyad, a long monograph on the Kadi 'Iyad (476-544/1083-1149 [q.v.]), which is enriched by numerous pieces of information on scholars of Morocco and al-Andalus, and by citations from otherwise lost works. Of this work, the autograph ms. (incomplete) is in the Royal Library in Rabat (no. 784), and there is a good ms. in the General Library of Rabat (no. 229 K); this has been the object of an edition begun in Tunis (1322/1904), and then 3 volumes have been published in Cairo in 1359-61/1939-42; the vols. iv and v at al-Muhammadiyya in 1977-80.

A third work by al-Makkari, the Rawdat al-asl al-7'irat al-anafs fi akhbr man labkhib min al-3'am al- hadratayn Marrakush wa-Fas, contains biographies of scholars and other Moroccan personalities, together, like the preceding two works, various other texts, in
Fig. 1. Aerial view of Ḥarāfīū during the Ḥaḍḍj. (Photograph by courtesy of the Embassy of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, The Hague).
Fig. 2. Pilgrims at Minā. (Photograph by courtesy of the Embassy of the Kingdom of Saoudi Arabia, The Hague).
Fig. 3. Aerial view of Minā during the *hajj*. (Photograph by courtesy of the Embassy of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, The Hague).
Fig. 4. Interior of the Mas'd. (Photograph by courtesy of the Embassy of the Kingdom of Saoudi Arabia, The Hague).
1. Diagrams in the unique manuscript of the *Tahdhib* of al-Dimyāṭī displaying the notions of 'ayn al-Ka'ba, facing the Ka'ba head on, and ḍiḥat al-Ka'ba, facing the general direction of the Ka'ba, that is, anywhere within the field of vision (ca. 90°) of a person facing the Ka'ba head on. Taken from ms. Oxford Bodleian Marsh 592, fols. 23b-24a.

2. An illustration of al-Dimyāṭī’s eight-sector kibla scheme in the unique copy of his shorter treatise on the kibla. The directions of the kibla are defined in each sector in terms of the Pole Star. Taken from ms. Damascus Zāhiriyya 5579, fol. 14a.
3. Two illustrations from an anonymous treatise on the kibla and the Ka'ba of uncertain provenance. On the left is a latitude and longitude grid with various localities marked, as well as the Ka'ba, shown in the upper left corner, inclined to the meridian. (No such diagram is contained in any scientific treatise from the medieval Islamic period.) On the right is an eight-sector kibla scheme not attested in any other known source. The main kibla indicators used in each sector are the risings or settings of prominent stars which should be directly behind the person facing the kibla: this suggests that they were determined by someone standing with his back to the appropriate part of the Ka'ba looking towards those regions. Taken from ms. Cairo Tal' at madīna 811, fols. 59b-60a.
Two 12-sector diagrams occurring at the end of the unique complete copy of a treatise on folk astronomy by the 7th/13th century Yemeni scholar Muhammad b. Abi Bakr al-Farisi. The one on the left corresponds roughly to the scheme described in the text of al-Farisi's treatise. Notice that the scheme is surrounded by a schematic representation of the Sacred Mosque. The one on the right is developed from the eight-sector scheme of Ibn Surāka. Taken from ms. Milan Ambrosiana Griffini 37, unfoliated.
5. On these flyleaves of an Ottoman Turkish copy of a 10th/16th century Syrian zīdīj are preserved four different schemes of sacred geography. Two are represented graphically, and two others by ordered lists of localities (upper left and upper right). In addition, there is (lower right) a diagram for locating the so-called ridāj al-ghayb, intermediaries between God and man, belief in whom was widespread amongst Sūfis in Ottoman times. Taken from ms. Paris B.N. ar. 2520.
6. A defective diagram of a 12-sector scheme (simplified from that of Ibn Surākā) in an elegantly copied manuscript of Ibn al-Wardī’s Cosmography. As in some diagrams of this kind in various copies of al-Kazwīnī’s Āthār al-bilād, there are only 11 sectors: presumably at some stage in the transmission someone noticed that, because of copyists’ errors in some copies of the text, Medina occurred in two sectors. The one omitted here is the one in which Medina had been entered by mistake. Taken from ms. Istanbul Topkapi Ahmet III 3020, fol. 52b.
7. The 40-sector scheme of al-Ṣafākūsī, superimposed on a 32-division windrose. The order of the localities around the Ka'ba differs somewhat in the two extant copies of this chart. Taken from ms. Paris B.N. ar. 2278, fol. 2b.
particular, idjazas received by or conferred by the author (ed. Rabat 1383/1964).
As well as these historical and biographical compilations, al-Makkari is said to have left behind a commentary on the Mukaddima of Ibn Khaldun (Hadjjii Ka'as, 110, 113). He will be mentioned here those which are extant and most distinguished scholars in the science of Kur'an reading (kirda [q.v.] and especially the theory and art of recitation (taqwid [q.v.]) in the Muslim West.
It is largely due to him that the new development in Kur'an reading scholarship which is connected with the Baghdadi Imams (al-Kur'an, Ibn Muqaffah (d. 324/936 [q.v.]) spread so soon via Aleppo and Cairo to Spain. Makkari started his studies in Cairo at the age of thirteen, and accomplished most of his learning there during the years 368-74/978-84, 377-9/987-8 and 382-9/992-3, concentrating on philology, kirda [q.v.] and taqwid [q.v.], and frequenting at an advanced stage such illustrious authorities as the commentator Abû Bakr al-Udflfi (304-88/916-98, GAS, i, 46) and Abu 'l-Tayyib 'Abd al-Mun'im b. Ghazala al-Albâli (d. 389/999). The latter had studied with Ibn Muqaffah's pupil Ibn Khâlawayh (q.v.) during Sayf al-Dawla's reign in Aleppo (see Hâlab, III, 86a) and became famous for his works on kirda (GAS, i, 15). Makkari also studied with Abu 'l-Tayyib's son Tâhir b. Ghazala (d. 399/1008), the same scholar, who was to become the teacher of Makkari's 17 years younger Maghribi colleague, Abû 'Amir al-Dâni (q.v.), who came to Cairo some years later. It is in Tâhir's teaching and his K. al-Tadhkira fi 'l-kirda (GAS, i, 16) that were to become the foundations of two influential kirda-works by each of Makkari (K. al-Tabsira, K. al-Tabshir, K. al-Kalâgh [q.v.]) and al-Dânî (K. al-Tayyib, K. al-Dâmi' [q.v.]). During Makkari's short residence at home in Cairo in 374-77/984-7, he studied with two outstanding Kayrawāni scholars: the legal scholar and traditionist al-Kâbîsî (d. 409/1011 [q.v.]) and the law professor Ibn Abî Zayd (d. 386/996 [q.v.]). In 387/998 he set off for his last journey to the east. Staying three years in Mecca, frequenting Meccan scholars and performing the hadj several times, he wrote in 389/999 his K. Mushkil gharb al-Kur'an, a summary of which is probably extant in a unique ms. (ed. Yusûf 'Abd al-Rahmân al-Muqaffah, Beirut 1981); its authenticity is, however, doubted by Abû Abî Farhâd (see his preface to note Marâghî's edition). On his way back to al-Kuraywân via Cairo, two other works were completed: (1) K. Mushkil ibn-Kur'an, written in 390/1001 in Jerusalem (16 ms. extant, Brockelmann, i, 515, S, i, 719, and cf. introd. to the critical edition by Yaşîn M. al-Sawwâs, Damascus n.d., 2 vols.; further edition by Hâtîm S. al-Dâmîn, Baghdây ca. 1970); and (2) K. al-Tâhirah, originally meant as a mere introduction to be memorised by beginners, which was later elaborated by Makkari and published in 424/1038 as K. al-Kalâgh an udâjîh al-kirda-ibâd (4 ms., ed. Muhyî al-Dîn Râmânî, Damascus, 2 vols.; Hâtîm S. al-Dâmîn, Baghdây ca. 1970). This longer version not only gives the fuller insâds for the readings but also grammatical justifications (isâfîn) for them, following closely the method first adopted by Abû Abî Fârîsî (d. 377/987 [q.v.]), whose K. al-Hudjâbâ, which was well known to Makkari, constitutes a complete Kur'an commentary discussing the readings presented by Ibn Muqaffah in his K. al-Sâbâ'a, see GDQ, iii, 116-43.
Makkari did not remain long in his home town, but — for reasons unknown to us — left al-Kuraywân for al-Andalus in 393/1003 and established himself as a teacher of Kur'an reading (musnûn) at Cordova at the Masjid al-Nukhayla in the 'Aštâr quarter. He soon won a wide reputation for his learning, and was appointed between 397/1007 and 399/1009 by al-Muzaffar 'Abd al-Malîk b. Abî 'Amir (see 3Amîrîs)
as mukra to the Mosque of the Zahira quarter, newly established by the Amirids. After the fall of Muhammad b. Higham al-Mahdi (399/1009) to teach at the Friday Mosque of Cordova. There he continued to teach until the end of the civil war, when the vizier Abu 'l-Hazm b. Djahwar [see DJAHWARIS] appointed him imam and preacher to the same mosque (after 425/1031), which office he held until his death on 2 Muharram 437/21 July 1045.

At Cordova, most of his works (numbering over 80, on various topics such as philosophy, history, and mostly on kir'a) were written. Two of the extant taqweed records have played a major role in the development of the kir'a's disciplines, al-Ri'ta ya li-taqweed al-kir'a wa-lafs al-tilawa (preserved in 9 mss., ed. Ahmed Farhät, Damascus 1973) is considered as one of the earliest systematic treatises on taqweed. His Sharh kali' al-wala' wa-mu'jam wu la-yad fi-l-qad'a (4 mss., ed. Ahmed Farhät, Damascus 1978) treats the rhetorical qualities of the three particles monographically and is a useful source for the study of kur'an rhetoric. A work unique of its kind is his K. al-lba'na fi ma'u'ni l-kir'a (4 mss., ed. Muhuyi al-Din Ramdan, Damascus 1979), previous edition by Abu-Farhät Shahabi, Cairo 1960) discussing problems arising from the existence of several mutually incompatible readings. Whereas his comprehensive Kur'an commentary al-Hidaya seems to be lost, his monograph on the special taqsiir problem of the abrogated verses is extant: al-IIdah li-nasik al-Kur'an wa-mu'jam (4 mss., ed. Ahmed Farhät, Riyadh 1976). Makkī's work has in later generations been overshadowed by that of his younger colleague al-Danni and the later scholastic commentators resting upon al-Danni's writings. Yet some of Makkī's treatises have exercised even a direct influence on later scholars, see Pretzl, in GIL, iii, 214. Some of his work has come to light again only in recent years, and has still to be studied as to its intrinsic value and its impact on later developments.


Biographical sources: Ibn Bashkuwal, K. al-Sīla fi ta'īrīgh 'ummat al-Analus, Cairo 1966, ii, 631-3; Abu Barakat al-Anhārī, Nuzhāt al-abākh fi tabākāt al-adhāl, ed. I. al-Samarra'ī, Baghdad 1970, 238; al-Dabbī, Bughyat al-mulamis fi ta'īrīgh ridgāl ahl al-Analus, Cairo 1967, 469; Yākūt al-Rūmī, Muṣām a al-adhāl, ed. Margoliouth, London 1925, ii, 173-5; al-Kīfī, Isbāh al-nuṣūrā', al-Ahmād ibn al- nutritious, though some real mortar joints in white plaster can also be found) to create a vertical emphasis, a horizontal one, or both. Other monuments, however, are in carved ashlar of yellow, grey or red sandstone slabs on a rubble core, which in many cases has cumbled with disastrous effect; some of this stone is local, from Qandhārī, and the rest imported from Qaybūtāna and Gufjarāt. The brick buildings are set on stone bases to withstand the rise of moisture charged with destructive salt. The glazed are generally white, cobalt, and turquoise; though the tiles designs may be stereotypical, the technical standard of the dense red brickwork is very high, and the true joints can hardly be seen. Glazed brick in chevron patterns is also used to face some domes internally, as may be seen in one of the earlier buildings on the hill, the tomb of Farhāt Khan's sister (898/1492).

The mausoleum of Djam Nizam al-Din Nīndū (915/1509) at the northernmost end of the site illustrates the recently Hindu origin of the Qajīpūr Sammās; square in plan, its four stone walls are decorated entirely with Hindu carving, except for a frieze of Kur'ānic inscriptions in beautiful qalīlī. The architectural and sculptural elements are articulated by twelve other horizontal bands of motifs, one gāhiya, alternating with plain stone. This is set off by the heavily-worked carving on the rear of the mihrāb, surrounded by a corbelled balcony with arched openings. The incomplete nature of this work shows that it has been borrowed from a Hindu temple, complete with a miniature sikhāra, though some panels are Islamic. The interior is dominated by the use of squinch arches, in tiers of first eight, then sixteen, to carry the missing dome. Both their scale and the corbelled technique are reminiscent of Ilutmish's tomb at Dihīlī (ca. 632/1235), though the ornamentation is again limited to flat bands, friezes and rossettes like tilework. Two āthār pavilions nearby, each on eight columns, also incorporate Hindu work, with corbelled domes, monolithic banded pillars, and kalsā finsals (late 15th century).

The tomb of Sultan Ibrāhīm (966/1558), son of 1īsā Khān Tarkhān I, is an octagonal brick structure surrounding a square cell inside with a carefully-proportioned Persian dome on a cylindrical drum above. Each of the faces houses a recess within a pointed arch outside, those at the cardinal sides being taller, and containing a door with a window above in the flat itākh wall, while those at the angles form five-faceted niches. It may have been derived from the tomb of Mullā Ḥasan at Sulṭāniyyā (q.v.) (ca. 936/1530), though it lacks double storeys at the
angles, and its proportions are more compact. Traces of turquoise tiling can be seen on the dome, though its septal reinforcements remain. Outside, recessed panels house blank arches with rosettes in relief, and arched mihrab screens alternately, under bold string courses which rise around the ajalis of the entrance. It is Iranian in its restraint. The mausoleum of the apparently paranoid Mirzâ Muhammad Bâki Târkhân (d. 993/1585), which follows the same pattern, still has merlons over the courses which rise around the ajalis
of the doorway to the south. The walls, outside and in, are of unglazed red brick with blue strips in the joints. Glazed bricks make a chevron pattern inside the dome, with bands of tiles below. The mausoleum of the Bâki Beg, the last independent Târkhan ruler, died while in submission to Akbar’s court, he too was buried at Makli, in the southernmost great tomb, in 1009/1601. Set in a once similar stone enclosure, with fine Kûrânic epigraphs around the gate, which has four rosettes set boldly in the tympanum, and over the mihrab elaborated with a faceted recess, flanked by miniature lotus posts and superimposed aedicules, the mausoleum itself is a domed octagon, whose alternating courses of venetian red and turquoise brick, with both joints picked out in white, reflect the alternately broad and narrow coursing of the yellow sandstone. The plan differs from Sultan Ibrâhîm’s tomb only in that the panels housing the angle arches are recessed. The outer dome has fallen, though its sepulchral reinforcements remain. The inner one is still carried on two tiers of tilework, and on the walls below is a tiled dado, which once had a counterpart outside. The three ajânâs and the tympanum of the doorway to the south house geometric ajâlis, surmounted by panels of Kûrânic inscription in white on cobalt.

The building housing the tomb of Djan Bâbâ (d. 1017/1608), with others from 964/1557 onwards, is by contrast a rectangular pavilion originally covered by three domes, of which the central one remains. The brown stone enclosure wall is heavily carved with both relief and incised work, with blank arcing carried fully developed polychromes and rosettes. The rich mihrab, with mukarnas vaulting, is housed in a carefully-conceived two storied backing.

The mausoleum of 1sâ Khân Târkhân II (d. 1054/1644) combines a square domed central cell with surrounding verandahs in two stories, two rows of ten square columns being on each face. The middle two columns in the outer row rise free of the gallery behind, like those of the Djanî Masjid at Ahmadâbâd, to support triple arches with lotus-buds on the intrados, below a remarkable rising parapet which is effectively a pîdishak for each face. The main dome, surmounted by a mahâpada finial, is surmounted by a series of crescent-shaped crenelations in each bay; it has, unusually, eight facets. The buff Kâthisâvâ sandstone surfaces of walls, pillars and lintels are wrough with carving of both types which in its swelling intricacy recalls that of Fathpur Sikri (1585-87) [q.v.]. The monolithic pillars of the upper level have scrolled bracket capitals of an Indian type, but those below have tapering honeycombs of a western Islamic kind. The building is at the centre of a large court with high stone walls, arcaded within, and with a massive iwân in the middle of each side once crowned by a smooth squinched vault. Hindu influence is evident in the ajânâh balconies projecting either side of these, and in the rows of niches forming the plinth. The work is reported to have been built in the Nawârî lifetime of Mirza Muhammad Bâki Târkhân (1048/1638), again a square cell rising into a dome, with an iwân on each cardinal face outside, but here the corners are built as heavy cylindrical towers containing spiral stairs, and the dome, slightly bulbous above a recessed springing, is apparently the first of its kind in Northern India: it is close to that of the Musjid-i Shâh at Maskhad (855/1451) in shape, and was once sheathed in light blue tile. The walls, outside and in, are of unglazed red brick with blue strips in the joints. Glazed bricks make a chevron pattern inside the dome, with bands of tiles below. The cenotaph and headstone carry especially fine carving. Another bulbous dome, with more pronounced shoulders, roofs the open tomb of Tughrul Beg (1090/1679), surrounded by mukarnas, and above twelve carved square pillars. Honeycomb capitals support a trabeated octagon below the arches of an Islamic zone of transition, and chevron vaulting.

**Bibliography:** The available material is uneven. For tilework, see H. Cousens, *Portfolio of illustrations of Sind tiles*, London 1906. His description of Makli in his *Antiquities of Sind, Calcutta 1929*, repr. Oxford and Karachi 1975, contains first-hand analyses of inscriptions and chronograms. See also *Makli*, xi (P. A. Andrews)
Yam territory he took Badr, situated at an altitude of 6,600 feet in waddi Badr, which later became the MakramTs' fortress near the town and left a garrison there. The MakramTs now became more active in Yaman.


The earliest known member of the family, ʿ safi al-Dīn Muḥammad b. al-Fahd al-Makrami, is said to have been the first of them to settle in the town of Badr in the Wadī Hibatnā in northern Nadjran, which later remained the usual residence of the Makramīs. When Sulaymān b. Hasan, founder of the Sulaymānī community, died in 1109-1160 (1697-1747)asserted his authority over the Ismāʿili community in Yaman. The Makramīs thereafter continued to interfere, by force and diplomacy, in the affairs of the Al Khayrāt dynasty until its fall ca. 1285/1868. They were aided by the fact that the Al Khayrāt were usually forced to employ Yaman mercenaries as the backbone of their army.

The power of the Makramīs reached a peak under Hibat Allah b. Ismaʿil and his son successor Diyar b. Ismaʿil who fashioned the strategy of conquering a mountain fortress in Saʿīf (before 1164/1751) and holding it against all attacks of the Zaydī imām and of the adventurer Abū ʿUlamā al-Madhāri. He forced the amīr Muḥammad al-Khayrāt into an alliance. According to modern Hadramī authors, he invaded Hadramawt, for the first time in 1170/1757, and proceeded to uproot the Zaydīs there and to abolish tribal law and customs. The Makramīs over Hadramawt appears to have lasted for some time, perhaps still during the reign of his brother Hasan (see R. B. Serjeant, Hūd and other pre-Islamic prophets of Hadramawt, in Le Mouton, ivi [1954], 132, repr. in idem, Studies in Arabian history and civilization. London 1981, with addendum, p. i). In 1178/1764 he invaded Nadjīf and inflicted a crushing defeat on the Wahhabīs at al-Haʾir. He pushed on further, approaching al-Riyād, but then agreed to a settlement and withdrew, spurning the offer of an alliance and joint anti-Wahhabi action by ʿUrayrī, the ruler of Al-Ahsāʿ. The Wahhabi chronicles seem to be mistaken in identifying the leader of the campaign as Hasan b. Hibat Allah. They, as well as Niebuhr, describe the leader as the lord of Nadjīf. Yet it is certain that Hasan did not succeed his brother until before the latter's death six years later. Ismaʿil is also the author of an esoteric Ismāʿili commentary on the Kurʾān, Misād al-taṣnim (ed. R. Strothmann, Göttingen 1944-55), of answers to questions by Hasan b. Sāmān and of other works (listed by Strothmann, op. cit., introd. 39). His brother and successor Hasan b. Hibat Allah (1184-9/1770-5) after his accession reaffirmed the Makramīs' domination in the territories of Muhammad al-Khayrāt, who had tried to assert his independence, by defeating him and occupying the town of Harad for two months. In 1189/1775 he led a second campaign against the Wahhabīs to al-Ḥāʾir and Dūrmā. The Wahhabi defence proved more effective this time, and Hasan, struck by illness, decided to retreat and died on the way back. In 1202/1788 "the lord of Nadjīf", presumably the 36th dāʾīʿ Abū ʿAli b. Ismaʿil b. Shakīb ʿAlī (1195-1225/1781-1810), joined forces with some of the tribes of the al-Dawārīt in order to prevent the Wahhabīs from taking possession of this region neighbouring Nadjīf, but was forced to retreat unsuccessfully. In 1220/1805 Saʿūd b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz sent a numerous Wahhabi army to conquer Nadjīf. After an unsuccessful assault on Badr, the Wahhabīs retreated having lost a fort near the town and left a garrison there.

The Makramīs now became more active in Yaman.
In 1237/1822 they seized Zabid for six months, and in 1241/1825-6 they sacked al-Hudayda. In 1241/1825-6 they sacked al-Hudayda. In 1277/1860 he seized al-Hayma and held it against all Zaydi efforts to expel him. Other conquests were of less duration. According to Manzioni (El Yemen, Rome 1884, 177-8), he entered into an anti-Ottoman alliance with the Sultan Ismā'il of Egypt, cut the Ottoman trade between the Hudsonaya and San'a', and raided the Ottoman provinces of al-Hudayda and al-Lubayya. In 1289/1872 the Ottoman Ahmad Mukhtar Pasha set out from the Hudayda to conquer Haraz. The dā'ī surrendered in the mountain fortress of 'Attāra after having received a promise of safety. When the Pasha was informed of the heretical doctrines contained in the captured Ismā'ili books, he ordered the dā'ī, his sons and other leading Makramis to be sent to the Porte. The dā'ī died on the way in al-Hudayda, perhaps murdered, and his son Ahmad perished at sea. Thereafter, the Makrami dā'īs again resided in Badr. They reached a modus vivendi with the Ottomans in Yaman and declared an invitation of the Sayyid Muhammad b. 'Ali al-Idrisi, ruler of 'Asir, to join an anti-Ottoman alliance, fearing Ottoman reprisals against their possessions in Haraz.

In 1532/1933, after the failure of prolonged Sa'ūdī-Yamanī negotiations concerning the status of Najdrān, the army of Imām Yāḥya Hamid al-Dīn seized Badr. The 45th dā'ī, 'Ali b. Muhsin Al Shībānī (1331-5/1913-36), probably a descendant of Hasan b. Isma'īl, fled to Abba in Sa'ūdī territory. The Yamanī army destroyed the houses of the Makramī dā'īs and desecrated the tombs of their ancestors. Strong local reaction forced it to withdraw and paved the way for the Sa'ūdī takeover of Najdrān, which was sealed by the Sa'ūdī-Yamanī treaty of May 1934. 'Ali b. Muhsin was allowed to return to Badr, and all members of the family in Najdrān, said to have numbered 145, were given a small pension by the Sa'ūdī government in lieu of the contributions which they had rendered in the mountain fortress of Haraz. The army of Sayyid Muhammad b. Nāṣir Al-→Bahārī entered Najdrān and镯. Sealed by the Sa'ūdī government in lieu of the contributions which they had rendered in the mountain fortress of Haraz.


MAKRAN, the coastal region of southern Balūcistān, extending roughly from the Somnani Bay in the East to the eastern fringes of the region of Baghārdā (see BAGMARD in Suppl.) in the west. The modern borders of the Makran thus bisect the mediaeval Makran. The east-west running Siyāhān range of mountains, just to the north of the Makrānī and Rakhshān valleys, may be regarded as Makrān's northern boundary. In British Indian times, this range formed the boundary between the southwestern part of the Kalat native state [see KILAR] and the Makrānī one [q. v.]; the easternmost part of Makran extends within the other, native state of Las Bāla [q. v.]. At this time, the part of Makrān within British India was often called Kēc Makrān to distinguish it from Persī Makrān.

The topography of Makrān comprises essentially east-west running parallel ranges of mountains; the coastal range, going up to 3,180 ft.; the central Makrān range, going up to 7,500 ft.; and the Siyāhān range, going up to 6,700 ft. Between these lie the narrow Kēc valley and the wider Rakhshān-Makrānī one, where some agricultural activity, chiefly dates, cereals and rice, can be practised by irrigation. Considerable fishing is possible from the coastalland itself, otherwise arid, but this region possesses few major harbours, except for Pasni and Gwādar [q. v. in Suppl.] in what is now Pakistani Balūcistān, and Ga'bahār (now an important base of the British and Indian Navy, with free access to the Indian Ocean) and Dāshī in what is now Persian Makrān. The only inland town of significance in Pakistani Makrān is Turbat, in the Kēc valley; the main towns of inland Persian Makrān are Nīshābār, Bampūr [q. v.] and the modern administrative centre of Persian Balūcistān, Irāngār (the mediaeval Fahrajī). Climatically, the coasts are in part affected by the southwestern monsoon, but the inland parts are extremely hot and arid. Makrān as a whole can never have supported more than an exiguous population.

The etymology of the name Makrān has been much discussed, but the popular Persian etymology from makh→kharin “fish eaters”, echoing the Greek description of the inhabitants of the coastlands as ἰδροφόφαγοι, cannot of course be credited. More likely it is a corruption of the name Magan, which is known in texts of the Sumerian and old Akkadian period as a territory somewhere in or beyond the lower Persian Gulf region having trade connections with Mesopotamia. Recently, J. Hansman has proposed the identification of the ancient Magan with modern western, substantially Persian, Makrān, and the other region of Melukhkha, described as being beyond Magan according to the ancient Mesopotamian texts, with modern Pakistani Makrān (A Peripat of Magan and Melukha, in BSOS, xxxvii [1973], 554-87). Magan would therefore be the Maka of the Old Persian inscriptions (described as a satrapy of Darius, and here apparently covering the whole of Makrān or Balūcistān), and the Makarēnē, seemingly so-called in the Seleucid period and certainly called thus in Byzantine Greek sources; but a derivation from Magan does not explain the intrusive r of Makrān. By the time of Alexander the Great, eastern Makrān was known to the Greeks as Gedrosia and its people as Gedrosii (a name possibly Iranian in origin, hence younger than the ancient one Melukhkha); the conqueror travelled through here on his way back from the Indus valley in 325 B.C., turning northwesterns and inland, probably from near Gwādar, to the Bampūr valley and thus by the Siyāhān depression, whilst his general Nearchus sailed along the Makrān coast to Charax at the head of the Gulf. In Parthian usage we have the
MAKRAN — AL-MAKRIZI

form Makuran (Mkwrn in the Shapur inscription of the Kacba-yi Zaradusht) and in Pahlavi the form Makulun (Muwlun) in the Kārār inscription of Naksh-i Rustam (P. Gignoux, Glossaire des inscriptions persanes et parasites, Corpus inscriptionum Iranicarum, Suppl. Series, i, London 1972, 28, 57), echoed in early Islamic times in the Makurān/Mukurān of Arabic poetry (e.g. al-Hakam b. 'Amr al-Taghlibi, in al-Tabarānī, i, 2708, and Ašḥā Hamdān, Divān, ed. Geyer, 328). In general, however, eastern Makrān must have remained until the Muslim invasions within the cultural and political sphere of India, and later, under the influence of the Brahmin kingdom of Sind.

Arab raiders reputedly entered Makrān from Kirmān during 'Umar's caliphate, but were deterred by the appalling desolation and inhospitableness of the terrain (sentiments subsequently further expressed by Aśgā Hamdān in his verses, see loc. cit.). In Mu'āwiya's caliphate, Ziyād b. Abīthī, governor of the east, sent thither Siyān b. Salāma b. al-Mubābīk al-Huqail, who succeeded in a garrience there, according to another tradition, Makrān was invaded by Ḥakīm b. Dābāla al-'Abī (al-Baladūrī, Fistsh, 433-4; Yākūt, Bulūdīn, ed. Beirut, v, 179-80). From here, raids were directed northwards into Kīkān in the region known to the Arabs at the time as Tūrān (q. v. in ḤF), which came to contain the mediaeval Islamic town of Kusdār (q. v.), and Makrān also formed the springboard for Muhammad b. Kasim al-Thakafī's invasion of Sind (q. v.) in 92/711.

The mediaeval Islamic geographers describe Makrān as a region of scant population and few amenities, its main product being sugar-cane syrup (fasīd, see ḤF art. Sukkar). The Hubūd al-ʿālam (ca. 372/982), tr. 123, § 27, comm. 373, reckons Makrān as part of Sind. It names Tīz, in the Ċabhābar bay, as Makrān's chief port, together with inland towns which were centres of trading like Kīz or Kīdī (modern Kī), the seat of the king of Makrān, and Rāsk, Panībdhūr, etc.; Tīz is described by al-Mukaddasī, 478, as a flourishing port with fine ribās, and Panībdhūr as the kāsha or chief-lieu of the region. The local ruler of Makrān whose seat was at Kīz must have been from the family mentioned in connection with the history of a thoroughgoing invasion of the region by Miskwāyih, in Tadžīrī al-amām, ii, 299-9, tr. v, 320-1, 'Abdū al-Dawlah's general 'Abī b. ʿĀli had penetrated to Tīz and western Makrān in 360/970 as part of the operations to subdue the disturbed province of Kirmān, and had brought all these regions under Ḫūyīd allegiance (cf. Bosworth, The Banu Ḫiyās of Kirmān (320/779/932-60), in Iran and Islam, in memory of the late Vladimir Minorsky, ed. idem, Edinburgh 1971, 117-18). With the subsequent rise of the Ḫuznawīds (q. v.), the local ruler of Makrān, named by Bayhākī as Maḍān, submitted to Sebūtīn and Muḥāmmed. After 417/1026, his son ʿĀlī likewise acknowledged the Ḫuznawīzī suzerainty, but Sultan Muḥāmmed's son Maṣʿūd during 421-2/1030-1 sent an army into Makrān which placed ʿAbī's brother Abu ʿAlī-Askar on the throne there; clearly, Makrān was at this time a loosely-tributary state of the Ḫuznawīzī empire on the same sort of footing as the Ẓiyārids of Gurgān and Ẓabārūstān or the Ṣaffārīds of Sīstān before the imposition of the Ḫuznawīzī direct rule in 393/1003 (M. Naṣīmī, The life and times of Sultan Muḥāmmed of Ghazna, Cambridge 1931, 79-80; R. Gelpke, Sultan Maṣʿūd I. von Gōzna. Die drei ersten Jahre seiner Herrschaft (941/1050-4/1052), Munich 1957, 314). During the next centuries Makrān appears little on the general scene of eastern Islamic history. At times, outside empires, like those of the Ǧhorīds and Khwāẓar-Šāhs (q.v.) and the āmīrs of the Il-Khānids after the death of Abū Sa'id (Ibn Bāṭūṭa, ii, 124; ʿAmīr Maḥdī Dīnār), exercised some measure of suzerainty there, but local potentates must have held all internal power. Marco Polo found Makrān coast on his way home in 1299, describing it as Kəsmacoran (= Kīdī Makrān) and as the last of the provinces of India, under a separate ruler of its own (Sir Henry Yule, The book of Ser Marco Polo the Venetian, London 1871, ii, 334-5; cf. P. Pelliot, Notes on Marco Polo, ii, 759-60). It was during these centuries that Makrān was largely colonised by Balūṭ tribes, Makrān being predominantly Balūṭ-speaking today. The region's history may now be followed in the EP art. Balūcīstān and the EP arts. Kīlāt and Lās Bēlā.


MAKRĪN b. MUHAMMAD b. ḤUZZITHūRI [see AL-BUṢŪTIRĪ, b. MUḤAMMAD AL-BUGHTURI]

AL-MUḤAMMAD b. ṢĀḤIB AL-KIRMANI [see AL-MAKRĪZĪ].—TAKI AL-DīN ABU ʿL-FĀʾĪBM AHMAD b. ʿALĪ b. ʿABD AL-KĀDIR [766-845/1364-1442], Egyptian historian. His father (d. 779/1378 at the age of fifty), a daughter of the wealthy philologist and jurist Ibn al-Saʿīgh (d. 776/1375). He was born in Cairo, apparently in 765/1363-4. The nisba Makrizī refers to a quarter in Bālabakk where his paternal family came from. His paternal grandfather, ʿAbī al-Kādir b. Muhammad (ca. 677-733/1278-1332, see Ibn Ḥadjar, Durar, i, 391 f.) was a Hawai, his maternal grandfather, who influenced his early upbringing, a Hanafī. His father was a Shāffi, and he himself opted for Šāfī'īsm in early manhood; he also developed (non-juridical) Zāhirī tendencies (cf. I. Goldzieder, Die Zāhiriten, Leipzig 1884, 196-202). He received the thorough education of a youth born into a well-to-do scholarly family, studying with famous scholars and eventually being able to boast of '600 šaykhās.' Like his father, but with greater success initially, he exercised a variety of administrative and scholarly functions, such as those of writer of taudūtī's, deputy judge, muhāṣib (for terms lasting only a few months each in 801, 802, and 807), preacher in the Mosque of ʿAmr and the Madrasa of al-Ḥasan, imām and chief administrative of the Mosque of al-Ḥākim, and professor of hadīth in the Muʿayyadiyā. In Damascus, where he spent about ten years beginning in 810/1408, he held teaching positions at the Ġagrafiyyā and Ikbāliyyā, and was chief financial administrator of the Kalānīsyya and the great Nūrī Hospital, although this last position was reserved by law for the Shāffi judge of Damascus. He had actually been offered that judgeship by al-Nāṣir b. Barkūk, but had refused. While in Syria, he appears to have decided to give up an unsatisfactory public career and devote himself full-time to historical scholarship (instead of part-time as he had done before). He did so after his return to Egypt. He spent a number of years in Mecca and died in Cairo in early February 1442. The last of his children had died already in 826/1423 (Salek, iv, 2, 651). A new, Nāṣir al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Muhammad (801-67/1399-1462), survived him (al-Sakhāwī, Dauq, ix, 150).

The germs of his determination to become an
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historian were perhaps planted by Ibn Khaldun, with whom he appears to have been on familiar terms; according to Dauë, ii, 24, he once predicted on the basis of Ibn Khaldun's horoscope that the latter would again be appointed to office. With his fellow historians, such as al-'Ayni [q.e.] and Ibn Hadjar, he seems to have had professional, and perhaps also personal, difficulties, although relations remained outwardly proper. Ibn Hadjar's devoted student al-Sakhawi displays an outspokenly negative attitude toward him. His contemporaries were sometimes critical of his scholarship, cf., e.g., Ibn Taghribirdi, Niju'm, ed. Popper, vi, 756, tr., part iv, 143, anno 841. Yet his works were not only numerous and often planned on the grand scale, but they also proved to be of lasting importance.

For older editions, translations, and studies, most of them still useful for scholarship, see Brockelmann (below, Bibliography), whose bibliographical references are not repeated here. Best known is al-Maṣʿūs ṣa'īd 'an l-ṭabāk wa l-aḏrāk, son of one-half of the ed. Bulāk 1270, repr. Beirut, ca. 1970; English translation by K. Stowasser in progress. It deals with the topography of Fustat and Cairo as well as with Alexandria and Egyptian history in general. According to the critical Ibn Hadjar (al-Sakhawi), al-Makrizi used much of the material assembled earlier by al-Awhadi (761-811/1359-1408). He made no mention of that in the Ḥikāt (in the way in which, for instance, Ibn Kuṭlūbghā acknowledged that he had used al-Makrizi's notes for his Tādī al-tarāṣīm, but elsewhere he spoke of his indebtedness to al-Awhadi (see Dauë), i, 358 f.). The accusation of plagiarism seems too harsh. The preservation of older sources now apparently lost is one of the Khiṭaṭ's greatest merits.

Among his many other works are a history of the Fāṭimidīm (Jāmāl al-ḥunāfī, ed. Djamāl al-Dīn al-Shayyāl, Cairo 1367/1948, 1387/1967; ed. A. Hilmy, Cairo, 1971-3, see C. Cahen and M. Adda, in Arabic, xxii [1975], 302-20) and a history of the Ayyūbīds and Māmulīūkīs (Dār al-sūn, ed. and tr. by G. C. Anawati, see MIDEO, xiii [1974], 150). He also published brief treatises on minerals (al-Maṣābīd wa l-sānīyā) and bees (Bahr, or Dīhr al-naḥl, ed. al-Shayyāl, Cairo 1946). A general work on geography, entitled Dāmī al-azhār min al-ṣawq al-miṭrī, has not yet been sufficiently studied, see Ibn 'Abīd al-Munīm al-Hīmāyari, at the end.

Bibliography: Ibn Hadjar, Ḥikāt, ii, 14, 19, 56, 62, 67; Dauë, iii, 11-36, tr., part v, 182. Still later biographical notes, such as the one in Ibn Ṭūās, ed. M. Mostafa, ii, 231 f. (Bibl. Isl. 36), contain no new information. Further, Brockelmann, ii, 75-76, 673, S.II, 36-8, also EP, ed. C. Cahen; Dārūs wa l-Makrīzī, Cairo 1391/1971 (lectures given in 1966 by six scholars). (F. Rosenthal)

MAKRUH (A.) "reprehensible action, action approved of", one of the five juridical qualifications (ākhām [q.e.] of human actions according to the Sharī'a [q.e.].

MAKS, toll, customs duty is a loanword in Arabic and goes back to the Aramaic maks, cf. Hebrew mekei and Assyr. mrisu; from it is formed a verb māk-s i, II, III and maksā, collector of customs. According to the Arabic tradition preserved in Ibn Sāda, even in the Dāhiliyya there were market-dues called maks, so that the word must have entered Arabic very early. It is found in Arabic papryi towards the end of the 1st century A.H.

C. H. Becker dealt with the history of the maks, especially in Egypt, and we follow him here. The old law books use maks in the sense of 'shrī', the tenth levied by the merchants, more properly the equivalent of an excise duty than of a custom. They still show some opposition to the maks, then it give due legal force, but the word continued to have unpleasant association, cf. the hadīq: inna sāḥib al-maks fi l-nār "the tax-collector will go to hell". Goldziher has suggested that the Jewish view of the publican may have had some influence here. There are six traditions about maks in the Kithāb al-Amaqal by Abū 'Ubayd al-Kāsim b. Sallām (Cairo 1533, nos. 1624-9, Brockelmann, S.I, 166), and al-Suyūṭī wrote a Risāla fi dhāmm al-maks (Brockelmann, II, 152, no. 174).

The institution of the customs duty was adopted by Islam about the beginning of the Umayyad period or shortly before it. While theological theory demanded a single customs area in Islam, the old frontiers remained in existence by land and water, and Egypt, Syria and Mesopotamia were separate customs areas. The amount of the duty in the canon law was settled not so much by the value of the goods as by the person, i.e. the religion of the individual paying it; but in practice, attention was paid to the article and there were preferential duties, and no attention was paid to the position of the goods in respect of Islam. The laws of taxation were very complicated and graduated; the

work on certain aspects of the biography of the Prophet (Imāma al-aswād, ed. Maḥmūd Shākir, Cairo 1941), a biography of Tamīm al-Dārī (Dauë al-ṣabīr, ed. M. A. 'Aṣghūr, Cairo 1372/1952), a treatise on caliph and rulers who performed the pilgrimage (al-Dhahab al-masbūk, ed. al-Shayyāl, Cairo 1935), a discussion of the preferred position of the Prophet's family (Maṣ'īf rādātī bi-l-ḥāshār fi l-khākī al-sāma' lān adhām, ed. M. A. 'Aṣghūr, Cairo 1973), attest to his religious interests, as does a work on dogmatics not yet studied (Tādī al-tārīḫī, fi l-tālīf 'an fī l-targīb wa l-tālīf, ed. M. A. 'Abīd al-Munīm, Beirut, 1935), a discussion of his later studies, see e.g. D. P. Little, xix [1974], 252-68), also on the Ayyūbīds (Dawār al-sūn, Cairo 1971, see idem in JESHO, ix [1962], 1-90). A

The institution of the customs duty was adopted by Islam about the beginning of the Umayyad period or shortly before it. While theological theory demanded a single customs area in Islam, the old frontiers remained in existence by land and water, and Egypt, Syria and Mesopotamia were separate customs areas. The amount of the duty in the canon law was settled not so much by the value of the goods as by the person, i.e. the religion of the individual paying it; but in practice, attention was paid to the article and there were preferential duties, and no attention was paid to the position of the goods in respect of Islam. The laws of taxation were very complicated and graduated; the
duties rose in course of time from the tenth ('ushr) to the fifth (khums).

The Egyptian mahs was levied on caravans and small dues, which became known as mukās, especially the mukās mukusiyya. The latter introduced not only an increase in the ground-tax but also a large number of smaller taxes which were called ma‘ātun and marṣīfī and included among the kihālī, the taxes to be paid according to lunar years. Such artifices (known as mukās from the Fatimid period and latter as mazām, hāmāt, radd, musama'ah, and mardūk) were destined to develop in time into the main form of oppressive the people and to become one of the principal causes of the economic decline in Egypt, until under the Mamluks a limit was reached where hardly anything was left untaxed and mukās were even granted as fiefs and "misfortune became general" (see 'ammat al-balwa). The small taxes, however, (but not the monopolies) were repeatedly abolished by reforming rulers, indeed 'ibāl al-mukās (other terms are radd, musama'ah, radd, ma’dwin) even formed part of the style and title of such rulers. Thus it is recorded of Ahmad b. Tulun that he abolished some duties, and later of Salāh al-Dīn, Baybars, Kallawīn and his sons Khalīl and Nāṣr Muhammad, of al-Ashraf Shāh-Bān, Barqūk and Djamak. Al-Makrīzī gives a long list of mukās abolished by Salāh al-Dīn, and al-Kalākhandī gives copies of the texts of musama'ah, which are decrees of the Mamluks sultans abolishing taxes or granting exemption from dues which were sent to the governors and read from the māndars and sometimes contain very full details, while shorter decrees were probably carved on stone and are given among the fragments published by van Berchem. It would of course be wrong to deduce from such abolutions of taxes that the government was a particularly good one, while on the other hand, the continually-recurring extort of the same taxes shows that the abuses had been restored in the interval. Al-Makrīzī, Khīti, i, 111, concludes with the well-known jibe at the Copts: "even now there are mukās, which are in the control of the vizier, but bring nothing to the state but only to the Copts, who do exactly as they like with them to their great advantage".

A group which particularly suffered from the mukās were the pilgrims to Mecca from the Maghrib. The Spanish traveller Ibn Qubayr [q.v.], who as a pilgrim passed by Egypt in 1183, saw at Alexandria, 'Ayyūbī and Dūqda many proofs of mukās and waṣa‘īf mukusiyya. He wrote a poem about them and sent it to Salāḥ al-Dīn, whom he admired. But he noted tāmkīs and darība mukusiyya even in Syria and Sicily. About that time, al-Makhzūmī wrote his Minḥāj, with lists of mukās and other duties (khums, wāqī, kaf, matīq). Among the great variety of dues, which were of course not all levied at the same place and at the same time, were the following: kihālī taxes on houses, baths, ovens, wells and gardens; harbour dues in al-Dīrāz and Cairo at "the corn-quay" (sābī al-ghalla) and at the arsenal (sinā‘a), also levied separately on each passenger; market-dues for goods and caravans (bāqī‘īs) also called for horses, camels, mules, cattle, sheep, poultry and slaves; meat, fish, salt, sugar, pepper, oil, vinegar, turnips, wool, silk, linen and cotton; wood, earthware, coal, halfa grass, straw and henna; wine and oil-presses, tanned goods; brokerage (samara) charges on the sale of wool, dates and linen. There were taxes on markets, drinking-houses and brothels, which were euphemistically called ru‘ām al-ulāyā. Warders deprive prisoners of everything they have; indeed, this right is sold to the highest bidder; officers consume the fiels of their soldiers; peasants pay their lords forced labour (wa'ammat al-balwa). The author of the poem al-Makhzūmī, who preceded the most famous versifier in this field, Ibn Durayd (died 321/933), also cites many officials (shādī, muhtasib, mubdshirun etc.) and included among the shaddīs, muhtasīb, mubdshirun and many officials (shādī, muhtasib, muṣāḥirun and wa‘alād) also accept them; when a campaign is begun, the merchants pay a special war-tax and a third of inheritances falls to the state; when news of victories is received and when the Nile rises, levies are made; the dhimmīs, in addition to the pay-tax, have to contribute to the maintenance of the army; pilgrims to the Holy Sepulchre pay a tax in Jerusalem; separate special taxes are levied to maintain the embankments, the Nilometer etc.

Outside of Egypt we occasionally hear of the mukās as toll or market-duty, e.g. in Dūqda and in North Africa (cf. Dozy, Suppl., ii, 606). Ibn al-Hādi‘īdī, Makkīlī, i, 67, mentions a muṣāḥah mutāmīl, but does not use the word mukās in this sense.

The text of the poem calls for some remarks. In its present state, it numbers 249 and even 25 verses of 6 ≤ in Ibn Sālim’s ed. of the Dīwān of Ibn Durayd (Tunis 1973, 115-37), while al-Baghdadī (loc. cit.) counts only 239, so that it must be considered that several verses have been interpolated. In fact, al-Suyūṭī (Bughya, 32) asserted that the original maṭla’ opened with a conditional particle, then a protasis without an apodosis, followed by a feminine, of which it was not known to what it related; it is Kamāl al-Dīn Ibn al-Anbārī (died 577/1181) [see AL-ANBARI] who allegedly composed a prologue of ten verses, of which the last may have been retained as a true maṭla’. Independently of probable additions, the plan of this poem composed in praise of the Mikālūs [g. r.] appeared barely coherent: at the beginning, there is the topic of the beloved, the separation, the cruel destiny of the poet, then comes the relation of a pilgrimage containing a certain number of toponyms in 3; the personal glorification, followed by the panegyric of the Mikālūs (vv. 96-110), but the beloved appears again later on, possibly justifying the nostalgia expressed in the MTikālūs, returning to the beloved (vv. 503-66), laments and commentaries (E. Levi-Provengal, 460; Brockelmann, II, 758). The BN in Paris also possesses one of Hasan b. Habīb (Vajda, 459) and another of Muhammad b. Ahmad al-Hawwārī (ibid.; Brockelmann, II, 15). Hamdūn b. al-Hājjī (1174-1232/1760-1817) has also left us a Maksura on prosody and rhymes (E. Lévi-Provençal, Manuscrits arabes de Rabat, 292 (5), 497 (11); Lakhdar, Vie littéraire, 282).


(CH. PELLAT)
government service and military studies. Later, in 1859, the Mekteb-i mulkiyye was founded as a military college for the male members of Muslim ʿAlī's family and some of others. In 1833, a Maktab al-mukimmāt al-harbiyya was set up in Cairo and closed down after three years, probably purveying for munitions or serving as military workshops. In 1836, a Maktab al-muḥāsaba was set up to train the accountants which were so badly needed. In the Khedive Ismāʿīl's days, the general sense of "school" for maktab seems to have become so prevalent in Egypt that the term maktabaḥīṣya, i.e. "national schools" or "local schools", as were called the primary schools founded between 1868 and 1879 in Cairo, her suburbs and the provincial centres, was accepted unquestioningly. From there, the usage seems to have spread into other Arab lands, although maktab continued too to be widely used as synonymous with kutṭāb. In our days, in Turkey, a primary school is called iḳ mektep and the next stage, the "middle school", or ṭṛ aṣf mektep. In Malaysia, it has recently been used for "Institute", as in Maktab Pergeruan Ilm Kha ("Specialised Teachers' Training Institute") in Kuala Lumpur. Maktab was also the title of a journal, published since 1307 A.H., in Istanbul, in Turkish, first as a weekly, then twice a month, for the benefit of modern Persian usage, in addition to its basic meaning of "school", maktab has acquired also the connotation of an "instructive manual", as in Maktab-i Īlām ("A manual of instruction into Islam", 2 vols., Tehran 1334; see 1343), Mekteb-i Ṣulṭānīyye ("A manual of instruction in Șīrāz", annual, i. 1378-1383), or even Maktab-i ʿ ع ("A manual of love", title of a play by ʿAll ʿAsghar Shārīf, Tehran 1313). Otherwise, during the 20th century, maktab has increasingly come to mean, in Arabic, "bureau" or "department", generally in the official sense, such as Maktab al-ḥukm ("Bureau of research") and Maktab al-dāʾim ("Permanent bureau") or Maktab al-sāḥba ("Office of Health"). In modern Turkey, maktab is used in the Arab world for this institution. In Iran kutṭāb-khāna is used (the entry-word for the article in EI), and in modern Turkey kütüphane. Other equivalents are ḵūznāt al-kutub and dār al-kutub.

With the zeal for literary pursuits and the ever increasing composition of books, after the period of conquests, men of literary tastes accumulated handsome private collections of books and from the example of the Kūfān philologist ʿAbū ʾAmr al-Ḡaybīnī we can reasonably assume that it was a custom for authors to deposit copies of their works for reference in the mosque of their town or quarter. The libraries of the Umayyads contained books on all the principal branches of knowledge cultivated at that time. Librarians were appointed to take charge of them, and translators may have worked in them or, at least, have deposited their works in them.

Yousef Eche, by dint of reading most of the relevant Arabic literature, manuscript or printed, on history and geography, belles-lettres in prose or poetry, ʿfāk and ʿawāf, has assembled all available information on public and semi-public libraries in ʿIrāq, Syria and Egypt during the mediaeval period (up to the death of Hūlegū). Hence there is no need to look further than this valuable compendium for the history of libraries in the Arab world during these centuries. The first public libraries formed a fundamental part of the history of the first academies known as bāy al-ḥikma (q.v.). That established by Muʿāwiyah contained collections of hadīṯ and works such as that of ʿAbī b. Ṣhariyya, composed at the order of the caliph. This was inherited by his grandson, Ḵālid b. Yāzīd (q.v.), who devoted his life to the study of Greek sciences, particularly alchemy and medicine. We are told that he caused such books to be translated, and when an epidemic occurred at the beginning of the reign of ʿUmar b.
'Abd al-'Aziz, he commanded the books to be fetched out of the library (khizāna) to be made available for the people. The bayt al-hikma underwent its greatest development in the time of the 'Abbasid caliph al-Ma'āmun in Baghdis. To make this library as comprehensive as possible he had valuable Greek manuscripts purchased in the Byzantine empire and translated by a number of competent scholars into Arabic. This library contained books in all the sciences cultivated by the Arabs. After the transfer of the caliphate from Baghdis to Sāmarrā under al-Mu'taʃim, successor of al-Ma'āmun, the bayt al-hikma lost its academic character and was known solely as khizāna al-Ma'āmun. Visited by scholars up to the end of the 4th/10th century, it is not mentioned by writers after that time, and is thought either to have been incorporated into the library of one of the caliphs or to have been dispersed by the Saljuqs. It is known, however, that some of its books carrying the emblem of al-Ma'āmun were presented to Ibn Abi Usaybi'a [q.v.] at the time of his compiling the Tabaḳāt al-aʃība. The period of the bayt al-hikma was followed by that of the dār al-ṣilm [q.v.], an institution of semi-official character, established in the style of a public library with its own building for the purposes of disseminating sectarian propaganda and teaching the name and science. These were set up in Baghdad, Mawsil, Baṣra, Rām-Hurmuz and elsewhere; that in Baṣra, founded by Ibn Sawwār, being said to be the first ever established by waḳf. All of these are described in detail by Eche, and some by Mackensen (see Bibli.). The dār al-ṣilm engendered the madrasa [q.v.], and so the library is the father of the Arab university. Other celebrated libraries were those attached to the Nizāmiyya, and the Muntasiriyah madrasas in Baghdis, where there existed also many others attached to madrasas, mosques, riḥāṣ and mausoleums. Eche describes more than twenty of these, most of which were destroyed by Hulegii in 656/1258, as were those of other cities in ʿIrāk. Similar libraries were founded in Damascus, Aleppo and other cities in Syria, and in Egypt. The library collected by the Fātimid caliph al-Ḥākim [q.v.] in Cairo contained untold literary treasures and we learn that in the year 435/1043-4 the waẓir Abu ʿl-Kāsim ʿAbbās al-Dājrārī gave instructions for a catalogue of the books to be made and the bindings to be renewed, and he appointed Abū ʿl-Ḥaḍar al-Kudārī and Ibn ʿIṣām al-Warrāq to superintend the work. This library remained intact till the death of the last Fātimid caliph al-Ṣājīd, when Ṣāḥīb al-Dīn ordered it to be dissolved and the Kādi ʿl-Fāḍil [q.v.] acquired most of the books and deposited them in the library of the Fāḍiliyya madrasa which he founded, where they were soon neglected, and by the time of al-Kalḵāṣandi most of them had disappeared. This library is stated to have contained 6,500 volumes on the exact sciences alone, such as mathematics, astronomy, etc., and among its treasures was a globe of copper stated to have been constructed by Ptolemy and bearing an inscription stating that it had been acquired by Khaḍī b. Yaʿzīd b. Muʿāwiya. The Spanish Umayyad caliphs at Cordova possessed a library which achieved great renown. Al-Ḥakam II [q.v.] devoted his life to it, employing agents to collect books from all Islamic lands. It is said to have contained some 400,000 volumes, described in a catalogue of 44 volumes, each containing 40 leaves. Disastrously, it was plundered and largely destroyed in the time of his successors. After the conquest of Granada by the Catholic kings, in order to facilitate the conversion of the Moriscos, the order was given that all books in their possession should be handed over to the authorities for examination by experts, so that all useful works of philosophy, medicine and history might be retained and all others destroyed. Cardinal Cisneros, however, decreed that all books in Arabic should be burnt in a public square in Granada. We are frequently told of valuable private libraries which were placed at the disposal of learned men, as e.g. in the biographies of al-Suli [q.v.] we read of his large collection of books which were tastefully bound in red and yellow leather. Al-Safādī [q.v.] records in the biography of Ghars al-Nīmat al-Sābī that he founded in Baghdis a library of about 300 volumes for the use of students and that this library was shamelessly robbed by the librarian who had been placed in charge. In Persia, libraries allegedly existed at the time of the Achaemenids, as we hear from Ibn Nadim, but these were destroyed by Alexander the Great. In the 'Abbasid period libraries are recorded at Rām-Hurmuz (founded by Ibn Sawwār), Rayy and Isfahān (plundered by the Ghaznawid troops in 420/1029 and removed to Ghazna, but later destroyed there by the Qurṭid Sulṭān ʿAlī al-Dīn Ḥusayn). In Ṣirāz, the celebrated library founded by ʿAḍud al-Dawla contained 4,000 books written up to that time, all branches of learning (al-Maḳṭāz, 449, tr. in Pinto [see Bibli.], 278). When early in the 7th/13th century the Mongols swept over Persia we read that in addition to the loss of human life and the destruction of other valuable property untold quantities of priceless books were wantonly destroyed. Although some of the sultans of the Ilkhan patronised scholars and were keen friends of learning, no mention of a library from that period has as yet been found. The earliest of which we hear is, however, that of the saint Niẓām al-Dīn Awīlī, a contemporary of the Khalīfah and Tughluḳid sultans. Many of the Mughal emperors and their courtiers were dedicated bibliophiles and possessed private collections of great value, and fostered the development of the patronised scholar. This was dispersed after the traumatic events of the 1857-8 Indian Mutiny, and some of its valuable manuscripts came to the India Office Library and the Royal Asiatic Society; but many remain in various libraries of India and Pakistan. Sezgin records 46 libraries in India and 8 in Pakistan which have published catalogues of their Islamic manuscripts, among them the Bānkīpur [q.v.] Library at Patna (6,000 manuscripts), the Buḥār collection in the National Library at Calcutta (485 Persian and 465 Arabic manuscripts), and the Rāmpur State Library (10,500 manuscripts in Arabic, Persian and various Indian languages). After the conquest of Constantinople, Mehmed II Fāṭih [q.v.] assembled the manuscripts in Greek, Latin and other languages which had survived the holocaust into the library which he founded in the Eski Saray, which now forms part of his palace, the Topkapi Saray. Ahmed III [q.v.] established no fewer than five libraries in Istanbul, including his Enderūn-i Hûmâyûn Kütûbkhânesî, of which the poet Ndrîm [q.v.] was appointed curator. He also prohibited the export of rare manuscripts. Most of the libraries formerly attached to mosques in the capital have now been transferred to the Sûylemanie Public Library. In Istanbul alone there were said to be in 1959 over 135,000 manuscripts, many of them known only to scholars through the very inadequate defters published in the late Ottoman period.
Most countries in the Middle East now possess a national library performing the functions of such libraries everywhere, including, it may be, the publication of the national bibliographies (see auchterlonie, Librariae [see Bibl.], 245-9). Public, university, special and school libraries have been set up, schools of librarianship inaugurated, and library associations founded.

Arrangements, administration and use of libraries. In the 4th/10th century there were already buildings devoted solely to libraries and erected especially for this purpose. For example, Sahrib. Ardashir, the vizier of Bahá al-Dawla [q. v. in Suppl.], built in 381/991 in Bagdad in the Karkh quarter a Dar al-kutub, which contained over 10,000 volumes (Ibn al-Aghir, i, 246; Yákút, i, 799). The geographer al-Mukaddasí (449) found in Shiráz a huge library which had been built by the Búyíd Ajud al-Dawla (338-72/949-82). This library was a separate building and consisted of a great hall, a long vaulted room and along the side-rooms were cases of carved wood three ells high and three broad, with doors which were let down from the top. The books lay on shelves one above the other. The cases used in the Fâtimid library in Cairo were somewhat different (al-Makrizi, Khatir, Cairo 1270, i, 409); the bookcases (ruff) were divided by partitions into separate compartments (hâdiz) each of which was closed by a door with hinges and locks. Open cases, which also were divided into small compartments, are illustrated in a miniature by Yahyá b. Mahamid of the year 634/1237 in the Paris manuscript of al-Hariri, ms. arabic, 5847), which shows a library in Basra (Blochet, Les enumérateurs des manuscrits orientaux, Paris 1926, Pl. 10).

Unlike our custom, we find the books lying one above the other in the small compartments, as is still usual in the East. This explains the oriental custom (which is only occasionally found in the West) of writing a short title of the works on the upper and lower edge.

The books were systematically arranged, classified according to the various branches of knowledge. Copies of the Kur'ân had usually a special place in libraries, for example, they were kept on a higher level than the others. The various books were often present in several copies; this made it possible not only to lend the same work to several readers, but the scholar was also enabled to read corrupt passages at once in a manuscript by referring to another copy. The Fâtimid library of Cairo, for example, had thirty copies of the Kitâb al-Ayn of al-Khallí, twenty copies of the Ta'rikh of al-Tabarí and, if the figure is not wrong, actually a hundred copies of the Djamára of Ibn Durayd.

The waqfyya drafted when the books were deposited normally served as the catalogue. Occasionally we hear of a special catalogue (fihrist [q. v.]) being compiled by the librarian. These catalogues sometimes ran filling 44 of 20 leaves each (Ibn Khaldun, Tadhrij, iv, 146). In the Fâtimid library, to the door of each bookcase was affixed a list of the books contained therein.

Libraries usually had a director (jâhid) and one or more librarians (khâzin) according to the size of the institution, also copyists (nâshir) and attendants (farâ'id). We find that some of the most celebrated scholars were librarians; thus the historian Ibn Miskawaih was librarian to the vizier Abu 'l-Fadl b. al-'Amid in Rayy (Ibn Miskawaih, Ta'rikh al-umam, ed. Amedroz and Margoliouth, Oxford 1921, text, ii, 224, tr. v, 237); al-Shâbûnî (d. 390/1000), the author of the Kitâb al-Diyârî, was librarian of the Fâtimid library in Cairo under al-'Azîz (Ibn Khallîkân, Râjî'at, 327).

The books were acquired partly by purchase and partly by the copyists attached to the libraries copying manuscripts. Al-Makrizi has preserved for us the budget of a library (ii, 459); according to this, the caliph al-Hâkim (386-411/996-1020) spent 207 dinârs a year on the Dar al-Imân founded by him. This was allotted as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dinârs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mats from 4 'Abbâdân, etc</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper for copyist</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary of the librarian</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drinking water</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wages of the attendant</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wages of the keeper of paper, ink, and reed pens</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repairing the door-curtains</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repairing books</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felt carpets for the winter</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blanket for the winter</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Libraries were open to everyone free of charge. Paper, ink and reed-pens were supplied by the authorities. Some private libraries even provided for the maintenance of scholars who had come from a long distance. A deposit had usually to be made if books were taken outside the library buildings; at least Yâkút (iv, 509-10) praises the liberality of the libraries in Marw, where he always had two hundred and more volumes to the value of two hundred dinârs in his house without a deposit. Instructive in this connection also is the waqf document of 21 Safar 799/24 November 1396) by which Ibn Khâlûdân bestowed his Kitâb al-Ibar on the library of the Djamâ al-Kârawiyyin in Fas; according to it, this manuscript was only to be lent to trustworthy, reliable men for two months at the most in return for a substantial deposit, for this period was long enough to copy or study the borrowed work. The director of the library was to take care that this rule was observed (Lèvi-Provençal, in JA, cciii [1923], 164).

But at the same time we find in Muslim lands purely private libraries. One example was the library of the Madrasa al-Mahmúdiyya founded in Cairo in 797/1395. By the will of the founder, the Ustadar Djamal al-Dîn Mahmúd b. 'Ali (d. 799/1397), no book was to leave the rooms of the madrasa. The manuscripts of the Ta'rikh al-umam of Ibn Miskawayh (Gibb Mem. Ser., vii/6) published in facsimile by Caetani belonged to this library; in the waqf document on the first page of this manuscript, dated 15 Shâbân 797/5 June 1395) it is written: "The above-named donor makes the condition that neither the whole work nor a single volume of it shall be lent from the library, either against a deposit or without one".

Nevertheless by the year 826/1423 when the books were checked, it was found that 400 volumes (exactly a tenth of the total) were missing, whereupon the then director of the mosque was dismissed (cf. Ibn Hâdîr, 'Askâliânî, in Quatremère, Memoire [see Bibl.], 64, 70; al-Makrizî, Kataê, ii, 395).

If we think of the above statements, which are true even of the 4th/10th century, it can safely be asserted that Muslim libraries were in every respect centuries in advance of those of the west; there was a general need for public libraries felt in Muslim lands much earlier than in the west.

Bibliography: 1. General. Quatremère, Memoire sur le goût des livres chez les Orientaux, in JA, Ser. 3, vi (1838), 35-78; and the supplementary
notes by Hammer-Purgstall in JA, Ser. 4, xi (1848), 187-98; Mez, *Renaissance des Isldms*, Heidelberg ... The streams that flow into the Araxes on the right bank are as follows: 1. in the northwest the lower Kara-su, [44x673]200 MAKTABA — MAKU

**AL-MAKTÜL** [see al-suhrawardi].

**MÁKU**, a former khanate in the Persian province of Ardharbâyjân, and now the name of a town and of modern administrative units around it (see below).

Máku occupies the north-western extremity of Persia and forms a salient between Turkey (the old sandık of Bâyazîd, modern vilayet of Ağrı) and Soviet Transcaucasia. In the west the frontier with Turkey follows the heights which continue the line of the Zagros in the direction of Ararat. The frontier then crosses a plain stretching to the south of this mountain (valley of the Sar-lu) and runs over the saddle between Great and Little Ararat. Down to 1920 Great Ararat formed the frontier between Russia and Turkey, while Little Ararat was divided between Russia and Persia. Since 1920 Great Ararat has been completely surrounded by Turkish territory, while Little Ararat is divided between Turkey and Persia. The Turco-Persian frontier at the present day comes down to the Araxes. The Lower Kâra-çu and the Araxes (to its confluence with its right bank tributary, the Khor-dây) form the frontier between Máku and the autonomous territory of Nakhchewan which forms part of the Armenian SSR. The third side of the triangle i.e. the inner boundary between the Khânate and the Persian province of Köhî [q.v.] is somewhat vague. When the prestige of its khan was at its greatest, its lands stretched to the districts of Çay-paşa, Çâlîrdar (Kara-Ayni) and Allâdî. The little khânate of Avâdjl (90 villages belonging to the Ayrumlu Khân) on the Bâyazîd-Çâlîrdar-Köhî road formed a little enclave of close to the Turco-Persian frontier.

The region of Máku consists of a series of heights and fertile valleys. In the centre between the valley of the Zângîmar and that of the Agh-dây rises the isolated mass of Sokkar. At the foot of the Little Ararat along the frontier chain and on the slopes of Sokkar there are excellent pastures.

The lands of Máku are very well-watered. The streams that flow into the Araxes on the right bank are as follows: 1. in the northwest the lower Kâra-çu,
which runs almost parallel to the Araxes and receives on the right bank the waters from Dambat (a high plateau to the south-east of Little Ararat where in 1905 Minorsky discovered the ruins of the ancient town which local Armenian tradition identifies with Arghakawan, cf. Moses of Chorene, iii, 27, and ibid., i, 30); 2. the mountain-torrents Yllandarasi and Sarli-cay; 3. the river Zangimar (Zangibár, Máku-cay) which consists of three main branches, one coming from the khanate of Awadji, the other, the Tighnit, from the south-east corner of the plain of Çalldrán from the vicinity of the village of Tighnit (Armenian name tsmt = "muddy"); and the third from the central canton of Bábádji. The combined waters run through the defile in which lies the town of Máku and water the rich district of Zangibasar ("watered by the Zangimár"). Here the Zangimár receives on its right bank the waters from the central massif of Sokkar (this tributary seems to have been once known as the Kaban), and on the left bank the Sarli-su (different from the above mentioned Sarli-su) which rises in Turkish territory in the north of Bâyazid and flows a considerable distance parallel to the central course of the Zangimár. 4. The Ágh-cay, the sources of which are on the eastern face of the chain which separates Turkey from Persia and on the southern face of the transverse chain (Alágáin) which separates Ágh-cay from the trends of the main massif of the range, its tributary irrigate the canton of Sögmán-áwá, flow into the fertile plain of Çayápára and flow into the Kotur-cay which waters the plain of Köhó. Below this confluence, the Ágh-cay receives on its right bank the waters of the district of Áland which rise near the Turco-Persian frontier to the south of the sources of the Ágh-cay and the north of those of the Kotur-cay. The town of Máku is situated in long. 44° 30' and lat. 39° 18' at an altitude of 1,294 m./4,245 feet. Its site, 170 miles from Tabriz and on the main Tabriz-Erzerum road, is very striking. It lies in the short gorge through which the Zangimár here runs. The cliffs rise perpendicularly on the right bank. The cliffs on the left bank rise to a height of 600 feet above the river. The little town lies in an amphitheatre on the slope of the town at the foot of the rocks, are the ruins of ancient fortifications and a spring. Then the mountain wall rises almost perpendicularly, and at a height of 180 to 200 feet leans forward. There is therefore an incredible mass of rock suspended over the town. (According to Monteith's estimate, the dimensions of the cavern thus formed are: height 600 feet, depth of the cavern 800 feet (?), breadth 1,200 feet, thickness at the top of the arch 200 feet.) It is only for a brief period daily that the sun penetrates into this gigantic cave. Just above is a cave which used to be hoisted up by a rope. (The only European who has been inside it is A. Ivanovski.)

The town of Máku in ca. 1900 was 6,670, comprising Turkish-speaking Shífs. The population of Máku consists of Turks and Kurds. The former, who are in the majority, occupy villages along the rivers of the khanate. They are the remains of the Turkoman tribes of Bayat, Pornak etc. The canton at the foot of the Sokkar is called Karaköyunlu. The people (about 900 houses in the earlier decades of this century, grouped into 26 villages) belong to the Ahl-i Hakk [q. v.] faith (RMM, xl, 66) which is indirect but interesting evidence of the character of the heresy of which the Turkoman dynasty of the Kara-Köyunlu was accused (Münebedjim-baši, iii, 153). The old eminity between the Turkoman tribes survives in the general name applied by the Kara-Köyunlu to their Shífs, the "Twelver" neighbours: they call them Ak-Köyunlu (Grodzky, 9).

The Kurds of the khanate are semi-nomads. The Djaláli (cf. on their supposed ancestors, Álam-ára, 539, under the years 1017-18) occupy the slopes of Ararat, and in summer betake themselves to the pastures along the Turco-Persian frontier. Many sections of them lead a troglodyte life in the caves of the Dambat (Grodzky).

The little village of Djabbarlu is inhabited by Yazidis [q.v.].

Ancient History. The oldest monuments of Máku go back to the period of the Urartian (Vannic) kingdom. The chamber carved in the rock near Sangar (on the Máku-Bázírgán-Bâyazid road) is one of a number of similar constructions in Bâyazid and in the country west of Urmia (Minorsky, Kela-îgin, in ZVOIRAÖ, xxiv, 171; S. Matheson, Persia, an archaeological guide, London 1972, 81-5). A Vannic inscription known as that of "Máku" seems to come from Bástam on the Ágh-cay (district of Çay-para). It is of king Kusa II, son of Argisht (ca. 560-645 B.C.; cf. Sayce, A new Vannic Inscription, in JRSÄ [1912], 107-15; N. Y. Marr, Nadût Ruûli II iz Maku, in ZVOIRAÖ, xxv [1921], 1-54). The inscription is important as showing that the power of the kings of Ván extended to the region of Köhó.

Máku later formed part of Armenia. It corresponds to the canton of Artaz of the province of Vaspurakan (Armenian 7th century Geography). According to Moses of Chorene, the district was at first known as Shawarshan, but was given the name of Artaz in memory of the old home of the Alán whom Artashés transplanted hither (cf. Ardoz in Ossetia). The name Shawarshan may be explained from the rule of the Arturuni kings among whom the name Shawargh (Xšawayštín Špār) which is a Mod. Pers. Siýawušt was frequent (cf. Marquart, Erdnásahr, 4, 177). The suggestion of this scholar that Artaz is connected with the older "Ačagà etc., Strabo, xi, 14, 3, is untenable because Azara is above Artaxata, which again is above the land of Artaz = Máku. The Amatuni kings who later established themselves north of the Araxes must also have ruled in Artaz, for the diocese of Máku is called Amatunecagtan (Adontz).

The name Máku and Hac'hem (= Hasun) north of Máku are mentioned in the History of Thomas Arsruni written in the 10th century, in the passage (ii, § 3) describing the frontier of the lands ceded by the Sásání Khusrâw to the emperor Maurice in 591
(Brosset, Coll. d’hist. arm., St. Petersburg 1874, i, 78). On the many Armenian monuments in the land of Mäku, cf. the work of Minorsky on the antiquities of the Khánate; cf. also Hübschmann, Die älteren Ortsnamen, 1904, 344, and Adontz, Armenia i epokhu Justini-
niana, St. Petersburg 1908, index.

According to a legend recorded by Moses of Chorene (i, 30; ii, 49), Tigranes, having defeated the Mede (in Arm. Mar) Azdahak, settled his descendants all around Masis (Ararat). Neither the Arab historians (al-Tabarl, Ibn al-Athlr) nor geographers (allahu mustawft, however, presupposes a different histori

Allah MustawfT, however, presupposes a different corner of Armenia, although the name looks very old. It would be tempting to explain Mäku as Mâh + kûh - “Mountain of the Medes” (Pers. mâh and Arm. mûr go back to the old Iranian Mâda). The form Mäkûya (*Mäkûya*) which is found in Hamd Allâh Mustawf, however, presupposes a different final element.

**History under Islam.** Hamd Allâh Mustawfî (Nuzhat al-kulûb, ed. Le Strange, 89) in his first work (740/1340) to mention Mäku among the cantons of the tûman of Nakçhûwan: it is a castle in the cleft of a rock and at the foot lies a village which stands in the shade till midway. In this place lives the Christian chief priest (kashish) whom they call Mar-Hâsîyâ (this reading is preferable to Mar-Khasîd). The former was soon taken by the Ottomans and at the foot of the mountain (pdy-i kûh) and the other on the preservation of which Persia had former-

The result is not known, but Persia’s possession of Mäku recognised in 1049/1639 does not seem to have again been seriously disputed by Turkey.

The family which ruled Mäku from 1747 to 1923 belonged to the Bayat tribe, the clan settled around the Sokkar (on the Bayat, cf. Köprüzü-zade Mehmed Fu’âd, Oğuz etnolojisinne dâvâ tâvârîh notaslar, in Türkiye Müşteri-i Uslul [Istanbul 1925], 16-23). According to oral tradition, Ahmad Sultan Bayat was in Khurâsân in the service of Nâdir Shah. After the latter’s assassination, he seized one of his wives and a part of his treasure and returned to Mäku. Very little is known about him or his son Husayn Khân (Monteith’s host?) who died in 1835. It is possible that under the Zand dynasty and at the beginning of the Kâdîs, the real authority in the region north-west of Adharbaydjan belonged to the family of Dumbeli Khâns [cf. Ta’rîh, the special history of the Dumbeli Khâns of Khol] and at that time the head of the house was in Khol (cf. Ta’rîh, the special history of the Dumbeli Khâns of Khol) and at the same time recalled the MahmudT Beg who was their representative there. In 1057/1647 the Kurf beg of Shûshîh (a stronghold on the borders of Persia) rebelled against the Turks. The Persians, while protest-

Contra to the tenor of the inscription, Ewliyâ Çelebi, ii, 357-9, claims that it was the Ottomans who, after the peace of 1049/1639, destroyed Mäku and at the same time recalled the Mahmûd Beg who was their representative there. In 1057/1647 the Kurf beg of Shûshîh (a stronghold on the borders of Persia) rebelled against the Turks. The Persians, while protest-

The family which ruled Mäku from 1747 to 1923 belonged to the Bayat tribe, the clan settled around the Sokkar (on the Bayat, cf. Köprüzü-zade Mehmed Fu’âd, Oğuz etnolojisinne dâvâ tâvârîh notaslar, in Türkiye Müşteri-i Uslul [Istanbul 1925], 16-23). According to oral tradition, Ahmad Sultan Bayat was in Khurâsân in the service of Nâdir Shah. After the latter’s assassination, he seized one of his wives and a part of his treasure and returned to Mäku. Very little is known about him or his son Husayn Khân (Monteith’s host?) who died in 1835. It is possible that under the Zand dynasty and at the beginning of the Kâdîs, the real authority in the region north-west of Adharbaydjan belonged to the family of Dumbeli Khâns [cf. Ta’rîh, the special history of the Dumbeli Khâns of Khol] and at the same time recalled the Mahmûd Beg who was their representative there. In 1057/1647 the Kurf beg of Shûshîh (a stronghold on the borders of Persia) rebelled against the Turks. The Persians, while protest-

Clavijo mentions a monastery of Dominicans at Mäku, “en el dicho lugar” (Frayles de Sancto Dom-
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accessibile in Europe). The disappearance of the Dum-
bull must have opened the way to the Bay at.

Khan (1775-1865), son of Husayn Khan, is often
Cirikov, Likhutin) as an influential chief jealous of his
prerogatives. We know that the Bâb was entrusted to
the guardianship of 'Ali Khan from June to December
1847 and that the latter treated them very kindly. The
Bâb in his esoteric language calls Mâku aspâl-bal-bâdîn
in contrast to aspâl-bal shahîd ( = Çahrik, see salmâs),
where his imprisonment was more rigorous (cf.
Brown, *A traveler's narrative*, 1891, ii, 16, 271-7;
Dâji-Khâvî, Nukat al-kutab GMS, xvii under Shâh khâk
'Ubayd Allâh. Timur Pâsha Khan (1820-95?) profited by
a similar situation during the Russo-Turkish war of
1877-8. In 1881, his appearance at the head of the
Mâku horsemen in the district of Salmâs accelerated the
collapse of the invasion of Kus, as under Shâhkhâk
'Ubayd Allâh. Timur Pâsha Khan was hailed as the
saviour of Adharbaydjan and the people even called
him Mâku Pâdshâh.

His son and successor Murtâdâ Kuli Khan Ibdâl-
al-Saljana (1863-1923) at first continued the policy of
isolation and aggrandisement of the khânate, but his
activity aroused suspicion on all sides. At the begin-
nning of the First World War in 1914, a Russian
invasion earned him a forced stay in Tiflis. In time, Mâku
became part of the theatre of war. The Russian troops
built a light railway from Shâh-tâkhtî (on the Araxes)
to Bâyazîd, and the station of Mâku became a busy
centre. In 1917 the Sardar returned home and held his
position till the coming of Rida Shah Pahlavi, when,
after the arrest of intriguing, he was arrested on 25 Mihr
1332, 112). In modern Iran, Mâku town is described as having
a population of 6,670, all Turkish-speaking and Shi.*

In the Persian Society, 1913,

The ten Aristotelian categories are commonly
translated of the title of the work of Aristotle [see
ARISTOTLIS] on that subject, which is also referred to,
by the transliteration of the Greek title as
Kdtighuriyds. or makula, but the singular is usually
translation of the title of Aristotle [see
AL-MAKULAT (A.), "Categories", the

2. Tioaov (Quantity, "how large?")£am

1. ouawc (Substance, "what?") djawhar

2. Tioaov (Quantity, "how large?")£am

The disappearance of the Dum-
bull must have opened the way to the Bay at.

Khan (1775-1865), son of Husayn Khan, is often
Cirikov, Likhutin) as an influential chief jealous of his
prerogatives. We know that the Bâb was entrusted to
the guardianship of 'Ali Khan from June to December
1847 and that the latter treated them very kindly. The
Bâb in his esoteric language calls Mâku aspâl-bal-bâdîn
in contrast to aspâl-bal shahîd ( = Çahrik, see salmâs),
where his imprisonment was more rigorous (cf.
Brown, *A traveler's narrative*, 1891, ii, 16, 271-7;
Dâji-Khâvî, Nukat al-kutab GMS, xvii under Shâh khâk
'Ubayd Allâh. Timur Pâsha Khan (1820-95?) profited by
a similar situation during the Russo-Turkish war of
1877-8. In 1881, his appearance at the head of the
Mâku horsemen in the district of Salmâs accelerated the
collapse of the invasion of Kus, as under Shâhkhâk
'Ubayd Allâh. Timur Pâsha Khan was hailed as the
saviour of Adharbaydjan and the people even called
him Mâku Pâdshâh.

His son and successor Murtâdâ Kuli Khan Ibdâl-
al-Saljana (1863-1923) at first continued the policy of
isolation and aggrandisement of the khânate, but his
activity aroused suspicion on all sides. At the begin-
nning of the First World War in 1914, a Russian
invasion earned him a forced stay in Tiflis. In time, Mâku
became part of the theatre of war. The Russian troops
built a light railway from Shâh-tâkhtî (on the Araxes)
to Bâyazîd, and the station of Mâku became a busy
centre. In 1917 the Sardar returned home and held his
position till the coming of Rida Shah Pahlavi, when,
after the arrest of intriguing, he was arrested on 25 Mihr
1332, 112). In modern Iran, Mâku town is described as having
a population of 6,670, all Turkish-speaking and Shi.*

In the Persian Society, 1913,

The ten Aristotelian categories are commonly
translated of the title of the work of Aristotle [see
ARISTOTLIS] on that subject, which is also referred to,
by the transliteration of the Greek title as
Kdtighuriyds. or makula, but the singular is usually
translation of the title of Aristotle [see
AL-MAKULAT (A.), "Categories", the

2. Tioaov (Quantity, "how large?")£am

1. ouawc (Substance, "what?") djawhar

2. Tioaov (Quantity, "how large?")£am

The disappearance of the Dum-
bull must have opened the way to the Bay at.

Khan (1775-1865), son of Husayn Khan, is often
Cirikov, Likhutin) as an influential chief jealous of his
prerogatives. We know that the Bâb was entrusted to
the guardianship of 'Ali Khan from June to December
1847 and that the latter treated them very kindly. The
Bâb in his esoteric language calls Mâku aspâl-bal-bâdîn
in contrast to aspâl-bal shahîd ( = Çahrik, see salmâs),
where his imprisonment was more rigorous (cf.
Brown, *A traveler's narrative*, 1891, ii, 16, 271-7;
Dâji-Khâvî, Nukat al-kutab GMS, xvii under Shâh khâk
'Ubayd Allâh. Timur Pâsha Khan (1820-95?) profited by
a similar situation during the Russo-Turkish war of
1877-8. In 1881, his appearance at the head of the
Mâku horsemen in the district of Salmâs accelerated the
collapse of the invasion of Kus, as under Shâhkhâk
'Ubayd Allâh. Timur Pâsha Khan was hailed as the
saviour of Adharbaydjan and the people even called
him Mâku Pâdshâh.

His son and successor Murtâdâ Kuli Khan Ibdâl-
al-Saljana (1863-1923) at first continued the policy of
isolation and aggrandisement of the khânate, but his
activity aroused suspicion on all sides. At the begin-
nning of the First World War in 1914, a Russian
invasion earned him a forced stay in Tiflis. In time, Mâku
became part of the theatre of war. The Russian troops
built a light railway from Shâh-tâkhtî (on the Araxes)
to Bâyazîd, and the station of Mâku became a busy
centre. In 1917 the Sardar returned home and held his
position till the coming of Rida Shah Pahlavi, when,
after the arrest of intriguing, he was arrested on 25 Mihr
1332, 112). In modern Iran, Mâku town is described as having
a population of 6,670, all Turkish-speaking and Shi.*

In the Persian Society, 1913,
Les Categories d'Aristote dans leurs versions syro-arabes, and has no connexion with the Syriac version of James Yahya b. Hunayn is himself credited with having translated the Greek. It certainly has no connexion with the Syriac version of James of Edessa (ed., with Ishak's Arabic version, K. Geor, Les Categories d'Aristote dans leurs versions syro-arabes, Beirut 1948). Ishak's version is stylish and, on the whole, clear and accurate. It survives in a recension by al-Hasan b. Suwâr (d. ca. 408/1017), based on Yahya b. 'Adî's copy and furnished with an introduction and critical notes. In these, Ibn Suwâr makes use of a large amount of earlier material, including a commentary by Ibn 'Adî.

The controversy in the classical world concerning the authenticity of the work appears not to have survived its transmission to the Islamic world. Ibn Suwâr mentions it, no doubt drawing on his Greek sources, but he accepts the work as genuine, as do the other commentators.

Many commentaries on the work were made. Among those mentioned by the bibliographers but not, as far as we know, extant are works by Abû Bishr Mârât, Tâhîbî b. Kurra, Dâjîrî b. Hayyân (attrib.), Abu I-Kâsim b. al-'Abbâd, and 'Abd al-La'îf al-Bâghdâdî. Epitomes are also attributed to Ibn Bahrîz (a pupil of Mâjîlî and a patron of Hunayn), al-Kindî, Abû Abu '1-Kasîm b. al-Kindî, Abû al-Tayyib (d. 286/900), and Muhammad b. Zakariyyâ al-Râzî. Surviving works based on the Categories include a paraphrase by al-Fârâbî (ed. D. M. Dunlop, Al-Farabi's paraphrase of the Categories of Aristotle, in IQ, iv [1958], 168-77, v [1959], 21-54), a large section of Ibn Sinâ's al-Shîja (al-Manîkî 2 - al-Makulât), ed. G. Anawati et alii, Cairo 1959), a commentary by Abu l-Faraj b. al-Tayyib [see Ibn al-Tayyib] (d. 434/1043) (preserved in Cairo ms. Bibl. Eg. 7772, anon, paraph. India Office ms. Or. 3832), notes by Ibn Bâdîjâq [q. v.] on al-Fârâbî's paraphrase (preserved in Escorial ms. 612), and Ibn Rûshd's Compendium (in Hebrew tr.) and Middle Commentary (ed. M. Bouyges, Avrordes: Taîkîh kitab al-magoulat, Beirut 1932). The work or, at any rate, the subject with which it deals is also, of course, referred to, if at no great length, in other Islamic philosophical works, e.g. the Rassîl 'Iswân al-Shîja and al-Ghazzâlî's Miycâr al-ilm.

It might well be thought that the Categories received more attention from the earlier Islamic philosophers than it merited, particularly in view of the difficulty of determining precisely what it is about. This question is still disputed; I. Madkour (introd. to ed. of al-Shîja, 2 cited above) characterises it as "... à la fois une recherche sur la substance et les accidents et un essai de déterminer exhaustivement le nombre des genres suprêmes; par là, elle se rattache à la fois à la métaphysique et à la logique." Others maintain, more simply and perhaps more plausibly, that it is merely an early attempt by Aristotle to list all the predicates that can be attached to a given man, and that it is therefore indisputably an adjunct, if a minor one, to the study of logic. The choice of al-Makulât as the translation of the title may perhaps indicate that Ishak himself inclined to the latter view (kâla ... 'ala ... "to predicate ... of ... "). It may be that the digressions in the work itself, the mass of commentary, in Greek, Syriac and Arabic, that it attracted, and the inclusion of a similar treatment of the categories in Metaphysics δ (where, according to Ross, it is clearly out of place) combined to obscure the significance of the title. Whether most of the Islamic commentators really considered it to be an integral part of the Organon, or their respect for Aristotle forced them to retain it as such, is not clear. Ibn Sinâ is the only philosopher to give an independent opinion on the nature of the Categories.

---

Early Arabic nomenclature of the categories

(compiled by F. Zimmermann)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<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>ãóûê</td>
<td>'ayn</td>
<td>ãâ'îh</td>
<td>ãâ'îh</td>
<td>ãâ'îh</td>
<td>ãâ'îh</td>
<td>ãâ'îh</td>
<td>ãâ'îh</td>
<td>ãâ'îh</td>
<td>ãâ'îh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ãèóô</td>
<td>ãâ'îh</td>
<td>ãâ'îh</td>
<td>ãâ'îh</td>
<td>ãâ'îh</td>
<td>ãâ'îh</td>
<td>ãâ'îh</td>
<td>ãâ'îh</td>
<td>ãâ'îh</td>
<td>ãâ'îh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ãèóô</td>
<td>ãâ'îh</td>
<td>ãâ'îh</td>
<td>ãâ'îh</td>
<td>ãâ'îh</td>
<td>ãâ'îh</td>
<td>ãâ'îh</td>
<td>ãâ'îh</td>
<td>ãâ'îh</td>
<td>ãâ'îh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ãóûê</td>
<td>ãâ'îh</td>
<td>ãâ'îh</td>
<td>ãâ'îh</td>
<td>ãâ'îh</td>
<td>ãâ'îh</td>
<td>ãâ'îh</td>
<td>ãâ'îh</td>
<td>ãâ'îh</td>
<td>ãâ'îh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ãèéñû</td>
<td>ãâ'îh</td>
<td>ãâ'îh</td>
<td>ãâ'îh</td>
<td>ãâ'îh</td>
<td>ãâ'îh</td>
<td>ãâ'îh</td>
<td>ãâ'îh</td>
<td>ãâ'îh</td>
<td>ãâ'îh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ãèóô</td>
<td>ãâ'îh</td>
<td>ãâ'îh</td>
<td>ãâ'îh</td>
<td>ãâ'îh</td>
<td>ãâ'îh</td>
<td>ãâ'îh</td>
<td>ãâ'îh</td>
<td>ãâ'îh</td>
<td>ãâ'îh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ãèóô</td>
<td>ãâ'îh</td>
<td>ãâ'îh</td>
<td>ãâ'îh</td>
<td>ãâ'îh</td>
<td>ãâ'îh</td>
<td>ãâ'îh</td>
<td>ãâ'îh</td>
<td>ãâ'îh</td>
<td>ãâ'îh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ãóûê</td>
<td>ãâ'îh</td>
<td>ãâ'îh</td>
<td>ãâ'îh</td>
<td>ãâ'îh</td>
<td>ãâ'îh</td>
<td>ãâ'îh</td>
<td>ãâ'îh</td>
<td>ãâ'îh</td>
<td>ãâ'îh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ãèéñû</td>
<td>ãâ'îh</td>
<td>ãâ'îh</td>
<td>ãâ'îh</td>
<td>ãâ'îh</td>
<td>ãâ'îh</td>
<td>ãâ'îh</td>
<td>ãâ'îh</td>
<td>ãâ'îh</td>
<td>ãâ'îh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ãèóô</td>
<td>ãâ'îh</td>
<td>ãâ'îh</td>
<td>ãâ'îh</td>
<td>ãâ'îh</td>
<td>ãâ'îh</td>
<td>ãâ'îh</td>
<td>ãâ'îh</td>
<td>ãâ'îh</td>
<td>ãâ'îh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ãóûê</td>
<td>ãâ'îh</td>
<td>ãâ'îh</td>
<td>ãâ'îh</td>
<td>ãâ'îh</td>
<td>ãâ'îh</td>
<td>ãâ'îh</td>
<td>ãâ'îh</td>
<td>ãâ'îh</td>
<td>ãâ'îh</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and the value of the work. He takes its object to be to assert—not to prove—that ten things are al-mufradd) can be applied. One of these is substance in connection with the theory of definition, and in al-Ighârât he omits all mention of them.

Ibn Rughd does not tell us his opinion of the work or indicate whether he made his commentary on it for its own sake or out of loyalty to Aristotle. After him, at all events, it would seem that Ibn Sina's assessment of its worth commanded general assent, for it makes few further appearances.


**MAKURRA** [see Nûsba].

**MAL (A.), means in the old language possession, property, referring among the Bedouins particularly to camels, but also to estates and money, and in any case to concrete things. The word is formed from mâl and li and means properly anything that belongs to any one. As a noun it is of course treated as a med. w stem from which a verb is then formed. The meaning "money", the word is used in the expression mâl jibi 'dumb property' in contrast to mâl naff, 'speaking property', applied to slaves and cattle. The full formation of the concept appears in the introduction to the *Idgâra tid makhsûs al-idgâra* of Abu 'l-Fadl Dâj'far b. 'Ali al-Dimashkî (Carly 1318/1900-1, 2 ff.), studied and for the most part translated by H. Ritter, in *I. VII,* (1916), 1-91. There and in the *Mafdiâl al-ulâm* (see Bibl.), 39, the different classes of property are enumerated. As mâl includes property in its different aspects, the word can also mean "taxes".


The acquisition, conservation and disposal of property is one of the four main sections of domestic economy (tadbîr al-manâzil), the second part of practical philosophy, which is divided into ethics, economics and politics, just as it entered Islam with the rest of Hellenistic science. As the Politics of Aristotle, the first book of which deals with economy, was not translated into Arabic, the Muslims had to be content with the only translated work on economics, compos-

ed by the Neo-Pythagorean Ps.-Bryson, which has had a deciding influence on the whole economic literature of Islam. The text, the Greek original of which is lost, was first edited by L. Cheikh, in *Machriq*, xix (1921) and has been recently published with the Hebrew and Latin versions and a German translation by M. Plessner. The interesting chapter on mâl in it was further expanded by Muslim authors of the school of the Ps.-Bryson, particularly from religious literature. A standard work is the *Akhldk-i nairi* of al-Tust [q.v.], of which the economic section has been translated and translated by Plessner. The view of the origin of money which Aristotle holds in the *Nicomachian Ethics* reached Islam direct, besides coming through the Ps.-Bryson; it is first found in the *Tahdhib al-akhldk* of Miskawayh, e.g. Cairo 1322, 1904-5, 38 (cf. also *Namus* and Dhamar).

The word mâl very early became a technical term in arithmetic. It is first found in exercises in dividing inheritances applied to the property of the testator which is to be divided. We later find the word used regularly for the unknown quantity in an equation; in this meaning it was afterwards replaced by *dayy* [q.v.]. Used for the unknown in quadratic equations, it became the word for the square of a number. The fourth power is called mâl mâl, the fifth mâl mâl mâl mâl, the square of the cube. The history of this change of meaning has been elucidated by J. Rüster, *Zur ältesten arabischen Algebra und Rechenkunst*, in *SB A. Hist. Phil.-hist. Kl.* (1917), no. 2, esp. ch. vi, cf. also index s.v. Mâl. **Bibliography**: Brockelmann, Grundriss, i; H. Ritter, *Ein arabisches Handbuch der Handelswissenschaft, in I.*, vii (1916), 1-91 (cf. esp. the passages quoted on p. 45, no. 3, from the Arab lexiconographers, the Lâ and Dozy, s.s.); M. Plessner, *Der akribies des Neuplatonikers "Bryson"* und sein Einfluss auf die islamische Wissenschaft, 1928; Marx, *Die Einführung der aristotelischen Ethik in die arabische Philosophie, in Verhandlungen des XII. Intern. Orientalsistentkongresses*, 290 ff.; on the meaning in algebra, cf. the references given in Ruska, *op. cit.*; al-Khârazmî, *Mafdiâl al-ulâm*, ed. van Vloten, 1895; 1953; 1959; 1968 (the latter passage tr. by Wiedemann, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Naturwissenschaften*, xiv = *SBPMS ErL*, xl [1908]). (M. Plesner)

**MÂL AL-BAY’À (A.), also hâk al-bayû’, rasûm al-bayû’ and pilat al-bayû’, a term used for the payments made to the *djând* at the time of the swearing of the oath of allegiance (bayû’ [q.v.]) to a new ruler.

The practice was unknown among the Umayyads and early ‘Abbasids, and the first example seems to be the payments made to the *djând* in Baghdad following the death of al-Mahdi in 169/785, when each man was given eighteen months’ or two years’ salary (rizk) after they had caused disturbances. It is not clear, however, that this was directly related to the bayû’s, and it may have been settlement of arrears of pay. Nonetheless, this seems to have become a precedent, and extra *sâli* [q.v.] was paid at the time of Hârûn’s accession the next year. After the death of Hârûn in 193/809, al-Amin’s supporters in Baghdad paid two years’ rizk to the army, while in Marw his brother al-Ma’mûn paid one year’s salary at the time of the bayû’s. By this time, such payments seem to have been regarded as standard practice, and the harmful effects were soon apparent; when Ibrahim b. al-Mahdi was proclaimed caliph in Baghdad in 291/895, opposition to the Ma’mûn, he promised six months’ *sâli*, but was unable to pay the full amount, hence drafts were given
to the troops so that they could collect payment in kind from the surrounding country. There is no mention of payment at the accessions of al-Mu'tasim (218/833-834/882) or al-Wathiq (227/842), but whether this meant that the practice was in abeyance or that it had become routine is impossible to tell. On the accession of al-Mutawakkil (232/847), eight months’ salary was paid, and some, but by no means all, of his successors followed the practice. Under al-Muktafir, the size of the army became glaringly obvious. The troops in Baghda‘d received māl li‘l-bay’a at the time of his accession, while those escorting the hajdjī riwayst rode when they did not receive māl li‘l-bay’a. al-Muktafir’s clearly felt was the due. After the abortive revolt of Ibn al-Mu‘azz in the next year, the gwād were given a second payment for renewing the oath. In 317/929 a revolt was launched with the object of deposing al-Muktafir and making al-Kāhir caliph, but the attempt collapsed when the leaders were unable to supply the year’s nizād demanded by the army as a reward. The re-establishment of al-Muktafir meant that māl al-bay’a was required for the third time in his caliphate, and this led to the selling off of state lands at very low prices in an effort to satisfy the troops. The accession of al-Kāhir in 320/932 meant a further payment.

Thereafter, the practice seems to have become less regular; at the accession of al-Muktadir in 329/940, the Turkish amīr ‘al-mul‘aṣ Baghda‘dī [q.v.] reduced payments and restricted them to his own followers. Payments were sometimes made under the Būyids, as at the accession of Bāhā’ al-Dawla [q.v. in Suppl.] in 379/989, when rasm al-bay’a was paid, and the army also extorted it on the accession, in suspicious circumstances, of the ‘Abbasid caliph al-Kādir in 381/991. Under the later Būyids, extra payments continued to be demanded, and sometimes made, at accessions and other times of crisis, but the decline of the system of regular salaries, and the bankruptcy of the state, meant that the practice was irregular.

Bibliography: See descriptions of accessions in Tabārī, iii; Miskawayh, Taḏjīrī‘, ed. Amedroz; Rūḏhrāwī, Dhayl Taḏjīrī‘, ed. Amedroz; Ibn al-ʿAlī‘īr, and nā‘am. (H. Kennedy)

MAL-I AMIR [See SARHABDĪ].

MAL-I IRSALIYYE [See IRSALIYYE].

MALABAR, the name first given by Arab and Persian mariners in mediaeval times to a pepper-producing coastal region of the south-western Indian Deccan approximately conterminous with the modern state of Kerala. The name “Malabar” is probably derived from a combination of the Dravidian term mala = “mountain” and the Persian bār = “country” (Logan, i, 1), though the affix bar may alternatively be derived from the Arabic bar = “a continent”, or the Sanskrit vāra = “a slope” (Hobson-Jobson, 539; cf. Madras glossary, 460). The name Malabar is not generally employed by the indigenous inhabitants of the region, who have traditionally preferred the Dravidian Maḷiśgalaṃ = “the hill country”, or the more classical Keraḷa, a name thought to be derived from the former Chēra kingdom of the Indian Deccan (Logan, i, 224; see also Menon, op. cit., passim).

According to Hobson-Jobson, the substantive part of the name Malabar, variously appearing as Malai, Male, Malāi, etc., is to be found “in the earlier post-classical notices of India, whilst in the great Temple-Inscription at Tanjore we find the region in question called Malai-nada”. The affix bār would seem to appear for the first time (in the form Manbar) in al-Idrisi’s mid-6th/12th century geographical study

Nuzhat al-nasīğāt fi ḥikrīr al-afāk (Nainar, 19), whilst Yākūt includes the name Malībār in his 7th/13th century geographical dictionary, the Ma‘ṣğal al-buldān (Nainar, 19; cf. Miller, 18). In its original usage, the name Malabar was applied by the Arabs to the whole coast of the south-western Deccan from Mt. D’éli in the north to Cape Comorin in the south. Although originally an exclusively Arabo-Persian designation, the name Malabar soon attained widespread international currency, being employed by John of Montecorvino in 683/1293 (Yule, Cathay, i, 215) and by Marco Polo in 698/1298 (Bk. ii, ch. 25). The name Malabar also occurs in Ming Chinese sources, both in the rather obscure form Ma-li-mo employed in Chau Ju-kua’s 7th/13th century Chu-fan-chi (Hirth and Rockhill, 88, 90) and in the immediately recognizable form Ma-lo-pa listed in Feng Ch’eng-chün’s Hsi-yü ti-ming.

Although the name Malabar was adopted by the Portuguese and applied by them to the whole region of modern Kerala, from the beginning of the British period the name was applied to an increasingly restricted area, being employed to designate that part of the south-western Deccan which came under direct British rule. This area, which covered the northern third of present-day Kerala, became the administrative district of Malabar, a part of the Madras Presidency situated between 10° and 12°30’ north latitude. This district, which included the important ports of Kannur (Cannanore) [q.v.] and Kozhikode (Calicut), as well as the important Māppila Muslim centre of Ponnani. After the incorporation of Malabar within the modern Indian state of Kerala in 1956, the old Malabar district was divided into three smaller districts: Kozhikode, Kannur and Palghat. In 1969 a fourth district, Malappuram, was carved out of these three (Miller, 18). Under the British, Minicoy Island and the Laccadives [q.v.] were attached to Malabar for administrative purposes, though when Malabar was incorporated within Kerala in 1956, the Laccadive, Minicoy and Amin-divi Islands were reorganised in the separate Indian Union Territory of Lakshadweep.

Arab contact with the Malabar region pre-date the Islamic era by many centuries, and the foundations of the present Māppila Muslim community of South India were laid within a few years of the hidjra, certainly well before Muhammad b. Kāsim’s conquest of Sind in 93-5/711-13 (Miller, 39-43; Ahmad, 77; Logan, i, 231-43; Cherrern, op. cit., passim); Malabar is therefore the site of the earliest Muslim community to have been established on the South Asian continent.

Today South India’s Māppila community numbers some five millions and extends beyond the frontiers of Kerala into Tamil Nadu and Karnataka. Māppila communities are also to be found in Bangalore, Madras and Bombay as well as overseas in Arabia, Sri Lanka, Malaysia and Burma. The former district of Malabar remains, however, the Māppila homeland par excellence; thus according to Census of India figures for 1921, out of a total population of 2,039,333 there were 1,004,327 Muslims living in the Malabar district, 93.60% of whom were Sunniś. Nearly all the Malabari Muslims are Māppilas, but there is also a sizeable Lābbai [q.v.] community, and there are lesser numbers of Pathans and Arabs. According to the 1971 Census of India, there were 4,162,718 Māppilas in Kerala state, of whom 2,765,747 lived in the four administrative districts (Kozhikode, Kannur, Palghat and Malappuram) which correspond approximately to the former Malabar District. (In 1971 the total population of this same region was 8,012,759, of
whom 4,789,198 were Hindus; Miller, 315.) Today the administrative region of Malabar no longer exists, but the name is still widely applied to coastal Kerala, Arabo-Persian meaning, that is, the whole littoral of the south-western Indian Deccan between Mt. D'Elia in the north and Cape Comorin in the south. The common anglicised form is Malacca, but the official spelling now used in Manchester, Malacca State and is 152 km. from the Malaysian capitals. Together with Central Malacca and China, Srivijaya flourished and became a noted Portuguese and Dutch buildings. The common anglicised form is Malacca, but the official spelling now used in Malaysia is Melaka. Giving its name to the Malacca Straits separating the Malaya peninsula from Indonesia, Malacca is the administrative centre of Malacca State and is 152 km. from the Malaysian capital of Kuala Lumpur. The town is distinguished from other Malay cities by its 19th century Chinese Malay shop houses and old Portuguese and Dutch buildings. Together with Central Malacca district, it currently numbers about 250,630 inhabitants. Relatively quiet today, Malacca was in the 9th/10th century the bustling heart of the most powerful kingdom in Malay history, the Malacca Sultanate, which played a key role in the expansion of Islam as well as by references in Chinese sources. It is believed that a prosperous trading kingdom, which the Chinese called San-fo-chi (reconstructed as Srivijaya) rose in southeastern Sumatra in the 1st/7th century. Acting as a entrepot to serve the trade between India and China, Srivijaya flourished and became a noted trading centre for Buddhist studies. At the height of its power it claimed overlordship over the interior and east coast of Sumatra, the Malay peninsula, and the islands of the Riau-Lingga archipelago and the South China Sea. By the 6th/7th century, Srivijaya appears to have been weakening as neighbouring kingdoms challenged its commercial hegemony and sought to take advantage of new opportunities for trade with China. Attacks by Chola India in 415-16/1025 and recurring hostilities with Java further undermined its position. From 772-3/1371, Java claimed suzerainty in southeastern Sumatra, but around 792-3/1390 a Palembang prince apparently attempted to assert his independence. Shortly afterwards, he was ousted by an invading Javanese army. When a Chinese fleet visited Palembang early in the 9th/10th century, it was still an important port, but was under the control of a Chinese prince chief. Two major sources contain the Malay legend of a Palembang prince who left Sumatra, founding a dynasty which ultimately ruled in Malacca. The first is the Sepah Melayu, a Malacca court text, of which the oldest extant version dates from the 11th/17th century but which was probably based on earlier recensions since lost. The second is the Suma oriental, a work by a Portuguese apothecary, Tomé Pires, sent to Malacca in 914-15/1509 by the Portuguese to investigate trading conditions there. Though the two sources differ in detail, the core of the legend is similar. According to the Sepah Melayu, a descendant of Alexander the Great (in Malay, Iskandar Zul-karnain) appeared miraculously on a hill in Palembang named Bukit Si Guntang. A covenant was concluded between him and the local chieftain in which he promised that he and his descendants would govern the people justly in return for their loyalty. With the title Sri Tri Buana, he was then made ruler. Subsequently, seeking a suitable site for a city, Sri Tri Buana came to an island which he renamed Singapore after glimpsing a strange beast which he took to be a lion (singa) there. During the succeeding four reigns, Singapore developed into a great trading city, but the fourth and fifth rulers flouted Sri Tri Buana’s earlier covenant, unjustly punishing their subjects. In retribution, Singapore was attacked not only by giant swordfish but by Javanese armies. The ruler, Iskandar Shah, fled up the coast to Muar, but was twice forced to relocate his settlement. Finally, he came to a place called Bentaram which he deemed auspicious after he saw one of its hounds kicked by a courageous mule deer. Because he was standing under a melaka tree (Phyllanthus emblica; Tetramerista glabra) he decided to call the place Melaka.

The broad outlines of Pires’ version are similar. According to the Suma oriental, a Palembang prince entitled Paramesvara would not acknowledge his subservience to Java and proclaimed his independence. The Javanese attacked and Paramesvara fled to Singapore with a following which included thirty orang laut, proto-Malay sea people whose habitat developed so quickly, scholars have been drawn by Malay traditions which attribute its founding to a prince from a mighty kingdom situated in Palembang in southeast Sumatra. Malabar and Anjengo, Madras 1908; F. Hirth and W. Rockhill, Chau Ju-kua: his work on the Chinese and Arab trade in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, St. Petersburg 1911 (repr. Taipei 1970); Sir H. Yule, The Book of Ser Marco Polo, 4 vols., London 1903; idem and A. C. Burnell, Cathay and the way thither, 4 vols., London 1915-16; S. Muhammad Nainar, Arab geographers’ knowledge of Southern India, Madras 1942; Feng Ch'eng-chün. Hirigü ti-ming ("Names of places in western regions") (Peking 1957; Aziz Ahmad, Studies in Islamic culture in the Indian environment, Oxford 1964; A. Chertian, The genesis of Islam in Malabar, in Indica (1962), 1-13; G. Bouchon, Les Musulmans du Kerala à l’époque de la découverte portugaise, Centre des Récherches d’Histoire et de Philologie de la IVe Section de l’École Pratique des Hautes Études (IV, Hautes Études Islamiques et Orientales d’Histoire Comparée), 5; Mare Luso-Indicum, Geneva-Paris, it., 1-59; R. E. Miller, Maqāla Muslims of Kerala, Madras 1976; F. S. Dale, Islamic society on the South Asian frontier: the Matābullas of Malacca 1498-1922, Oxford 1980 (A. D. W. Forbes)

MALACCA, a town situated on the west coast of the Malay peninsula, in lat. 2° 12' N and long. 102° 15' E. The common anglicised form is Malacca, but the official spelling now used in Malaysia is Melaka. Giving its name to the Malacca Straits separating the Malaya peninsula from Indonesia, Malacca is the administrative centre of Malacca State and is 152 km. from the Malaysian capital of Kuala Lumpur. The town is distinguished from other Malay cities by its 19th century Chinese Malay shop houses and old Portuguese and Dutch buildings. Together with Central Malacca district, it currently numbers about 250,630 inhabitants. Relatively quiet today, Malacca was in the 9th/10th century the bustling heart of the most powerful kingdom in Malay history, the Malacca Sultanate, which played a key role in the expansion of Islam through the Archipelago. The broad outlines of Pires’ version are similar. According to the Suma oriental, a Palembang prince entitled Paramesvara would not acknowledge his subservience to Java and proclaimed his independence. The Javanese attacked and Paramesvara fled to Singapore with a following which included thirty orang laut, proto-Malay sea people whose habitat develop so quickly, scholars have been drawn by Malay traditions which attribute its founding to a prince from a mighty kingdom situated in Palembang in southeast Sumatra. Malabar and Anjengo, Madras 1908; F. Hirth and W. Rockhill, Chau Ju-kua: his work on the Chinese and Arab trade in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, St. Petersburg 1911 (repr. Taipei 1970); Sir H. Yule, The Book of Ser Marco Polo, 4 vols., London 1903; idem and A. C. Burnell, Cathay and the way thither, 4 vols., London 1915-16; S. Muhammad Nainar, Arab geographers’ knowledge of Southern India, Madras 1942; Feng Ch'eng-chün. Hirigü ti-ming ("Names of places in western regions") (Peking 1957; Aziz Ahmad, Studies in Islamic culture in the Indian environment, Oxford 1964; A. Chertian, The genesis of Islam in Malabar, in Indica (1962), 1-13; G. Bouchon, Les Musulmans du Kerala à l’époque de la découverte portugaise, Centre des Récherches d’Histoire et de Philologie de la IVe Section de l’École Pratique des Hautes Études (IV, Hautes Études Islamiques et Orientales d’Histoire Comparée), 5; Mare Luso-Indicum, Geneva-Paris, it., 1-59; R. E. Miller, Maqāla Muslims of Kerala, Madras 1976; F. S. Dale, Islamic society on the South Asian frontier: the Matābullas of Malacca 1498-1922, Oxford 1980 (A. D. W. Forbes)

MALACCA, a town situated on the west coast of the Malay peninsula, in lat. 2° 12' N and long. 102° 15' E. The common anglicised form is Malacca, but the official spelling now used in Malaysia is Melaka. Giving its name to the Malacca Straits separating the Malaya peninsula from Indonesia, Malacca is the administrative centre of Malacca State and is 152 km. from the Malaysian capital of Kuala Lumpur. The town is distinguished from other Malay cities by its 19th century Chinese Malay shop houses and old Portuguese and Dutch buildings. Together with Central Malacca district, it currently numbers about 250,630 inhabitants. Relatively quiet today, Malacca was in the 9th/10th century the bustling heart of the most powerful kingdom in Malay history, the Malacca Sultanate, which played a key role in the expansion of Islam through the Archipelago. The broad outlines of Pires’ version are similar. According to the Suma oriental, a Palembang prince entitled Paramesvara would not acknowledge his subservience to Java and proclaimed his independence. The Javanese attacked and Paramesvara fled to Singapore with a following which included thirty orang laut, proto-Malay sea people whose habitat
was the coasts and offshore islands of Sumatra and the peninsula. In Singapore, Paramesvara killed the local chief, a vassal of the Thai kingdom of Ayudhya, and established himself instead. When the Thais attacked five years later, Paramesvara fled to Muar where he settled, while the orang laut moved about 8 km. further north to the mouth of the Malacca River. Discovering an attractive area up-river (Bertam), they persuaded Paramesvara to establish his residence there. Paramesvara gave the port at the estuary the name Malacca, which according to Pires' version means 'hidden fugitive', although no satisfactory derivation is known. Another suggested derivation given in the Sejarah Melayu is the Arabic malakat (written ملاكات in Malay and ملاكات or ملاك in early Arab trading manuals) = ‘possession’, which the text interprets to mean ‘a place where merchants gather’.

The Malacca dynasty. The precise chronology of the first five rulers varies according to the source, and gravestones have established the reign dates of only some of the later rulers. The following is the currently accepted list of the Malacca dynasty:

- Paramesvara (died 816/1413-14)
- Megat Iskandar Shah (817/1414 - 826/1423-4)
- Sri Maharaja Sultan Muhammad Shah (827/1424 - 847/1444?)
- Raja Ibrahim, Sri Paramesvara Dewa Shah (848-9/1445? - 850/1446?)
- Raja Kasim, Sultan Muzafar Shah (850/1446 - 863-4/1459?)
- Raja Abdullah, Sultan Mansur Shah (863-4/1459? - 882/1477)
- Sultan Alauddin Riyat Shah (882/1477 - 893/1488)
- Sultan Mahmud Shah (893/1488-934-5/1528)

After 917/1511, when Malacca was captured by the Portuguese, the dynasty ruled from capitals in the Riau archipelago and peninsular Johor. The last direct descendant was murdered in 1111/1699.

Malacca as an international entrepôt. In order to appreciate the reasons for Malacca’s place in the expansion of Islam, it is necessary to understand its emergence as an entrepôt. It has been said that Malacca was founded, rather than grew into, a trading city. Its life blood was always commerce, for Malacca was sufficiently important to receive a mission from the Chinese Emperor. During the course of the 9th/15th century, it eclipsed its rivals, notably the ports of Pasai and Aru on Sumatra’s northeast coast, which had long since participated in international trade. Tomé Pires commented, “There is no doubt that Malacca is of such importance and profit that it seems to me it has no equal in the world.”

If the Malay origins of Malacca are accepted, it can be argued that a primary reason for its rapid rise was the fact that its founders brought with them the prestige, administrative traditions and commercial experience of the formerly great port of Srivijaya. However, there were more tangible factors in Malacca’s success as an entrepôt. It was strategically placed on the narrow Straits through which shipping between China and India passed and where the dominant monsoonal wind systems met. Ports in the Straits region had a guaranteed clientele because seaborne trading patterns followed the cycle of the monsoon winds. Ships from India and the western lands arrived at various periods between March and January, while traders from China and the east came between November and March and those from the western archipelago between May and September. For some shipping, there was an enforced wait before they could return home as the monsoon changed direction or gained force; other traders, taking advantage of different wind systems, needed to wait only a short period before they left. Malacca proved ideally suited as a stapling port where goods could be stored, ships reprovisioned and cargoes sold and purchased quickly. It had an attractive harbour with approaches free from shoals and mangrove swamps and, because it lay in the lee of Sumatra, was more sheltered from storms than Pasai. By tropical standards, the climate was pleasant; there were good stands of timber for masts in the jungles nearby; and to the northeast of the settlement was a supply of potable water. Malacca was also well-placed as a collecting point for local jungle and marine products which were valued in India and China. A portage route linked the upper Malacca River with the gold mines of inland Pahang, and numerous rivers that disembogue on both sides of the Straits facilitated the transport of goods between the coast and interior. Finally, the hill to the east of the settlement (Malacca or St. Paul’s Hill) was a natural vantage point where lookouts could be posted to warn against any impending attack.

Diplomatic initiatives by the first rulers further contributed to Malacca’s commercial success. The patronage of China, the greatest Asian power at the time, was assiduously cultivated. When a large Chinese mission arrived in 806/1404, Malacca responded by sending envoys back to the imperial court. As the emperor’s favour, Paramesvara was granted an elevated title and Malacca became the first foreign nation to receive the Yung Lo Emperor’s
personal inscription. Between 806-7/1404 and 838-8/1435, twenty missions were sent from Malacca to China, several of which were headed by the ruler himself. By offering the appropriate tribute and fulfilling its obligations to its Chinese overlord, the new settlement retained China’s favour and protection in the initial stages of its development. For their part, the Ming Emperors obtained as a vassal an important commercial centre which could act as a base for the Chinese naval fleets that periodically sailed to the Indian Ocean. Although the Imperial court withdrew from active involvement in overseas affairs after 837-8/1434, junk trade with Malacca continued. Nor were the close ties of the past forgotten. Sultan Muzafar, Sultan Mansur and Sultan Mahmud requested investiture by China and it was to China that the last Malacca ruler looked for assistance when the Portuguese attacked in 916-17/1511.

The new settlement also reached if not friendship then at least a modus vivendi with its two powerful neighbours, the Thai kingdom of Ayudhya and Majapahit in Java. Founded in 751-2/1351, Ayudhya continued to claim suzerainty over the entire peninsula, and Majapahit too exercised a vague overlordship in the southern peninsula. Accordingly, until the latter part of the 9th/15th century, Malacca rulers acknowledged themselves to be Ayudhya’s vassals. In return, Malacca supplied troops and his suppliers of foodstuffs and other goods, as well as valued trading privileges. When Ayudhya attempted to impose its control there in 809-10/1406, 822/1419 and 834-5/1431, Malacca was able to appeal to its patron China, who ordered the Thais to desist. The relationship with Majapahit, on the other hand, was more harmonious. Malacca continued to accept vassal status till the end of the century, and ties with Majapahit were fostered through regular missions. There were also the close ties of the past forgotten. Sultan Muzafar, Sultan Mansur and Sultan Mahmud acknowledged themselves to be Ayudhya’s vassals. In return, Malacca received supplies of food and people as much as valued trading privileges. When Ayudhya attempted to impose its control there in 809-10/1406, 822/1419 and 834-5/1431, Malacca was able to appeal to its patron China, who ordered the Thais to desist. The relationship with Majapahit, on the other hand, was more harmonious. Malacca continued to accept vassal status till the end of the century, and ties with Majapahit were fostered through regular missions.

The new settlement also reached if not friendship then at least a modus vivendi with its two powerful neighbours, the Thai kingdom of Ayudhya and Majapahit in Java. Founded in 751-2/1351, Ayudhya continued to claim suzerainty over the entire peninsula, and Majapahit too exercised a vague overlordship in the southern peninsula. Accordingly, until the latter part of the 9th/15th century, Malacca rulers acknowledged themselves to be Ayudhya’s vassals. In return, Malacca supplied troops and his suppliers of foodstuffs and other goods, as well as valued trading privileges. When Ayudhya attempted to impose its control there in 809-10/1406, 822/1419 and 834-5/1431, Malacca was able to appeal to its patron China, who ordered the Thais to desist. The relationship with Majapahit, on the other hand, was more harmonious. Malacca continued to accept vassal status till the end of the century, and ties with Majapahit were fostered through regular missions. There were also the close ties of the past forgotten. Sultan Muzafar, Sultan Mansur and Sultan Mahmud acknowledged themselves to be Ayudhya’s vassals. In return, Malacca received supplies of food and people as much as valued trading privileges. When Ayudhya attempted to impose its control there in 809-10/1406, 822/1419 and 834-5/1431, Malacca was able to appeal to its patron China, who ordered the Thais to desist. The relationship with Majapahit, on the other hand, was more harmonious. Malacca continued to accept vassal status till the end of the century, and ties with Majapahit were fostered through regular missions.

A prime factor in Malacca’s success was the quality of its administration. High priority was given to security within the town and to the protection of foreign merchants and their goods. One very practical measure was the construction of underground warehouses so that stored goods would be less vulnerable to theft and fire. An early Chinese account mentions men patrolling the streets ringing bells, and both Malay and Portuguese sources describe the active part taken by rulers themselves in supervising the enforcement of law. By the middle of the 9th/15th century, a body of laws had been codified regulating punishments and attempting to control abuses such as bribery, especially of judges. A separate maritime code set out the powers of a ship’s captain when at sea and his relationship with the captain and crew of the vessel he was carrying. The fact that foreigners in Malacca had ready access to a legal authority in cases of dispute must have been a great attraction to traders.

Commercial transactions were aided by an efficient administrative system shaped to the needs of the mercantile community. Four Shabbandars or harbour masters were appointed, each representing a group of trading nations. One was for the Gujaratis alone, since they were the most numerous (estimated at 1,000 by Pires); another was for other Indians and for traders from Pegu and Pasai; another for those from Java, the Moluccas, Banda, Palembang, Borneo and the Philippines; the fourth was for traders from Champa, China and the Ryukyu Islands (probably including Japan). Each Shabbandar had the responsibility of welcoming individual traders, assigning them warehouses, overseeing the affairs of his particular group, maintaining a check on weights, measures and coinage, adjudicating disputes between ships’ captains and merchants, and generally supervising the market place.

Customs duties were also carefully regulated. In general, these were paid in accordance with the value of the cargo, with additional gifts presented to the ruler and leading ministers. Though the bulk of Malacca’s revenue came from these duties, they were somewhat lower than those of its chief rivals. The Chinese, furthermore, were exempt from any gift-offering. For large ships, a flat rate of 6% of the total value was levied, eliminating the need for further gifts. To minimise the possibility of extortion or corruption, a consortium of Malacca merchants under the supervision of the Temenggung often bought up the entire cargo of these larger vessels. Each merchant then received a proportion of the cargo equivalent to the amount he had contributed. This proved a speedy and efficient method of clearing cargoes, enabling captains to buy up new supplies and prepare for their homeward journey with the appropriate monsoon. The smaller Malay traders of Malacca acted as middlemen, by selling or bartering the goods in front of their houses, in licensed stalls erected on the bridge over the Malacca River, or in the market place itself. They also carried cargoes by boat to other areas in the region. According to Pires, no less than 84 groups of foreigners, especially Indians, who took up residence on the southern side, impressive buildings were related to the Malacca dynasty through marriage, and some of the highest ministers traced their descent from orang laut. It was the practice to provide the sea people (orang laut, i.e., coastal dwellers) with rewards for their services, and their number was increased to 2,000. By the second reign, the population had swollen to 6,000 and it continued to grow as Malacca’s trade expanded. Peoples from the ar-
the archipelago. Because of the middleman role of Malays, and because their language was easily learnt from the eastern archipelago as well as a distribution point for Indian textiles. This dual role was vital in its commercial success, giving it a great advantage over nearby ports and ensuring its dominance in the Straits region. By the beginning of the 10th/16th century, Pires valued Malacca's trade at 2.4 million cruzados annually, well over half that of Seville, one of Europe's major commercial cities.

Statecraft in Malacca. The prestige which came to Malacca was linked not only to its wealth but to the development of a court culture. A fundamental part of this culture was the formulation of a concept of statecraft that reinforced the status of the dynasty and of Malacca itself. At the apex of the kingdom was the ruler, whose exalted lineage was traced to Sri Tri Buana in Palembang. The legend of the contract made by Sri Tri Buana with the Palembang chief stressed that a terrible retribution would be meted out to any subject guilty of derhaka or disloyalty to the ruler. Although the latter was enjoined to treat all his subjects with respect, the punishment of a wicked king must be left to Allah Almighty. But when a ruler governed justly and wisely, the kingdom would flourish, for the prosperity of the state found its ultimate source in the king. Divine powers were inherent in him, in pre-Islamic times perhaps subsumed in the Sanskrit word sakti or old Malay andeka but later denoted by the Arabic term daulat.

Despite the king's theoretical sanctity and total authority, there were checks against arbitrary rule. It was customary for all state decisions to be based on muafakat or consultation between the ruler and his ministers. The interaction between the two is well expressed by the Sejarah Melayu, which compares the ruler to the fire and the ministers to the firewood "and fire needs wood to produce a flame". Since the ministers were responsible for the daily functioning of the kingdom, they wielded great power. The most important was the Bendahara, originally of commoner and perhaps orang laut birth, but whose line in time became intimately linked with the royal house through intermarriage. Following him came the Penghulu Bendahari, the head of all Shahbandars, who controlled state revenues as well as royal servants and scribes. The Temenggung, originally third in line but later regarded as Bendahara designate, was chief of police and chief magistrate. Finally, the Laksamana headed the military administration and was commander of the ruler's bodyguard and the fleets of orang laut.

Below them were many other nobles, although the numbers are unknown. Some noble positions were created as royal favours, but many others were inherited. The nobles shared in the process of government through collective decision-making in a large assembly where consensus was highly valued. Because of their commercial interests, these men were often extremely wealthy and could call on a large following. Indeed, the greatest challenge a ruler could face was a coterie of hostile ministers and nobles. It is not surprising, therefore, that by the mid-9th/15th century Malacca's great achievements in statecraft had been translated into laws which spelt out special royal prerogatives in dress and ceremonial and the severe penalties for any who flouted this rigid summitey code. In extreme cases, such as the use of words forbidden to any but the king, the offender would be put to death.

While these notions of kingship did not originate in Malacca, it was there that they were fully developed and most clearly articulated. Malacca's great achievement was to redefine a court culture which was then consciously imitated throughout other parts of the Malay-speaking world. Despite local variations, the style of dress, literature and dance, social norms and courtly language were similar throughout the peninsula and most clearly articulated. Malacca's great achievement was to redefine a court culture which was then consciously imitated throughout other parts of the Malay-speaking world. Despite local variations, the style of dress, literature and dance, social norms and courtly language were similar throughout the peninsula and east-coast Sumatra, with considerable influence in Borneo and parts of the eastern archipelago. The fact that this highly-respected dynasty also adopted Islam was not only an important ingredient in its own prestige, but was also fundamental to the spread of Islam in the Malay-Indonesian archipelago.

Islam in Malacca. Arab and Indian Muslim traders had been in the archipelago for several centuries, but Islam did not begin to attract converts in significant numbers until after the 7th/13th century (for the coming of Islam, see MALAY PENINSULA and INDONESIA). By 929-3/1292 the town of Perlak and by 696/1297 Samudra-Pasai on the north-eastern coast of Sumatra had Muslim rulers, but on the peninsula the earliest evidence of an Islamic king is the Trengganu Stone from the east coast. It has a partly illegible kahgra which makes it hard to date. While we have no evidence as to the date of the first Islamic ruler, the first reference occurs in the Bendahara Melayu, 789/1387. Various dates for the conversion of the Malacca ruler, ranging from 811-12/1409 to 839/40, have been suggested, but the precise year is still speculative. While the Islamic name of Iskandar is attributed to Malacca's founder by the Sejarah Melayu, it is unlikely that the first ruler was himself Muslim. Pires attributes the conversion to the second ruler, whom he calls Iskandar. Since his dynastic list omits one king, it is more probable that the conversion he describes can be identified with the third ruler, Sultan Muhammad Shah, whom the Sejarah Melayu depicts as the first royal convert. The second, and conceivably the first ruler, may have assumed the name Iskandar and the Persian title of Shah to enhance their status, but Muhammad is a more appropriate name for a newly-converted king.

The Sejarah Melayu presents the conversion of the third ruler as an act of divine revelation. The Prophet, appearing to him in a dream, instructs him to recite the confession of faith, gives him the new name Muhammad, and tells him of the imminent arrival of a teacher from Jeddah. When the king awakes, he finds that he has been miraculously circumcised and that he is able to recite the creed. That afternoon a religious teacher arrives as his dream had foretold and, convinced by this event, both the ruler and his court embrace Islam.

The precise reasons for the ruler's conversion are still debated. According to Pires' account, the second Malacca ruler was aware that the commercial vitality of Malacca's rival, Muslim Pasai, was largely due to its patronage by Indian Muslim cloth merchants. He therefore took active steps to emulate Pasai's success and himself attract Muslims to Malacca. Muslim traders were granted commercial privileges; residences and mosques were built for them and they were welcomed at court. Pasai, assuming the prestigious role of proselytiser, encouraged this development by sending teachers to Malacca. Pires goes on to say that under the influence of both Pasai and prominent Muslim merchants, the second ruler at the age of 72 adopted Islam and married the King of Pasai's daughter.

Pasai's example and Malacca's desire to attract
merchants must have been persuasive in Malaccan court circles. Arguments in favour of taking definitive measures to secure Muslim trade would have been purely the result of commercial considerations. In the reign of the third ruler can be found in other parts of the Islamic heartlands, and in at least one case the position of Imam, Kadi, or judge in the Islamic religious hierarchy, although there are passing references to Imam, Kadi, and Khatib. It seems that the major religious official, who also played a prominent role in court in property disputes. Kadi. He had far greater authority than did the kadi or judge in the Islamic heartlands, and in at least one case the position passed from father to son. Other religious officials, especially the ruler's own teacher, similarly gained influence in court circles and Malacca's administration because of their assumed piety and superior knowledge.

The high point of royal encouragement of Islam came during the reign of Sultan Mansur, who built a great new mosque for Malacca and made preparations to make the pilgrimage. He died before this could be accomplished, but his son, Sultan Alauddin, said to be devoted to mosque affairs, also announced his intention of going to Mecca. Though he too abandoned his goal, the projects assumed greater significance when it is realised that until the late 19th century no Malay kings had made the hajj.

In the development of Malacca's court culture, Islam's great strength was its willingness, within certain limits, to tolerate many non-Islamic beliefs and traditions. An examination of Malacca's laws (Undang-Undang Melaka) shows that Islam made continuing compromises with existing practices, particularly in regard to criminal punishments and sexual offences. These laws, though drawn up by Islamic jurists and modified over several reigns, often include two penalties for the same crime, one following custom (adat) and the other said to be that of "the

Within Malacca, Islam helped to strengthen the dominance of the court. By the time Islam was formally adopted in Malacca, the influence of Persian notions of kingship, stressing the monarch's sacral nature and elevating him to a place high above ordinary mortals, had spread through much of the Islamic world. The Malacca ruler became part of this tradition. Already regarded as semi-divine, he was now able to assume other new and imposing titles. Coins from Malacca proclaim the ruler as Sultan and Shah, raising him above all other princes in the region who, with the exception of Pasai, bore the simpler title raja. He was also "Helper of the World and of the Religion" (Nāṣir al-dunya wa l-din), "Allah's Shadow Upon the Earth" (Zill Allah fi l- Islam), to whom obedience was due as a religious obligation. In the words of the Sejarah Melaka, "When you do your duty to the Prophet and Allah, with whom a good king is joined, then it is as though you are doing your duty to Allah himself".

There have been suggestions that the Hinduised tult of Sultan Muhammad's successor imply a short-lived rejection of Islam. In general, however, the promotion of Islam in Malacca was very much a matter of undertaking, with the rulers themselves actively encouraging proselytisation. In the reign of Sultan Mansur, marriages between Muslims and infidels were arranged to attract new converts, and apostasy was forbidden. The daily prayers were made obligatory for Muslims, and to a considerable extent the legal system began to favour Muslims, especially as witnesses and in property disputes. The adoption of Islam became increasingly necessary in order to maintain high positions in the court; while able non-Muslims could still rise, they usually eventually converted to the new faith. Nothing is known of the Islamic religious hierarchy, although there are passing references to Imam, Kadi, and Khatib.

Little is known of the nature of Islam in Malacca. The main source for information about its theological content has been the Sejarah Melaka, but although the text contains scattered references to Islam, these cannot be considered as particularly revealing. The reshaping of the royal genealogy to incorporate Alexander the Great (Iskandar Zul-karnain), regarded as a great Muslim warrior-conqueror, the rule of India, conveys more about Malay attitudes to ancestry than to religion. The Islamic invocation at the conclusion of each chapter and the death-bed testimonies of various rulers are purely formulaic phrases. Stories similar to that describing the miraculous conversion of the third ruler can be found in other parts of the Indonesian world and are hardly unique.

Some of the stories were created by post-Reformation references to mysticism, but the Sejarah Melaka itself does not demonstrate any deep knowledge of Sufi thought. The great Persian theologian and mystic, al-Ghazali (d. 505/1111 [q. v.]), mentioned simply as an example of a very learned man; similarly, the episodes which describe the exchange of missions between Malacca and Pasai, apparently over questions of doctrinal interest, may be equally related to the Malay love of riddles and the rivalry between the two courts. In one of these episodes, a teacher from Mecca is sent from Malacca by Sultan Mansur to Pasai to have his book on mysticism, Dart manzum, either authenticated or explained. In another, Sultan Mansur poses to the Pasai court the question of whether those in heaven or hell abide there forever, from which it has been inferred that the work of the late 8th/14th century and early 9th/15th century mystic 'Abd al-Karim al-Djilji (d. 820/1417 [q. v.]) was known in Malacca. Sultan Mahmud later sent a further mission to Pasai to resolve an apparent contradiction between two statements concerning the nature of unbelieft. But while the deliberately undisclosed answer may possibly imply a mystic response, the debate over what distinguished an infidel from an unbeliever was of general concern to Muslims in these early stages of Islamicisation.

Available sources do no more than suggest that Islamic teaching in Malacca was tinged with mysticism. Historical evidence is more revealing about Malacca's prestige as a thriving Muslim centre in the 9th/15th century and about the contribution of Islam to the shaping of Malay culture.

Within Malacca, Islam helped to strengthen the dominance of the court. By the time Islam was formally adopted in Malacca, the influence of Persian notions of kingship, stressing the monarch's sacral nature and elevating him to a place high above ordinary mortals, had spread through much of the Islamic world. The Malacca ruler became part of this tradition. Already regarded as semi-divine, he was now able to assume other new and imposing titles. Coins from Malacca proclaim the ruler as Sultan and Shah, raising him above all other princes in the region who, with the exception of Pasai, bore the simpler title raja. He was also "Helper of the World and of the Religion" (Nāṣir al-dunya wa l-din), "Allah's Shadow Upon the Earth" (Zill Allah fi l- Islam), to whom obedience was due as a religious obligation. In the words of the Sejarah Melaka, "When you do your duty to the Prophet and Allah, with whom a good king is joined, then it is as though you are doing your duty to Allah himself". There have been suggestions that the Hinduised tult of Sultan Muhammad's successor imply a short-lived rejection of Islam. In general, however, the promotion of Islam in Malacca was very much a matter of undertaking, with the rulers themselves actively encouraging proselytisation. In the reign of Sultan Mansur, marriages between Muslims and infidels were arranged to attract new converts, and apostasy was forbidden. The daily prayers were made obligatory for Muslims, and to a considerable extent the legal system began to favour Muslims, especially as witnesses and in property disputes. The adoption of Islam became increasingly necessary in order to maintain high positions in the court; while able non-Muslims could still rise, they usually eventually converted to the new faith. Nothing is known of the Islamic religious hierarchy, although there are passing references to Imam, Kadi, and Khatib. It seems that the major religious official, who also played a prominent role in court in property disputes. Kadi. He had far greater authority than did the kadi or judge in the Islamic heartlands, and in at least one case the position passed from father to son. Other religious officials, especially the ruler's own teacher, similarly gained influence in court circles and Malacca's administration because of their assumed piety and superior knowledge.

The high point of royal encouragement of Islam came during the reign of Sultan Mansur, who built a great new mosque for Malacca and made preparations to make the pilgrimage. He died before this could be accomplished, but his son, Sultan Alauddin, said to be devoted to mosque affairs, also announced his intention of going to Mecca. Though he too abandoned his goal, the projects assumed greater significance when it is realised that until the late 19th century no Malay kings had made the hajj.

In the development of Malacca's court culture, Islam's great strength was its willingness, within certain limits, to tolerate many non-Islamic beliefs and traditions. An examination of Malacca's laws (Undang-Undang Melaka) shows that Islam made continuing compromises with existing practices, particularly in regard to criminal punishments and sexual offences. These laws, though drawn up by Islamic jurists and modified over several reigns, often include two penalties for the same crime, one following custom (adat) and the other said to be that of "the
law of Allah”. In fact, the so-called “law of Allah” was often adapted from shari'a law to conform with local conditions. This fusion of Islam and Malaccan custom was not always acceptable. An Arab sailor-author whose account is dated 866/1462 considered that, in Islamic terms, Malacca had no culture; he was critical of the marriage between Muslims and infidels, and the fact that divorce was not regarded as a religious act; he also condemned the failure to observe Islamic restrictions against certain foods, especially the eating of dogs and drinking of wine. The *Sparuh Melayu* hints at the continuing tension between Malays and foreign Muslims who looked down on a society they might well consider morally and spiritually lax. One incident describes how a Malacca noble, coming to his religious class intoxicated, accuses his teacher of being in Malacca purely for financial gain; another noble defends the subtext of Malay pronunciation in comparison with that of Arabic.

From an orthodox point of view, Malacca Malays might not have been deeply versed in Islamic theology or punctilious observers of strict *ghara'a* law. On the other hand, even when the faith was only newly-established in Malacca, the sources contain no hint that Muslims from eastern Asia questioned its orthodoxy. Ma Huan, a Chinese Muslim interpreter whose account may relate to any period between 812-13/1409 and 853/1451, notes simply that “the king of the country and all the people follow the Muslim faith, fasting, doing penance and chanting litanies”. By the second half of the 9th/15th century, Malacca was regarded as a focal point for Islamic scholarship, with religious teachers attracted by the patronage of the court and the possibility of supporting themselves by taking on pupils. Islam also became a lingua franca. In the southern Philippines, Borneo and Java, legends link royal conversion to teachers arriving from Malacca or to local figures who received instruction there. The explication and dispersal of Islamic beliefs was facilitated because Malay was already established as a regional *lingua franca*. Furthermore, the process of Islamicisation was fostered by the later Malacca rulers, who regarded themselves and were perceived as the champions of Islam in the region. Sultan Muzafar was said to have actively encouraged princes in the northern coastal ports of Java to adopt Islam, and one Javanese non-Muslim ruler was driven to complain to the Portuguese about Malacca’s *Muslim* fervour. While Malacca laid down the basis for much of Malay culture, Islam itself became so associated with Malay that, in places such as Borneo, to embrace Islam was much to the example of the prosperous and successful dynasty. But the statement clearly has found in Malacca. Sultan Muzafar did, however, defeat the rulers of Kampar and Indragiri on the east coast of Sumatra, forcing them to become Muslim and gaining access to the pepper and gold of the Sumatran interior. His son Sultan Mansur extended suzerainty over Perak, gained after wars with Kedah, Ayudhya’s vassal. His control was strengthened along the east coast of Sumatra, where Siak was defeated and Mansur’s daughter married to its ruler. Mansur’s sister, who married the ruler of Minangkabau, also brought her husband to accept Islam. The next ruler, Sultan Alaudinn, incorporating the entire Riau-Lingga archipelago in his territory, and to ensure his hold over the empire, travelled the kings of Pahang, Kampar and Indragiri at the Malacca court, where he was said to have instanced their belief on Malacca.

Islam must have provided the last ruler of Malacca, Mahmud, with a rallying point around which to mobilise his subjects in campaigns against the Buddhist Thais. During his reign Malacca attacked Kelantan, a Thai vassal in the northern Peninsula, and in 902-3/1497 moved as far north as Ligor. A Thai prince of Patani agreed to accept Melaka’s suzerainty and adopt Islam, while the ruler of Kedah also revoked Thai overlordship. When Mahmud formally renounced any Thai claims to suzerainty in the region, relations with Ayudhya were broken off. In 905-6/1499 the *Thais* attacked Malacca again and possibly made further inroads into the Siamese territories prior to the first arrival of the Portuguese in 941-5/1509. But by this stage, Malacca’s hold over the central and southern peninsula was so strong that Ayudhya was only able to impose overlordship over the most northerly Malay states.

During the 9th/15th century, the nexus between flourishing international trade and a thriving religious environment, characteristic of major maritime ports in the archipelago, is well-exemplified in Malacca. Islam became an integral part of the court culture of Malacca which, admired and emulated throughout the Malay world, also laid the basis for the evolution of modern Malay society. While Malacca played a vital role in the Islamicisation process, Islam was equally important in contributing to Malacca’s special place in Malay history. Perhaps the measure of Malacca’s prestige is expressed most vividly by the last ruler, Sultan Mahmud, who claimed that Malacca was so great that it could be made into Mecca itself. Although implications of Sufi teaching on the importance of the *haj* have been read into this, it is as easy to see it simply as the boast of a proud, wealthy and successful dynasty. But the statement clearly created a dilemma for orthodox Muslims, and according to later Malay arguments it was Sultan Mahmud’s notion that the people of Aru, though converted before Malacca, practised a form of Islam inferior to that found in Malacca. Sultan Muzafar did, however, defeat the rulers of Kampar and Indragiri on the east coast of Sumatra, forcing them to become Muslim and gaining access to the pepper and gold of the Sumatran interior. His son Sultan Mansur extended suzerainty over Perak, gained after wars with Kedah, Ayudhya’s vassal. His control was strengthened along the east coast of Sumatra, where Siak was defeated and Mansur’s daughter married to its ruler. Mansur’s sister, who married the ruler of Minangkabau, also brought her husband to accept Islam. The next ruler, Sultan Alaudinn, incorporating the entire Riau-Lingga archipelago in his territory, and to ensure his hold over the empire, travelled the kings of Pahang, Kampar and Indragiri at the Malacca court, where he was said to have instanced their belief on Malacca.

Islam must have provided the last ruler of Malacca, Mahmud, with a rallying point around which to mobilise his subjects in campaigns against the Buddhist Thais. During his reign Malacca attacked Kelantan, a Thai vassal in the northern Peninsula, and in 902-3/1497 moved as far north as Ligor. A Thai prince of Patani agreed to accept Melaka’s suzerainty and adopt Islam, while the ruler of Kedah also revoked Thai overlordship. When Mahmud formally renounced any Thai claims to suzerainty in the region, relations with Ayudhya were broken off. In 905-6/1499 the Thais attacked Malacca again and possibly made further inroads into the Siamese territories prior to the first arrival of the Portuguese in 941-5/1509. But by this stage, Malacca’s hold over the central and southern peninsula was so strong that Ayudhya was only able to impose overlordship over the most northerly Malay states.

During the 9th/15th century, the nexus between flourishing international trade and a thriving religious environment, characteristic of major maritime ports in the archipelago, is well-exemplified in Malacca. Islam became an integral part of the court culture of Malacca which, admired and emulated throughout the Malay world, also laid the basis for the evolution of modern Malay society. While Malacca played a vital role in the Islamicisation process, Islam was equally important in contributing to Malacca’s special place in Malay history. Perhaps the measure of Malacca’s prestige is expressed most vividly by the last ruler, Sultan Mahmud, who claimed that Malacca was so great that it could be made into Mecca itself. Although implications of Sufi teaching on the importance of the *haj* have been read into this, it is as easy to see it simply as the boast of a proud, wealthy and successful dynasty. But the statement clearly created a dilemma for orthodox Muslims, and according to later Malay arguments it was Sultan Mahmud’s notion that the people of Aru, though converted before Malacca, practised a form of Islam inferior to that found in Malacca. Sultan Muzafar did, however, defeat the rulers of Kampar and Indragiri on the east coast of Sumatra, forcing them to become Muslim and gaining access to the pepper and gold of the Sumatran interior. His son Sultan Mansur extended suzerainty over Perak, gained after wars with Kedah, Ayudhya’s vassal. His control was strengthened along the east coast of Sumatra, where Siak was defeated and Mansur’s daughter married to its ruler. Mansur’s sister, who married the ruler of Minangkabau, also brought her husband to accept Islam. The next ruler, Sultan Alaudinn, incorporating the entire Riau-Lingga archipelago in his territory, and to ensure his hold over the empire, travelled the kings of Pahang, Kampar and Indragiri at the Malacca court, where he was said to have instanced their belief on Malacca.

Islam must have provided the last ruler of Malacca, Mahmud, with a rallying point around which to mobilise his subjects in campaigns against the Buddhist Thais. During his reign Malacca attacked Kelantan, a Thai vassal in the northern Peninsula, and in 902-3/1497 moved as far north as Ligor. A Thai prince of Patani agreed to accept Melaka’s suzerainty and adopt Islam, while the ruler of Kedah also revoked Thai overlordship. When Mahmud formally renounced any Thai claims to suzerainty in the region, relations with Ayudhya were broken off. In 905-6/1499 the Thais attacked Malacca again and possibly made further inroads into the Siamese territories prior to the first arrival of the Portuguese in 941-5/1509. But by this stage, Malacca’s hold over the central and southern peninsula was so strong that Ayudhya was only able to impose overlordship over the most northerly Malay states.
attacked by a Portuguese fleet under the command of Afonso de Albuquerque. The Portuguese aim was to establish a port for their expanding Asian trade, to gain access to and command of eastern spices, and to strike a major blow at Christianity's great rival, Islam. Internal dissensions in Malacca, and Portuguese military superiority, led to the flight of Sultan Mahmud with 3,000 men and the fall of the city itself on 21 Dżumáda I 917/10 August 1511. There can be little doubt that at the time both Malays and Portuguese felt the religious nature of the conflict to be as compelling as the commercial one. Several Portuguese take-hostage in Malacca in 914-15/1509 were circumcised and forcibly converted by Sultan Mahmud's orders. His refusal to negotiate with Albuquerque two years later was attributed to the influence of Muslim merchants, especially those from India who had previously experienced conflict with the Portuguese. Albuquerque for his part saw "Moors" as Portugal's implacable enemies, both on commercial and spiritual grounds, and gave orders that any Malay captured should be put to death. The Hindu merchants of Malacca regarded the Christian Portuguese as a natural ally against their Muslim rivals and gave Albuquerque valued assistance both before and after Malacca's fall.

In the aftermath of the attack, Malacca was sacked and mosques and royal graves destroyed to provide stone for the great fortress, La Formosa, built on the site of Sultan Mansur's great mosque. A Portuguese governor and administration was appointed, Hindus were placed in high positions and relations with neighbouring non-Muslim rulers were cultivated. In time, a modus vivendi was reached with other Muslim states whose economy had come to be closely linked with Malacca's. But despite sustained efforts, the Portuguese were never successful in reviving Malacca's former commercial supremacy. While it remained an important entrepot, foreign merchants complained of high duties and official corruption, and Muslim traders preferred to patronise Islamic Atjeh. Furthermore, Portuguese Malacca faced the continuing hostility of the Malacca dynasty's heirs. Setting up a new capital in the Riau-Lingga archipelago, they made repeated attacks on Malacca in an effort to recapture the city. When the Dutch appeared in the area in the early 11th/17th century, the Malacca dynasty, now based in peninsular Johor, were more than ready to assist the Dutch East India Company (VOC) in a siege of Malacca, perhaps hoping that they might thereby return. However, after Malacca's fall to Dutch forces in Shawwal 1050/January 1641, it became simply one more port in the vast VOC trading network. Unlike the Portuguese, the Dutch never saw Malacca as an important commercial centre. Its major function was to act as a strategic guard post on the Malacca Straits, with commercial traffic focussed on Batavia, the VOC capital.

Under the Dutch administration, the Malay population (including Malay speakers from elsewhere in the archipelago) slowly increased to more than 5,000 and the Malay rulers did frequent Malacca, but not in great numbers, being always the object of Dutch suspicion. But Islam fared better under the Protestant VOC than under the Roman Catholic Portuguese. The VOC did not encourage missionary activities among Muslims, and in many ways was more concerned about Catholicism. However, without a Malay court to act as a religious sponsor, and without the links to the Muslim world provided by a cosmopolitan trading port, Malacca made no further significant contribution to the development of Malay Islam. In 1795, during the Napoleonic Wars, it was taken over by the British to prevent its capture by the French. Under the British, the famous fort was destroyed to forestall its use by hostile forces in the future. Malacca reverted briefly to the Dutch in 1818 but in 1824, by the terms of the Anglo-Dutch Treaty, was returned to the British in exchange for Benkulen (west Sumatra). In 1826 it was incorporated into the Straits Settlements, but was always subservient commercially to Penang and Singapore, which became renowned centres for Islamic study. In 1867 the Straits Settlements were transferred from the Government of India and brought directly under the Colonial Office. During the colonial period (1874 until 1957), Malacca was under the control of a British Resident responsible to the Governor in Singapore. It became part of the independent Federation of Malta in 1957.


MALACCA [sec mala‘i]

MALA‘I (a. pl. of mala‘i), appears in a number of sources, in a figurative sense, as the equivalent of musical instruments; it is sometimes replaced by ala‘ al-labhe or linked with the word laba‘ which means “game, pastime, amusement”, as e.g. in certain works called ki‘dah al-labhe wa ‘l-mala‘i. According to the L, the verb laba‘ denotes an action aimed at amusing and at securing farab, the emotion of joy or sadness; this further term, closely associated with music and its power, gives birth to another appellation dlat al-tarab. Dozy, in his Supplement, ii, 554, lists several terms which come from the same root and are connected with the same idea: mulhi “musician, instrumental player, minstrel, balladeer whose profession is to amuse the masses”; the feminine mulhiya would mean “dancer”, according to Quatremère, but Dozy remarks “I believe rather that this musical instrument, more probably, we have arbâh al-mala‘i: ‘musicians’ and ala‘ al-mala‘i “musical instruments”. We have thus already three equivalent terms denoting the same idea.

These few explanations of the usage of the term mala‘i underline very clearly the association of the designated object with the idea of game, pastime, diversion and amusement, a point which leads us to examine certain questions of principle. Does this obvious connection with games and diversion indicate a certain ideological and conceptual attitude which could be at the very origin of the term in its relationship with music? Is it therefore possible that the term was adopted at a given moment and in particular circumstances? Was it, together with its variants, the sole term used to designate the musical facts to which it corresponds? Are the various principles given by Dozy exceptional ones, or do they rather indicate that the term mala‘i is a wider one and extends beyond the idea of musical instruments to denote, e.g., music in general, and above all, the art-forms of music? Is there perhaps a more restricted sense denoting e.g., a particular category of instruments? As we shall see, it seems that mala‘i is a term with manifold usages.

A study of the sources on music reveals to us a very significant state of affairs. On one side, the term mala‘i, either alone or linked with laba‘, appears in the title of 7 or 8 works which, accordingly, set forth systematically the facts concerning it. On the other, mala‘i appears in the chapters and passages devoted to music which form part of works belonging to certain categories of writings, but is almost absent from treatises with a speculative character. These last, which examine closely the mathematical, theoretical and philosophical aspects of music, like those of al-Kindi, al-Fârâbi, Ibn Sinâ, etc., use other terms to denote the musical instruments or the other concepts covered by mala‘i, such as ala‘ pure and simple, or ala‘ al-mala‘i, ala‘ al-jubâr and ala‘ al-qinnâ. The Epistle of the Ikhwan al-Safa, which is on the borderline between the opposing categories, uses on one occasion at the beginning of the treatise the term in the combination sinâ‘at al-mala‘i (instrumental art or music instrumentals), but in the definition of music and its aims twice repeated we read “mâs‘âkî is qinnâ, the mäskhâr is the musician and the mäskhâr are musical instruments, ala‘ al-qinnâ”. Amongst the rare exceptions in the speculative treatises, one may cite a case of a late, anonymous treatise calledMu‘jzat al-anghâm wa ‘l-hunûk wa ‘l-tarab fi ‘l-ithnâ‘ yâhâr wa ‘l-sîtâ “Knowledge about the melodies and modes and the happy emotions caused by the 12 and 6 modes” (ms. Top Kapu Sarayi A. 2130, pp. 2-47), where it says “The search for farab has led to the invention of mala‘i (musical instruments) by the philosophers”.

It is interesting to note that seven out of the eight treatises completely devoted to mala‘i saw the light in the 3rd/9th century; the eighth one, the Dhamm al-mala‘îb wa ‘l-mala‘i by Ibn al-Kayyâl (d. 938/1532), is conceived in the same spirit and bears almost the same title as one of the seven others, Ibn Abî ‘l-Dunây’s Dhamm al-mala‘î (author d. 281/894). Like this last, Ibn al-Kayyâl brings together games and music in his treatise (ms. Chester Beatty 3419, fols. 1-7a), of which the first two-thirds are devoted to games and the last third to music, dancing and musical instruments, whose origin is attributed to Satan. Given that the theologian and jurist Ibn Abî ‘l-Dunây’s Dhamm al-mala‘î is the oldest extant work of this kind, it is plausible to suggest that it was indeed he who established the model of the systematic and expanded connection of “music and musical instruments” with “games, pastimes and amusement”.

Ibn Abî ‘l-Dunây in fact attacks violently music, which he regards as a diversion from the life of devotion and piety; his attack covers all kinds of musical activity, including the instruments linked up with games and other types of pleasure. This treatise accordingly became a source of inspiration for later generations of theologians and jurists who opposed music. Discussion concerning mala‘i in either a wide sense, embracing the art-forms of music and all instruments, or a more restrained sense crops up again whenever it is a question of sama‘ (q.v.); in the numerous passages about the problem of mala‘i, we find attitudes varying from total prohibition to total admissibility of music, dancing and all instruments. Hence in certain cases, the term mala‘i acquires a very wide sense, embracing the art-forms of music and the dance; in others, it is restricted to instruments given by the jurist as forbidden in- struments of amusement,学问 and piety; his attack covers all kinds of musical instruments; amongst the rare exceptions in the different treatises, see Shiloah, The theory of music in Arabic writings, 50-2), discusses the case of several instruments, such as the daf (tambourine) and the ghabâba and yârsâ (flutes), then he deals separately with the mala‘i, which are identified with mawsî’i (a generic term for stringed instruments). In this case, one must understand that mala‘i denoting the forbidden instruments for amusement correspond essentially with stringed instruments, those par excellence of art-form music. The Mâlikî jurist Ibn al-Hâdîj (d. 737/1336) confirms in some measure this remark in his Madkhal al-šarî‘ al-darîfî, where he states that ghanîa, listening to slave musicians, to the šid, the jâbûr and other instruments of amusement (mala‘i) is to be condemned. An attitude similar to al-Adîwî’s turns up again in the treatise of Ibn al-Kaysarâni, Fi djawâd al-sama‘î, in which the author begins also by putting forward the idea that certain instruments are allowable, but then devotes a passage to mawzûmûr and mala‘i, which are absolutely forbidden. The jurist al-Shamî (d. 993/1585) in his Nıṣâb al-dhisâb writes that if the šid, the jâbûr and the sama are publicly on view, it is the mahbûs’s duty to destroy them. Finally, in this type of writings, the term mala‘i or ala‘ al-labhe is taken, according to the attitude of the various authors, at times as the equivalent of all the concepts concerning art-form
music and the dance and at times as designating certain instruments which are universally condemned.

In the general schema of the literature on samā‘, there are other points of view about the term and concept of malāhī. Al-Nāhilusi (d. 1143/1731) in his Īdāb al-dalālāt fī samā‘ al-ālāt (ed. Damascus 1302/1884) puts forward the idea that the word labw, by which one describes the instruments (malāhī or ālāt al-labw), does not necessarily indicate that musical instruments are invariably used with the aim of amusement. This qualification and the prohibition which follows from it are justifiable when the end sought is mere amusement. But when they contribute to the spiritual elevation of the Sūfī, this idea of distraction and amusement is no longer valid, since an instrument as such is not to be condemned because of its shape or the harmonious sounds which it makes; thus listening to the beautiful sounds made by birds is not forbidden. We find exactly the same attitude again, set forth in more or less the same terms, in the work of al-Nabulusi’s pupil al-Sarakhsi (d. 1312/1905). Said al-Majdūlī (d. 775), Rāfī al-majdūli fī ḥukm ilabāh samā‘ al-ālāt bi ‘l-mujahmāt al-tāsyihāt (ms. Berlin, We 1811, fols. 1-29).

With this refutation, which reduces to some extent the pejorative sense of malāhī and which rejects the ideological attitude which associates them wholly with maleficient effects, we can pass on to the class of writings which presents the point of view of literary exponents and which is seen in the works of the 3rd/9th century devoted to malāhī. Amongst these, some are unfortunately lost, and we only have the titles in bibliographical works. Ibn al-Kīfī, in his T. al-Ḥukamā‘, mentions a treatise by al-Sarakhsi (d. 286/899), whose complete title is Kitāb al-Lahw wa ‘l-malāhī fī ‘l-ghnām wa ‘l-majdūlām wa ‘l-majdūlasa. Ibn Abī Usaybi’a, in his ‘Uyun al-‘inbā‘, gives an abridged title for the same work, K. al-Lahw wa ‘l-malāhī, and Hājjī Khālīfah refers merely to a K. al-Lahw; in the light of the practices of al-Sarakhsi’s time, it may be that we have here more than one work. Amongst the lost treatises on music of Thābit b. Kurra (d. 288/901), a Kitāb al-Lahw wa ‘l-malāhī is mentioned in the previously-cited work of Ibn al-Kīfī. Finally, in the Fihrist, Ibn al-Nadim cites a lost work of Muhammad b. Yahya b. Abī Mansūr al-Mawṣiḥī (3rd/9th century) which had the title Kitāb al-Ud wa ‘l-malāhī.

We come now to two final works of the 3rd/9th century which dealt with malāhī and which are, at the same time, the oldest treatises on music which have come down to us. The first, the Kitāb al-Malāhī, is that of the famous grammarian of the Kūfān school al-Mu‘āfiḍd al-B. Salama (d. ca. 592/905 [q.v.]). The work is essentially apologetic, and takes up the defence of two causes set forth in the introduction in the following order:

(1) Refutation of the opinion, probably that of the Shu‘ubiyah [q.v.], according to which the Arabs did not know the ‘ud and the other malāhī and the Arabic language did not possess the technical terms for the different parts of the instrument and for other musical features; and (2) demonstration of the fact that music and musical instruments were not illicit. The author begins with the second proof, to which he devotes a few lines only, adding some pieces of evidence in favour of music and musical instruments. The greater part of the treatise is thus devoted to the first proof, in which the attitude of the grammarian becomes clear. He comments upon a large number of Arabic terms relating to instruments and to music which he has gleaned from classical Arabic poetry. The method of presentation starts off from the origin of each instrument considered, most frequently, in the style of the aswād [q.v.] literature. The ‘ṣud, regarded as the king of instruments, comes first; in this connection, the author quotes Ḥālam Ibn al-Kullī for the legend of its invention by Lamēch [see Lamēch]. After having mentioned other Biblical inventors of instruments (Tzila, daughter of Lot, etc.), he moves on to details of terminology, supporting each piece of commentary by references to poetry. Thus he passes under review the different names for the ‘ṣud, sc. kirān, mizāhar, harbat and mawṣūl, the term for ‘string’, sc. watar, μαθάδ, and šar‘ā‘; the special name for the ‘ṣud’s four strings, sc. zir, μαθάδ, μαθάδ and bamm; its frets (daikā‘) are called in Arabic šāhī, the Arabic equivalents of the tunbār, a lute with a long neck and plucked strings, sc. īdirrīd and al-wāsīn; and the names of the ten different kinds of wind instruments, sc. mūzār, mizāwār, zamānār, nāy, kusayb, mughṭak, yarā‘, sanbak and hanubka. Still on the lexicographical level, at the end of the treatise the author adds the first forms of singing developed in the pre-Islamic period, sc. badī‘, nāb, ṣnadd and ḥasāf. In addition to its lexicographic importance, the work has a special interest for musicology in its aspect of organology (i.e. the science dealing with musical instruments). This interest extends in fact to all the categories of the literature on malāhī, and provides information to the scholar about a large number of instruments since fallen into disuse. Thus al-Shalālī (5th/11th century) mentions in his Kitāb al-Imā‘a ‘l-w-nfisī fī mas‘alat samā‘ al-ṣamā‘ 28 different instruments, and the total number to be gleaned from this literature amounts to several dozen.

To the same period as al-Mu‘afядd b. Salama’s work belongs that of the geographer Ibn Khurradādhbih (3rd/9th century [q.v.]), his Kitāb al-Lahw wa ‘l-malāhī. Despite certain similarities to the preceding work, this latter one is much more complex and sophisticated. In the same fashion as the Kitāb al-Malāhī, it opens with a section refuting the opinions of those who prohibit music and gives the story of the invention of the ‘ṣud by Lamēch as well as the stories of other inventors of musical instruments in Biblical times, but Ibn Khurradādhbih slants his work towards wider and more universal horizons. His interest is indeed more centred on cultural and historical than lexicographical questions. In furtherance of these, he touches on the music of other peoples, in particular, on that of the Persians and Greeks; and he pictures the musical world on a wide scale, dealing with the power of music and its different effects. From his glimpse at world music, he passes to its development among the Arabs, and then devotes the greater part of the work to a series of biographies of all the famous musicians from the beginnings of Islam to his own time. As a result, the term malāhī has here a wider sense and becomes the equivalent of “music”. Hence it is not by chance that al-Mas‘ūdī (d. 345/956 [q.v.]) has cited, in the form of a dialogue in his Murūjd al-dhahab (see BIBL.) the essential part of Ibn Khurradādhbih’s work. Al-Mas‘ūdī related indeed that the caliph al-Mu‘tamid, who was a fervid lover of music, asked Ibn Khurradādhbih to compose for him a treatise on the origins and evolution of music; the discourse which Ibn Khurradādhbih sets forth in response to the caliph’s request follows almost word-for-word the first part of the K. al-Lahw wa ‘l-malāhī as far as the point where the long series of biographies begins.

These two works are the beginning and the end of this category of writings on the malāhī. They make the opening of a genre of writings on music which borrows from that aswād literature which has anecdotal and
edifying works which do not however use the word *mālahī* any longer in their title. Nevertheless, the term was to remain for a long while in use sporadically. It is often to be found in the *Kitāb al-Āghārī* as e.g. in the passage concerning the caliph al-Mu'tamid cited above, in which it is said that he had a passion for *mālahī*. Moreover, in regard to the caliph Yazīd (60-4/680-3), the same source states that “he was the first to introduce *mālahī* (musical instruments) and singers at court”.

In conclusion, we are inclined to admit that the term *mālahī* came into current usage of the 3rd/9th century above all with the sense of musical instruments. Within the circles of those religious authorities opposed to music, their association with amusement is seized upon and stress laid on this pejorative connotation, which at times enables these authorities to attack what they regard as the negative side of music and its emotive power. It is accordingly in this sense that the term *mālahī* is perpetuated in the corresponding literature. In the circles of literary adepts, the sense of amusement is taken up as the equivalent of *farāb*, the dominating and much sought-after effect of music in that period. Its substitution takes place at the moment when the theoretical writings on music become formed, without the influence of Greek treatises translated into Arabic, i.e. towards the beginning of the 9th/10th century. The term disappears fairly rapidly from this literature, because the philosophers and theorists inveigled against the identification of music with playing, pastimes and amusement; hence they had no interest in utilising a term which denoted the very thing which they wished to avoid.


**MALĀHI (a.)**, pl. of *malīma* [q. v.], which is the subject of the article below mainly devoted to the *Malīmah Dānṣūdī* and its several versions culminating in an apocalyptic current, at first in connection with the announcing of the approach of the Mahdī [q. v.] and then oriented towards the predictions concerning the fate of different dynasties. These oracles gave birth to the elaborating of so-called *malāḥīm* (or *ḥīdāyān*) works, which have been already spoken of in the article *ṭalāfīr* and the subject is only raised again here in order to note the use of the term in the sense of predictions of a historical character (see e.g. al-Maṣāʿūdī, Murādī, i, 8, ii, 335 = §§ 6, 756) and to highlight the fact that Ibn Khaldūn enumerates several of these writings in a section about the beginnings of states and of nations which he places in the last pages of ch. 3 of Book 1 of the *Muqaddima* (Ar. text, ii, 193 ff., tr. of Slane, ii, 226 ff., tr. Rosenthal, ii, 200 ff.). There follows here a list of the texts of which he acquired knowledge, mainly in the Maghrib, but some also in the Orient:

— A *kasīda* of Ibn Murānā on the Lamūrī, i.e. the Almoravids, who seized Cēta [see SÀTAR] in 476/1083-4;
— A *kasīda* of 500 verses or 1,000 verses called *al-Tabhāb* and concerning the Almohads;
— A *maḥāb* ‘amusing piece’ or ‘playing thing’ of about 500 verses given in *zafāl* [q. v.] form, attributed to a Jew and also concerning the Almohads;
— A *kasīda* on the Hafsids of Tunis attributed to Ibn al-ʿAbbār [q. v.], but belonging to a person of the same name who was a tailor;
— Another *malīma* on the Hafsids;
— A *muṣāt* attributed to a certain Hawshānī and written in dialect Arabic in such an hermetic style that it would need an allegorical commentary.

In the Orient, Ibn Khaldūn acquired knowledge of a *malīmāt* attributed to Ibn al-ʿArabi [q. v.], the *Ṣuyyāt al-bādh* [see O. Yahia, *Histoir e et classification de l’œuvre d’ Ibn Arabi*, Damascus 1964, no. 708; T. Fahd, in Al-Qaṣīr, above], as well as several others attributed to Ibn Sinān, to Ibn Abī ʿl-ʿAbk [see Goldziher, in *ZDMG*, lxxiv (1921)] or, on the Turks, to the Sūfī al-Bāṣṭarbākī.

One should note that the works consulted by Ibn Khaldūn in the Maghrib are all in verse (classical or dialectical), that they were widespread in his own time and that he himself attached no credence to any of them.

**Bibliography:** In addition to references given in the article, see A. Kovalenko, Magee et Islam, Geneva 1981, index, and the Biblioth. al-Qaṣīr and *Malīmah* (Ed.)

**MALĀHIMA (a.)** angels (Persian “angel” — frights).

1. In the Kurān and in Sunni Islam.

The form *malāhīma* is the broken plural in Arabic of a word going back to early North-West Semitic (there is no cognate in Akkadian). Ugar. mlk ‘messenger’. Aram. mlṭ ‘messenger’ and O.T. Hebr. mlāḏ ‘messenger’, the root in Arabic being referred by the lexicographers and commentators to a root ml-ṭ or even l-ṭ (see LA, xii, 272-4, 370-1; al-Ṭabarī, Taṣīfī, i, 150; Lane, *Lexicon*, i, 81c), which they consider original to Arabic. A. Jelfery, *The foreign vocabulary of the Qurān*, 269-70, following e.g. K. Ahrens, *Christliche im Koran*, in ZDMG, lxxiv (1930), 24, thought it fairly certain that the proximate source of the word in Arabic was nevertheless the Ethiopic mlṭ, pl. mlṭēk, the usual equivalent in that language for Grk. ἄγγελος ‘messenger > angel’; the word was presumably a loanword from Ethiopic into Aramaic or Hebrew. Since it is so frequently used in the Korān, Muhammad’s audience was obviously familiar with it, and it must have been a pre-Islamic borrowing. The singular in Arabic is normally mlṭ without hamza, and so always in the Kurān; although LA in two places (xii, 274,8; 371,5) quotes the same verse as a proof that mlṭ does occur, but as an exceptional form (ḥālāmāḏ). Both singular and plural in Arabic are used only in the sense “angel”. In the Kurān it occurs twice in the dual (malṭēk, II, 96; VII, 19); of the two angels Hārūt and Mārūt [q. v., and sura], and of Adam and Eve being tempted in the
Garden to believe that they may become angels. The plural occurs very often in the Kur'an (in Flugel's _Compendium_ under i-ku, 171) but the singular only 12 times (Flugel, under m-ka, 183). These are the people demanding revelation by an angel rather than a human being (bashar, VI, 8, 9, 50; XI, 15, 33; XVII, 97; XXV, 8); women think Joseph an angel for his beauty rather than a human being (bashar, XII, 31); an angel's intercession (isra'a', LIII, 26) does not avail; twice as collective for angels, beside the 'arq (LXIX, 17), and in rows and rows (LXXXIX, 25). In XCVII, 11, "the angel of death" (malak al-maw'ut) occurs but not by name; see 'izara'ul, and references in tradition in Wensinck, _Handbook of Early Muhammadan Tradition_, 22b. Djibrib, the angel of revelation, is named three times (II, 91, 92; LXVI, 4); cf. traditions on him in Muslim, Constantinople 1333, i, 109-11 and other references in Wensinck, 59. In Kur'an XXVI, 193-5, Djibrib unnamed, is called "the Faithful Spirit" (ar-ruh al-'amir); he brings down the revelation to the kalb of Muhammad in a clear Arabic tongue. There are other descriptions of him, still unnamed, in LIII, 5-18 and LXXXI, 19-25, as appearing plainly to Muhammad in revelation. He, as "our Spirit" (ribahana), was sent to Maryam (XIX, 17). He is called the "Holy Spirit" (ruh al-khdus) in XVI, 104 and Allah aided Isra'il with the name (II, 84, 245, 309). This was confirmed (II, 92) as an angle of the same rank as Djibrib; see a long and apparently true story of how his naming came about in al-Baydawi (ed. Fleischer, i, 18, 18 ff.); in traditions he, with Djibrib, appears to Muhammad and instructs him; he does not laugh (Wensinck, 152b); Muhammad called the two his waizirs of the angels. To Isra'il [p. e.], the angel with the trumpet of resurrection, there is no reference either in the Kur'an or in canonical traditions, but very much in eschatological legend. In Kur'an XLIII, 47, the tortured in hell call to the keeper of hell, "O Malik!" and in XCVII, 18, the guards of hell are called al-Zabaniya, an otherwise unused word, meaning apparently, "violent thrusters" (LA, xviii, 53; the number of these, LXXIV, 30, is nineteen, and they are accepted specifically as to be angels, apparently to guard against the idea that they are devils; they are called "rough, violent" (ghazas shiddd). Another class of angels are those who are "Brought Near" to Allah, al-mukarrabun (IV, 170); these praise Allah day and night without ceasing (XXI, 20); al-Baydawi calls them also al-salaatuwayn (on Kur'an II, 28; ed. Fleischer, i, 47, 23), and al-karrushayn (salam; al-ruh) on Kur'an IV, 170 (ed. Fleischer, i, 243, 25) as those that are around the 'arq. The same term, mukarrab, is used of Isra'il (III, 40) as he is in the company of the angels nearest Allah; cf. 'izara'ul for his semi-angelic character. At the beginning of the Sira of the Angels (XXV) there is a significant description: "making the angels messengers (rasuln), with wings two and three and four: He increases in the creation what He wills", this has had much effect on later descriptions and pictures. They are guardians (hafsiz) over mankind, cognisant of what man does and writing it down (katsibin; LXXXII, 10-12), in XXI, 94 the writing down is ascribed to Allah himself. In LXX, 4; LXXVIII, 38; XCIV, 4, there occurs the very puzzling phrase "the angels and al-ruh". Al-Baydawi on the first two passages shows how perplexing the distinction was found (ed. Fleischer, ii, 356,5, 303,4): "the ruh is an angel set over the spirits (ar-ruh); or he is the whole genus of spirits; or Djibrib; or a creation (khulik) mightier than the angels", cf. too, al-Kazwini's _Aqida, ed. Wustenfeld, 56. For spirits and the conception 'spirit' in Islam, see Ruh. In the Kur'an there is no reference to the two angels, Munkar and Nakir, who visit the dead man in his grave, on the night after his burial, and catechise him as to his Faith. Thereafter, if he is an unbeliever, his grave becomes a preliminary hell, and if he is a believer, it becomes a preliminary purgatory from which he may pass at the Last Day into paradise; it may even, if he is a saint, be a preliminary paradise. This is called technically the Questioning (isu'ul) of Munkar and Nakir and, also, the Punishment of the grave (al-fazak al-bahr [p. o.]). This doctrine, similar to the Last Judgement of Christian theology, is one that is accepted by those who believe the same (to be believed on oral testimony) and is based on the implicit meaning of Kur'anic passages (XIV, 32; XL, ii, 49; LXXI, 25) and upon explicit traditions (al-Taftazani's commentary on al-Nasafi's _A'ka''id, Cairo 1321, 109; the _Musaddif_ of al-Ighi with commentary on al-Djurjani, Bllk 1266, 590 ff.). There is a still fuller account and discussion by the Hanhabi theologian Ibn Kayyim al-Dawziya (Brockelmann, ii, 106, no. 23) in his _Kitab al-Ruh_, Haydarab'd 1324, 62-144, §§ vi-xiv.

The angels are also called the heavenly host, or multitude (al-mala' al-al-im), LXXXVII, 8, XXXVIII, 69) and guard the walls of heaven against the "listening" of the djinn and shaytans. See further on this under Shaitan.

The Kur'an lays stress on the absolute submission and obedience of the angels to Allah "To Him belong the creation what He wills"; this has had much effect on the conception of the angels in the imagination of the people; and in the accounts of how the angels are distinguished as to their obedience (al-Taftazani's commentary on al-Nasafi's _A'ka''id, Cairo 1321, 109; the _Musaddif_ of al-Ighi with commentary on al-Djurjani, Bllk 1266, 590 ff.). There is a still fuller account and discussion by the Hanhabi theologian Ibn Kayyim al-Dawziya (Brockelmann, ii, 106, no. 23) in his _Kitab al-Ruh_, Haydarab'd 1324, 62-144, §§ vi-xiv.

The angels are also called the heavenly host, or multitude (al-mala' al-al-im); LXXXVII, 8, XXXVIII, 69) and guard the walls of heaven against the "listening" of the djinn and shaytans. See further on this under Shaitan.

The Kur'an lays stress on the absolute submission and obedience of the angels to Allah "To Him belong the creation what He wills"; this has had much effect on the conception of the angels in the imagination of the people; and in the accounts of how the angels are distinguished as to their obedience (al-Taftazani's commentary on al-Nasafi's _A'ka'?id, Cairo 1321, 109; the _Musaddif_ of al-Ighi with commentary on al-Djurjani, Bllk 1266, 590 ff.). There is a still fuller account and discussion by the Hanhabi theologian Ibn Kayyim al-Dawziya (Brockelmann, ii, 106, no. 23) in his _Kitab al-Ruh_, Haydarab'd 1324, 62-144, §§ vi-xiv.

The angels are also called the heavenly host, or multitude (al-mala' al-al-im); LXXXVII, 8, XXXVIII, 69) and guard the walls of heaven against the "listening" of the djinn and shaytans. See further on this under Shaitan.
formed of a madridj of fire and Adam of that which was described to you" (Muslim, Constantinople 1333, vii, 226; al-Baydawi, i, 52,4). Another difficulty in the doctrine of the impeccability of the angels is the Qur'anic statement as to Härūt and Mārūt referred to above. These two angels are supposed to have yielded to sexual temptation, to be confined in a pit near Babil and there to teach magic to men. But, it is answered, (a) the Qur'ān says nothing of their fall; (b) teaching magic is not practising magic; (c) they always first warn those who come to them, "We are only a temptation (fitnā), so do not be disposed of" (Qur'ān, ii, 96); cf. further, al-Tafṣāzānī on the 'Askā'id of al-Nasafi, Cairo 1321, 133.

In al-Baydawi on Qur'ān, ii, 32, there is a long discussion of the angelic nature (ed. Fleischer, i, 51, 20 to 52,8) which, however, runs out in the despairing statement that knowledge on the point is with Allāh alone (al-šim 'inda 'l-lāh). Perhaps Ibn Isā was of the djinn as to his actions (fitnā) but of the angels as to species (nās). Also, Ibn 'Abbās has a tradition that there was a variety (darb) of angels that propagated their kind (this has always been regarded as an essential characteristic of the djinn and of the shayāns as opposed to the angels) and who were called al-djinn; and Ibn Isā was one of these. Or, that he was aālnāwānī brought up among the angels and identified with them. Or, that the djinn were among those commanded to prostrate themselves to Adam. Or, that some of the angels were not impeccable, although that was their characteristic in general, just as some men, e.g. the prophets, are guarded against sin but most are not. Further, perhaps a variety of the angels are not essentially different from the shayāns but differ only in accidents and qualities as men are virtuous or evil, while the djinn unite both, and Ibn Isā was of this variety. The tradition from 'Abbās is no answer to this explanation, for light and fire in it are not to be taken too precisely; they are used as in a proverb, and light is of the nature of fire and fire of light, they pass into another; fire can be purified into light and light obscured to fire. So al-Baydawi.

With this should be compared the scholastic discussion of the djinn with the commentators of al-Djurjānī, Bālāk 1266, 576. In it the objector to the 'īsma of the angels has two grounds: (a) their urging upon Allāh that he should not create Adam showed defects (slander, pride, malice, finding fault with Allāh) in their moral character; (b) that Ibn Isā was rebellious, as above. These grounds are then answered scholastically. Then various Qur'ānic texts, as above, on the submission and obedience of the angels are quoted. But it is pointed out that these texts cannot prove that all of them, at all times, are kept free from all sins. The point, therefore, cannot be absolutely decided. Individual exceptions under varying circumstances may have occurred, just as, the shayāns as a class were created for evil (khulāka 'i l-sharr), there is a definite tradition (Shahr al-Māturīdī on al-Fālqi al-skālī ascribed to Abū Hanīfa, Ḥaydarābād 1321, 25) of one Muslim shayān, a great-grandson of Ibn Isā, who appeared to Muhammad and was taught by him certain sūras of the Qur'ān.

The story of Hārūt and Mārūt suggests that the angels possess sex, although they may not propagate their kind. But "they are not to be described with either masculinity or femininity" ('Askā'id ed. of al-Nasafi, Cairo 1321, 133). Al-Tafṣāzānī and the other commentators in this edition explain that there is no angel or djinn that dies (akhlūq) on the earth. But, it is said by restorers (ālak), it should, therefore, be left undecided and that, apparently, was the course followed by al-Idāji and al-Djurjānī. They may have sex and not use it. In that respect, man, who has in himself the possibility of sin and must himself rule his appetites of lust (shahāt), is the higher among the angels (al-fafūs), has a higher possibility of excellency from the angels (al-Baydawi on ii, 28, ed. Fleischer, i, 48, 28).

This leads to the second question as to the angels which scholastic theology has considered, the relative excellency of angels and men, and especially, of angels and prophets. This is stated shortly by al-Nasafi, 147: (a) "The Messengers (rasuul) of mankind (al-baghair) are more excellent than the angels of the angels; (b) the Messengers of the angels are more excellent than the generality of mankind; and (c) the generality of mankind are more excellent than the generality of the angels". Al-Tafṣāzānī develops the theme that there is general and indeed necessary agreement on the excellency of the messengers of the angels over mankind in general, but that the other two statements (a and c) will bear argument. He urges (a) the prostrating of the angels to Adam; (b) they are brought and taught all the names of things (Qur'ān, 29); (c) that Allāh "chose" (isfāf) Adam and Nūh and the family of Ibrāhīm and the family of Iṣrā'īl over all created things (al-lī-şāmin, III, 30); and (d) that mankind achieves excellencies and perfections of knowledge and action in spite of the hindrances of lust and anger. But the Mu'tazilīs and the "philosophers" (al-falasīf) and some Ash'arīs held the superior excellency of the angels. They urged (a) that they were spirits, stripped of materiality (arwaḥ mudjarrada), complete actually, free of even the beginnings of evils and defects, like lust and anger, and from the obscurities of form and matter (zulmāt al-hāyāt wa 'l-rū'a), capable of doing wonderful things, knowing events (ka'awdn), past and to come, without error. The answer is that this description is based on philosophical and not Muslim principles. (b) That the prophets learn from the angels, as in Qur'ān, XXVI, 193; LI, 5. The answer is that the prophets learn from Allāh and that the angels are only intermediaries. (c) That there are multiplied cases both in Qur'ān and in tradition where mention of the angels precedes that of the messengers. The answer is that their precedence in existence or because their existence is more concealed (akhfa) and, therefore, faith in them must be emphasised. (d) In Qur'ān, IV, 170, 'al-masīh does not disdain to be an 'abd to Allāh nor do the angels' must mean, because of linguistic usage, that the angels are more excellent than 'Īsā. The answer is that the point is not simple excellency but to combat the Christian position that 'Īsā is not an 'abd but a son to Allāh. In the Masūkīf, 572-8, there is a similar but much fuller discussion which involves a philosophical consideration of the endowment—mental, physical, spiritual—of all living creatures from inanimate spirits to the lower animals (al-bahītum).

In the 'Aḏḏīb al-makhbūkat of al-Kazwīnī, ed. Wüstenfeld, 55-63, there is an objective description of the angels in all their classes, in which the statements of Qur'ān and Sunna are adjusted to the Aristotelian-Neoplatonic universe with its spheres (al-affāk), in accordance with al-Kazwīnī's general aim to give a picture of the created universe in its details and wonders. Yet apparently, while the angels possess the quality of "life" (hayāt) and are the inhabitants of the heavens and of the heavenly spheres (rukkān al-sama'awāt), they are not to be reckoned among the animals (al-bahitum). Al-Darrājī includes mankind and the djinn, even the diabolic (mutaḥātayyana) djīn, such as the ghīl, in his Hayāt al-bahītum but not the angels. Equally
acute and scholastic with the discussion in the Mawḏık, and more spiritual than that by al-Kazwīn, is al-Ghazalī’s treatment of the mystery of the angelic nature in some of his specialist smaller treatises. For him, it is part of the general question of the nature of the spirit to which his smaller Madnūn is devoted. See, too, the larger Madnūn, Cairo 1303, in Ruhn, ii, 23 and the translation by W. H. T. Gairdner of his Mīṣkāt al-anwār, London, Royal Asiatic Society, 1924 passim. Muslim literature also takes account of non-Muslim ideas on the angels, such as those of “philosophers”, Christians, dualists, idolaters. These will be found given briefly by B. Bayyīsī in B. Bayyīsī, ii, 28, ed. Fleischer, i, 47, 18, and in more detail in al-Tahānawī, Dict. of techn. terms, 1337 ff.


2. In Shi‘ism. In Imāmī Shi‘ism, angels are closely associated with the Imāms. Imāmī doctrine consistently upheld the dogma that the Imāms, just like the prophets, were more excellent before God than the angels with whom they shared in divine protection from sin and error (ṣima), and leading theologians, like the Shawkī al-Muflīd, wrote treatises in support of it. The Imāms are, however, guided and aided by angels. According to a well-known Imāmī tradition, the Imāms could only hear the voices of the angels but could not see them, in contrast to the messenger prophets (rasūl), who could see angels while awake and would converse with them, and to ordinary prophets who could hear and see them in their sleep. This was countered, however, by other traditions which affirmed that the Imāms also see the angels, and the restriction was held to apply only at the time of their receiving divine instruction through the angel. According to a tradition attributed to the Imām Zā‘far, the angels regularly come to the Imāms, tread on their beds, attend their tables, come forth to them from every plant in its season, shake their wings above the children of the Imāms, prevent beasts from reaching them and join them in every prayer. Angels will, according to Imāmī belief, appear in the sky at the advent of the Twelfth Imām and will call out his name; Gabriel and Michael will rally the faithful according to their rank in the hierarchy of angels that adds to the Islamic angels of death, Munkar and Nakir, who question and torment the dead in their tomb, a positive counterpart, Mubāshṣir and Bāshir, who are sent to the saniest dead to comfort them. According to some, they are the same pair as Munkar and Nakir and merely change their function, while according to others they are a different pair. In Ismā‘ili-Shī‘ism, the hierarchy of ranks (budr) of the spiritual world are sometimes described as angels. In particular, the triad of Djadi, Fath and Khayāl, which mediates between the Universal Intellect and Soul and the prophets and Imāms in the physical world, are commonly identified with the archangels Džbrā’il, Mikâ’îl and Isrâ’îl. In an early Ismā‘īlī cosmogony, seven Cherubim (kārūṣyā) are named and described as having been created out of the light between the first two principles of the spiritual world. After them a group of twelve “spiritual beings (rāḥānyā)” was created to form their counterpart. In later Tāyibī Ismā‘īlīsm, the third to ninth Intellects of the spiritual world are called the seven Cherubim. Ismā‘īlī doctrine, however, also recognises angels of a more conventional character. They are described as being all of a single substance, with only their names varying in accordance with their functions. Some inhabit the spiritual world, others the heavens, and still others the physical world in order to preserve all its regions. They are seen only by prophets and those who rise spiritually to become like prophets.

developed a ten-point programme for the improvement of the conditions of women.

In her ideas on emancipation, she was certainly influenced by the writings of Kâsim Amin [q. e.], though her goals usually remained more moderate and for her concern with proper Islamic norms was strong. She defended the veil, but was bitterly opposed to polygamy. She attributed great importance to the proper education of women in such subjects as hygiene, household economics, child-rearing, first aid, etc., i.e., to the provision of an education which would prepare the woman for her role as mother and household manager. In this she addressed herself especially to upper-class women, whose idleness in seclusion and ignorance she perceived as the major cause for the weakness of their social position, and whose style of life she contrasted with a somewhat romanticised view of the active life of rural and nomadic woman. Although she propagated the possibility of higher education for women, she did not envisage an independent professional life for women, and opposed any suggestion of their participation in public life and politics. Concurring with the general trend of the emancipation movement for women at the time, she did not postulate the legal and social equality of women with men.

Bibliography: For a collection of her essays, addresses, and lectures, see Majdî al-Din Nasîf (ed.), Ahdâ Bâhiyat al-Bâdiya, Cairo 1962, and Bâhiyat al-Bâdiya, al-Nisâ ?yyât, Cairo 1328/1910, which includes all her articles published in al-Dajirat. The popular Ridâ Kahasil, Ahdâm al-nisâ‘ fi ‘ldâm ym al-arâb wa ‘ld-?ydat, Damascus 1959, v., 74-101, and Rawhiyya al-Kallalîn, ?Râhiyat arâhiyatî, Cairo 1964, 37-57, have comprehensive biographies on her, the latter work discussing especially her poetic works. For a general analysis of her role, see T. Philipp, Feminism and nationalism in Egypt, in N. Kebede and L. Beck (eds.), Women in the Muslim world, Cambridge, Mass. 1978. (T. Philipp)

MALAKA, Arabic form of the name of Málaga (in ancient times Malaca), which is today a major city of southern Spain, on the Mediterranean coast between Algâciras and Almâeria, and regional centre of the province of the same name. It is situated in the centre of a bay and lies at the foot of a hill known as Gibralfaro (?Djahal Farûh). The town is divided from north to south by a ravine which, at times of heavy rainfall, carries the waters of the Guadalmedina (?Wâdî ‘l-Madîna). To the west stretches the Hoya of Málaga, a fertile plain formerly covered with various crops and especially tropical fruits, but today severely damaged by the enormous tourist development of the region.

The geographers of al-Andalus, of the Maghrib and even of the Orient, provide lavish descriptions of Málaga in which they stress the outstanding qualities of the town just as much as the products of its soil. Its port, always a centre of intense traffic, was visited by numerous traders from all countries and especially from the mercantile republics of Italy, the Genoese in particular. The arsenal (?dar al-?nsâ‘), the name of which is preserved in that of al-Mansûra, drew the attention of the Genoese admiral Camillo Greco in October 1494. The town, in the Islamic period and particularly from the 5th/11th century onward, was magnificent and possessed remarkable buildings; there were two densely-populated quarters, that of Fuenteclara or Fantanella (Funtanalla) in the upper city and that of the fish merchants (al-Tayyâin) in the lower city, attractive public baths (hammâinî) and well-stocked markets. According to al-Hîmyârî (Rawd, text 178, tr. 214), five gates were let into the wall, of which two, to the south, overlook the sea; to the east, or rather to the west, was the Bâb al-Wâdî; the north gate, according to the same author, was called Bâb al-Khawka; the kâdî of Málaga Ibn ?Askâr (d. 636/1239) mentions the fifth, the Bâb al-Riyâh or "gate of the winds". The fortifications of the town in the time of Ibn al-Khârisnî, comprising a fortress, double walls, a ditch, bastions, towers set out at short intervals and well-defended gates, rendered Málaga an impregnable stronghold. The same Ibn al-Qârisnî (Mu?âfârât Mâlakâ wa-Sâ‘l), in Muqaddamât bi ilâd al-Maghrîb wa ‘l-Andalus, ed. A. M. ?Abdî, Alexandria 1968, 57-66; tr. E. Garcia ?Omez, El parangon de la civilisation y los Saltn, in al-and., ii [1934], 190-1) stresses the attractive appearance and the elegance of its population, the liveliness of its streets, markets and suburbs, as well as the beauty of its buildings and palaces and the size of its country houses.
The Vega, now known as the Hoya of Malaga, was cultivated in its entirety. The texts stress the abundance of fruits, especially delicious figs, almonds and raisins. The figs of Málaga (tín sayyuf) were much in demand on the markets and, when dried, were exported to Egypt, Syria, Irak and even India. The Málaga region was densely planted with fig-trees, vineyards, groves of almonds, olives and pomegranates, without counting other crops and the timber plantations. The wine was excellent with the result that, rightly or wrongly, it became proverbial, as is described by al-Shakwani in his Rūjula (ed. E. García Gómez, El regla del Islam español, Madrid 1934, 111). Ibn al-Khatib draws attention to the fact that Málaga enjoyed the benefits of the sea, which offers abundance and variety of fish, and of the land, so fertile that it produces lavish crops which not only allow it to be self-sufficient but also provide, through surpluses and the harvests from the common lands, considerable revenues. It is also appropriate to take into account the development, from the 5th/11th century onward, of the textile industry, in particular the manufacture of silk of different colours with a fringe of gold (ushghy) known in Europe by the names, among others, of algúixi, albèti, alevècii and osti, and the making of muslin for bonnets and turbans. The industry of leather and precious stones, used in the manufacture of sword scabbards, belts, shoulder-straps, and less important in the iron industry, producing especially knives and chisels is also to be noted; there was also the manufacture of glazed and gilded ceramics which, of unique type, were exported product. In the markets of the town, baskets were woven from both osiers and esparto grass. The curing of fish, anchovies in particular, was characteristic of Málaga. The tending of bees and silk-worms were also well developed industries; silk had become one of the most highly-prized export products.

Málaga possessed a considerable number of mosques. One of the first must have been that which, situated inside the fortress, was constructed at the initiative of the traditionist from Himg, Mu'awiyah b. Šalih (d. 150/765). The Great Mosque, which occupied the present site of the cathedral, in the centre of the former madina, had five naves according to the author of al-Rawd al-miṣr. The courtyard of this mosque was planted with orange and palm trees. The fortress was built or rebuilt by the Zirid Badis after he captured Málaga in 449/1057; it was reinforced in the 8th/14th centuries by the Nasrids, because for them the town constituted a vital strategic point. There were, it is known, at least five cemeteries; the largest was situated to the north-east, outside the gate of the Fontanella; there were also those of the Musallá and of the Rawda of the Banū Yahya, according to L. Torres Balbás (Ciudades hispano-musulmanas, i. 277). On the banks of the Gibralfaro, in the 9th/14th century, there lay, not far from the Jewish quarter, to the east of the town, the cemetery of the Jewish community; this then numbered just over 1,500 persons.

Concerning the social and economic life of Málaga, especially in the 7th/13th century, information is available from an exceptional document, the treatise on ḥisba by al-Sakati, which offers a vivid and expressive account of customs, weights and measures, corporations, the price of foodstuffs, etc. The description of Málaga, like that of other towns in the region, offered by Ibn al-Khatib in his Misr al-diqgirs (ed. M. Kamal Shabhána, Rabat 1956-1957, 87-92, and ed. A. M. al-Abbádi, in Mushadhdat Lišan al-Dín Ibn al-Khatib, 76-8) permits the formation of a close impression of the reality of life in Málaga in the later centuries of its Islamic history.

In the politico-administrative division of al-Andalus, Málaga, perhaps on the fall of the caliphate, came to be the regional centre of the kūra of Rayya (some read Rayyu) in place of Archidona (Arghidhūna or Ardijdhūna). The limits of the kūra are, exceptionally, indicated for the beginning of the 5th/11th century by the 8th/14th century author who was a native of Málaga, al-Nabūḥi, in his K. al-Markabah al-'ulāya, Cairo 1948, 82: the region included Alhama (al-Hammā) of Granada: to the west, the limit was formed by the Montemayor (Munt Mayyur, previously Hisn al-Wād) near Marbella; to the north by the Rio Genil (Wād Shannīl) alongside the Benamej (Hīṣ Bani Bahšīl) and the Castillo of Anzur (al-Ranisūl); the limit subsequently passed through the territory of Aljûnūs (al-Khûnūs), of Gilena (Karyat Ḩijāyāna), near Estapa (Ištabba) as far as the limit (hāwa) of Morón (Mawwarū). Among the strongholds and towns of the kūra were Marbella, Fuengorola (Suhayl), Cátarma, Iznájar, Comares, Vélez Málaga, Cóin, Alhama and Antequera and, for some time, probably also Estepa (cf. J. Vallvé, De nuevo sobre Bobastro, in al-And., xxi [1965], 139-74).

The perimeter of Málaga enclosed an area of some 34 hectares at the end of the 5th/11th century, which allows a calculation of the population, in these years, at 20,000 inhabitants, mostly residing in homes of 50 to 100 m², although some exceeded 150 m² or were smaller than 40). During the same century, according to Ibn Hazm in his Dhikhrar ansāb al-ʿArab (cf. Elías Terés, Linajes árabes en al-Andalus, in al-And., xxii [1957], index) a number of Arab tribes settled in the region of Málaga, among them Aghārīs, Lakhmīs, Nahdīs and Kayyīs descended from Ḥimyar, (ḥābiḥ) Umayyads, and Berbers of diverse origin (Lamāyya, Maghārib, Nafīza, among others of the race of the Sanbāḥa and the Zanāna), all of these on a broad base mostly Hispano-Christian and Hispano-Muslim, with a considerably smaller Hispano-Jewish element.

Málaga and its kūra knew almost eight centuries of Islamic history from the moment when, according to certain sources, an army sent from Ecija by Tārik, in 92/711, took the town, then an episcopal see and one of the most important ports of the peninsula in the Roman period. However, Ibn ʿAskar, who seems to take his information from Ibn Huyayn (cf. J. Vallvé, Una fuente importante de la historia de al-Andalus. La "Historia" de Ibn ʿAskar, in al-And., xxxi [1966], 244-5) presents in some detail a version according to which it was ʿAbd al-ʿAlāʾ, son of Mūsā b. Nusayr, who besieged the town and took it by storm, without thereby discounting the obliging wa-yūkāl which indicates that it was Tārik who sent the army to the conquest of Málaga. In the time of the waʾīf Abu ʿI-Khattār, in 125/742, the Syrian ḍānd of Jordan (al-Urdun) became established in the kūra. In the last decade of the period of the waʾīfs, the territory of Málaga experienced the effects of rivalries between Khalīb and Kayyīs who were seeking power, and the Syrians. Among these pretenders was Yahyā b. Hurayth, an Arab of the Qudham, who had to be content to govern the province of Rayya, but for only a short time, since he was soon to be stripped of power by Yūsuf al-Fihri, appointed in 131/747 waʾīf of al-Andalus.

Málaga gave a warm welcome to ʿAbd al-Rahmān I al-Dājibil and supported him after his landing at Almuñécar and his journey across the kūra of Iblīra. Until the second half of the 3rd/9th century, the chronicles record no event of importance, apart from the fact that, for an expedition against Djiiltīkiya, the kūra of Málaga supplied 2,600 horsemen to the imposing army which was formed with contributions from
other provinces. In the period of al-Mundhir, and at
the outbreak of the civil wars which marked the
major crisis of the amirate, Málaga and other regions
of southern al-Andalus found themselves involved in
the series of rebellions which ensued and of which the
leading protagonist was the muwazzad Umar b. Haf-
ṣūn, who established his operational base and the cen-
tre of his revolt in the territory of Málaga, where he
could rely on the decisive aid of the city chieftains and
of strong fortresses. This action obliged the authorities
in Cordova to send troops in order to defeat and
punish the rebels. One of the most important of these
expeditions dispatched in the time of the amīr ʿAbd
Allāh was that of 291/904 which, commanded by
Abān, brother of the amīr, routed the forces of Ibn
Hafsūn near Antequera. Some years later, the same
Abān marched against Málaga, laid siege to the city,
set fire to the suburbs and overran part of the
neighbouring littoral. A fresh expedition was sent
against the rebels of Málaga in 297/910 and achieved
a result favourable to the troops of the amīr. In the first
years of the reign of ʿAbd al-Raḥmān III, various
campaigns were undertaken in the region with the ob-
ject of putting an end to the rebellion of Umar b.
Hafsūn, who had found support there especially from
the people of Spanish origin, both Christians and
Moriscos. On the other hand, Beldā, which was
directed by ʿAbd al-Raḥmān III himself in 306/919,
crowned with success. Once Málaga had been subdued, all the strongholds of the kūra met the same
fate, as a result of repeated expeditions, and once the
territory had been pacified, the kūra of Rayya ex-
perienced a long period of prosperity which was to last
throughout the caliphate, until the turbulent years of the
third/fourth century.

In the first third of the 5th/11th century, at the be-
inning of the period of the Mulūk al-tawdīf (in fact as
early as the time of the fitna), Málaga declared itself
independent under the government of the Ham-
mūdīds [g.v.], recognised as caliphs by the majority of
Berbers of southern al-Andalus. Under the caliphate
of ʿAllī b. Hammūd, proclaimed in Cordova in 427/1036, who, arriving from Ceuta had disembarked
at Málaga, the town began to play a national role in
the affairs of al-Andalus. It was in fact the refuge of
al-Kāsim b. Hammūd when he was forced to leave
Cordova in 412/1021 and, in 413/1023, of his nephew
Yaḥyā b. ʿAllī, who sustained his rebellion in Málaga
and was recognised as caliph by the people of Seville
and by the neighbouring Berber chieftains. Some time
later, al-Kāsim, besieged in Xīrīs and taken prisoner
by his nephew, was incarcerated in Málaga, where he
was strangled on the orders of ʿIbrāhīm b. ʿAllī b. Ham-
mūd in 427/1036. In fact, Málaga was transformed
into another taifa kingdom and was the rival of Seville,
where the kāfār al-Kāsim b. ʿAbdāb employed a fraud
consisting of displaying and having recognised a dou-
ble of Highām II of Muʿayyad. Yaḥyā, son of ʿIbrāhīm,
was proclaimed in Málaga on the death of his father
in 431/1039 and was recognised by the people of the
town, but at the price of estrangement from another
Hammūdīd prince, Ḥasan, based in Ceuta. Con-
fronted by action undertaken by troops loyal to the
latter, Yaḥyā surrendered and abdicated in favour of
Ḥasan, who was proclaimed four months later, having taken power (432/1040), and was recognised
as rightful caliph by the troops of Seville and by the
neighbouring Berber chieftains. In 434/1043 the Ham-
mūdīd ʿIbrāhīm II was in charge of the political af-
airs of Málaga, but the inhabitants turned against him and he
was forced to seek refuge in Bobastro, where he ap-
pealed to ʿAbdīs for assistance in regaining his throne.

When his enterprise failed, in spite of the support that
he received, he withdrew to Ceuta. Power then fell to
Muḥammad b. ʿIbrāhīm b. ʿAllī b. Ḥammūd who,
adopted, like his predecessors, the title of caliph. He
reorganised public administration but, proving cruel
and bloodthirsty, he was deposed, and Muḥammad b.
al-Kāsim, governor of Algérics, was appointed in his
place.

The history of Málaga under the later Hammūdīs
remains fairly obscure, and there is evidence that the
situation was fairly precarious and showing symptoms
of weakness and instability, since Bādis of Granada
took steps to annex Málaga and its entire region to his
own possessions and achieved this in 448/1056, ac-
cording to al-Nubāḥi, who follows the account of Ibn
Askar, or in 449/1057-8, according to al-Makkařī
and other sources. Bādis, as has been said previously,
then built or reconstructed the old fortress and en-
trusted the government of Málaga to his own Bulug-
gin. The successor to the latter, Tamīm, showed
hostility to his brother ʿAbd Allāh, the Zirīd of
Granada, and, around 474/1082, he appealed un-
successfully to Yūsūf b. Tashfin for aid against the latter.
In 483/1090, Tamīm was deposed by Yūsuf, and
Málaga was henceforward ruled by Almoravid
kuwsād, but no significant information is available
until the time of Ibn ʿAbd Allāh b. Abī Hafs, who was
proclaimed in Malaga on the death of his father
al-Kasim b. Hammud when he was forced to leave
Ceuta and was incorporated into the Nasrid kingdom of Granada. The Banū Ashkilla, the kinsmen of Muḥammad b. ʿAbī Naṣr, who governed the town, consolidated themselves there, rebelled against the latter and of-
ffered allegiance to Alfonso X of Castile who was at
war with Granada. In 665/1267, Málaga was besieged
without success for three months by the Granadan; in
Dhu l-Hijjah 674/June 1273, Muḥammad II also at-
tacked the town without success, and subsequently the
Banū Ashkilla, who had obtained the favour of the
Marīnīds and recognised them as sovereigns, handed
over the town to them on 6 Shawwal 676/2 March
1278. Six years later, the Marīnīd sultan renounced
his claim to Málaga and other places in favour of
Muḥammad II al-Fakīh of Granada. Henceforward,
a Nāṣīrī governor was appointed over the town. The
plague of 1348 claimed some hundred victims each
day, with the result that the inhabitants panicked and
abandoned the town. In the later years of the crisis of
the Nāṣīrī kingdom, from 1455 onwards and in the
time of the sultans Saʿd and of Muḥammad XI,
Málaga found itself embroiled in dynastic quarrels
and civil war, while its plain was subjected to reprisals
on the part of the Castilians. In the course of the
campaign between 1485 and 1488 and, more especially in
that which began in the spring of 1487 against Vélez-
Málaga, the old capital of the Hammūdīs, after
three-and-a-half months of siege, its chieftain then
being ʿAbdīs al-Ṭaḥṣīl, fell on 27 Shawwāl 892/18
August 1487 to the might of the armies of the Catholic
Kings.

MALAM (pl. malama), a Hausa term derived from the Arabic mu‘allâm with the meaning “teacher”, formerly used to designate a man versed in the Arabic language and Islamic sciences to whatever extent. The tasks of a maldma were many and whatever extent. The tasks of a maldma in the Arabic language and Islamic sciences to whatever extent. The tasks of a maldma would devote himself mainly to teaching the Kurgan, preparing talismans (Hausa: al-sayyid), from the Arabic al-shaykh, or mu^allim, would devote himself mainly to teaching the Arabic language and Islamic sciences to whatever extent. The tasks of a maldma would devote himself mainly to teaching the Kurgan, preparing talismans (Hausa: al-sayyid), or from the Arabic al-shaykh, or mu^allim, a personal name. Combined with the word malam, however, in the phrase sheha malami, it is used as an epithet for a distinguished exponent of the Islamic sciences.

Malamatya Among the black communities of Algiers where the Hausa hort (possess) cult has been influential, the term malam is used as a title in the diyar of Sidi Bilâl. The malam is in charge of musical arrangements during ceremonies at the dâr and officiates at minor sacrifices outside it.


MALAMATIYYA, an Islamic mystical tradition which probably originated in 3rd/9th century Nishâpûr.

1. IN THE CENTRAL ISLAMIC LANDS

The foundation of this tradition has been attributed to Hamdûn al-‘Aṣîqar (d. 271/884-5 [q.v. and see further on him below, section 2]). One of the main sources for the study of its doctrine is the Risâlât al-Malâmâtîyya by ‘Abd al-Rahmân Muhammad b. al-Husayn al-Sulami (330-412/941-1021). This treatise (see Bibl.) contains a number of sayings by early authorities concerning the malâmâtîyya and an enumeration of the principles (usûd) of Malâmâtîyya teaching. This teaching is not a closely reasoned internally consistent system, but rather a number of tenets which centre around the basic Malâmâtîyya doctrine that all outward appearance of piety or religiosity, including good deeds, is ostentation. The most important of these tenets are: 1. the display of *‘ibâha* [q.v.]; 2. the display of a *hâl* [q.v.] is *shirk* [q.v.]; 3. in all *ahwâl* [q.v.]; 4. a man must struggle against finding satisfaction in doing good, since every action and every pious deed which he looks upon with appreciation is worthless. In accordance with these tenets, the Malâmâtîyya has to struggle continuously against his desire for divine reward and for approval by man. This explains the requirements: 1. not to say prayers (dâ’â’î) except (under special conditions) for those in distress; 2. not to dress differently from others and/or isolate oneself from the world, but to dress like everybody else and to live a normal life in conformity with the requirements of society; 3. to take up a despised profession and to refuse a prestigious one; and 4. to conceal one’s poverty (if revealed, one enters the state of neediness and will attract attention). The required struggle against the desire for the approval of men in conjunction with the concern to hide his hâl may bring the Malâmâtîyya to show only his bad qualities. In doing so, he may make himself an object of blame (Ar. malam, malâmà, from the root lâmâ “to blame”).

The Malâmâtîyya attitude is older than Islam. R. Reitzenstein, Hellenistische Wanderschriften, Leipzig 1906, 65 ff., was drawn upon by I. Goldziher, Vorlesungen über den Islam, Heidelberg 1925, 167-8, Eng. tr. Introduction to Islamic theology and law, Princeton 1981, 149-50, who traced back the essence of Malâmâtîyya thought to the ancient Greek philosophical school of the Cynics, while M. Mâré, Les mystiques musulmans, Paris 1963, 72-7, has shown that the Malâmâtîyya trend to hide one’s virtuous actions, in order not to divulge one’s saintly state, was to be found among the early Syrian Christians. Most
contemporary Muslim authors (see Bibli.) on al-Malamatiyya are in unanimous agreement that this tradition is not Islamic, neither in its spirit nor in its theory.

In the 4th/10th century, the Malamatiyya tradition reached Baghda and Mecca in the persons of Abu 'Umar al-Zadidjaj, Abu 'l-Hasan b. Bandar, Abu 'l-Hasan b. Sahih al-Bushangbji, Abu Ya'qub al-Nahrajiitrii and Muhammad b. Ahmad al-Farraj (cf. 'Abd al-Kadir Mahmud, al-Palajfa al-Suhfiya fi 'l-Islam, Cairo 1967, 415). In later centuries, the Malamati orientation frequently took the form of an explicit invitation of reproach and rejection by intensional repulsive behaviour. Sometimes, such behaviour became the hallmark and proof of sanctity.

Intentional and systematic transgression of the norms and values of society is particularly practised by the Kaldandariyya [q.v.], which have been looked upon (e.g. by A. Le Chatelier, Les conférences maxulmanes du Hedjaz, Paris 1887, 235 f.) as the continuation of the Malamati tradition within the framework of a more or less regular jurtka. This idea of continuity must be discarded, however. Fundamental differences exist between Malamati and Kaldandari thinking and practice, as has already been pointed out by Shihab al-Kassar, after whom the early Malamats were some-

2. IN IRAN AND THE EASTERN LANDS

The concept of blame that underlies the designation Malamatiyya (both in the sense of self-reproach and of exposing oneself to reproach by others) derives from Kur'an, V, 34 ("they struggle in the path of God and fear not the blame of any blamer"). A verse referring to the Prophet and his Companions, whom the Malamats indeed claimed as the first of their number (Hudjwiit, Kafig al-mahdjub, Leningrad 1926, repr. Tehran 1399/1979, 78). But as a historically identifiable group, the Malamatiyya first appeared in Iran in the 3rd/9th century, and since they remained confined to Iran, at least in their original form, it is permissible to define the Malamatiyya as an Iranian or, more narrowly, as a Khurasanian form of spirituality. As noted in the preceding section, the major figure of the Malamatiyya was Abu Salih Hamdun al-Kassar, after whom the early Malamats were sometimes known as al-Hamduniyya or al-Kasariyya. Born in Nishapur where he spent most of his life and gathered his following, he was himself a student of Abu 'l-Hasan Sâlim al-Bârûstî (for whose putative spiritual descent see Cavit Sunar, Melâmiik ve Bektaşîi, Ankara 1975, 9). Al-Bârûstî was a critic of the effusive and public devotions of the Karrâmiyya sect [q.v.] in Nishapur, and insofar as the emergence of the Malamatiyya may be taken as a reaction against contemporaneous trends, it is in the Karrâmiyya rather than the Sûfii that the counterpoint to the Malamatis should be sought. Shunning fame for piety and the comconitant danger of hypocrisy, Hamdun al-Kassar and his associates believed it necessary to conceal all acts of superrogatory worship and declared public appearances to be a matter of indifference; the pleasure of God and the pleasure of men were irreconcilable opposed goals. The appellate self was their exclusive object of blame (cf. the expression "reproachful soul"—al-nâfîs al-tasawwuw wa-al-mthalîl). Abû 'Umar b. Muhammad al-Suhrawardî, in his al-Nafahdt al-rabbdniyya, Beirut n.d., 268-70; Ibrahim Hîlîl, al-Tasawwuw al-Islami bayn al-dîn wa l-falajf, Cairo 1979, 11-14. In addition to these works and the works mentioned in the article, see A. J. Arberry, Sufism, an account of the mystics of Islam, London 1956, 70; 74; H. Ritter, Philologia XV, Farduddin 'Attur, in Orispi, xii (1959), 14 ff.; M.S. Seale, The ethics of Malâmâtiyya Sufism and the Sermon on the Mount, in Mîr, ivii (1969), 12-23 (contains an abridged translation of al-Sulaml's enumeration of Malâmât, 3. Nominalism and Intellectualism).
the musical sessions of the Sufis known as sama' [q. v.] and even of vocal—and hence audible—dhikr [q. v.]... Out of other figures sometimes designated as Malamats have been claimed by the Sufis as their own; this is the case notably with Abū 'Uṯmān al-Hirī. In addition, Malamati features are to be found in persons who have no direct relation with the Malamatī circle of Nishāpūr, especially in Bāyazīd Bīšāmī [see Abū Yazīd al-Bīšāmī], who, on several occasions claimed popular acclaim into blame by apparent violations of the Sharī'a. It is evident, then, that the demarcation between Malamatis and Sufis was not always sharp. Hamdūn al-Kassār himself met with Sahīl al-Tustārī and al-Dζunyādī [q. v.] while on a visit to Baghdād and earned their approval, surely an indication of compatibility between the Malamatīyya and the 'sōber' school of Irākī Sūfīsm.

Nonetheless, the shunning of all outward indications of one's inward state was a clear point of difference from the Sufis, one implying criticism of them. In return, the Sufis politely condemned the unceasing Malamātī preoccupation with the wretchedness of the nafs, which seemed to them a form of implicit ontological dualism, setting the soul up as a reality confronting God. Echoing earlier writers, Jāhīdī referred to the Malamātīs as "Though this group is precious and their state is noble, the veil of creaturely existence has not been fully lifted from them" (Abū al-Raḥmān Džāmī, Naftahāt al-unūs, ed. Māhdis Tawḥīdpūr, Tehrān 1336/1957, 9). Likewise, the preoccupation with reproach of the nafs seemed to some Sufis to bar the Malamātīs from all progress beyond the station (maḵām) of sincerity of devotion (iḥlās); al-Suhrawārdī said that while the Sufī has "lost awareness of iḥlās because of iḥlās ... the Malamātī is fixed at the station of iḥlās" (Aḵwārī al-maʿāṣīrī, in supplementary volume to al-Ghazālī, Ḥyā' ulūm al-dīn, Beirut n. d., 71).

A close relationship appears to have existed between the first Malamātīs and the practitioners of ṣawwaw (q. v.) the members of the craft guilds. Like them, the craft guilds were part of the bazaar and followed various callings, rejecting the work-denying interpretation of tawakkul made by certain Sufis. Both Hamdūn al-Kassār and Abū Hafs al-Hāddār are on record as offering definitions of ṣawwaw, and it is significant that al-Sulamī—who had no father—treated malāma and ṣawwaw as twin concepts in his writing. Ahmad Khīḍrāwī was identified by al-Kuḥīyārī as a fātāl and by Ḥudūrī as a malāmātī; this, too, must indicate an overlapping between the two affiliations. After the disappearance of the Malamātiyya in their original form, the craft guilds and organs of ṣawwaw seem to have become one of the chief repositories of Malamātī influence, with their emphasis on self-effacing probity and practical devotion.

Although no prominent individuals are identified as Malamātī after the 4th/10th century, the original Malamātiyya may have survived in Ḵᵛurāsān for considerably longer. In the 6th/12th century, al-Suhravārdī wrote in his Aḵwārī al-maʿāṣīrī, 71, "There is still a group of them (sc. of Malamātīs) in Ḵᵛurāsān; they have their elders who expound their fundamental principles and make known to them the conditions of their states. I have seen people that follow the same path in Irāk but they are not known by this name". Early on, however, the name Malamātī had been usurped by ascetics who actually sought the blame of others, instead of simply being ready to accept it; instead of hidden piety, liber-
tached itself to a heretical offshoot of the Bayramiyya [q.v.]. An account of the original split between the orthodox and the heretical branches of the Bayramiyya survives only as a legend recorded first in the 10th/16th century. According to this, 6 Ömer the Cutler (d. 880/1475-6), a dervish who had followed first Shâykh Hâmid (d. 815/1412-13) and then Hâmid's disciple, Hâdîdi Bayrâm [q.v.], refused to join the disciples of Hâdîdi Bayrâm's appointed successor, Ak Shams al-Dîn [q.v.] in performing dhikr [q.v.], or to kiss Ak Shams al-Dîn's hand. Thereupon, Ak Shams al-Dîn threatened to divest Ömer of the distinguishing cloak (êkîra) and headgear (tâfî) of the new order. Ömer's retort was to invite Ak Shams al-Dîn and his followers to his house, where he lit a fire in the courtyard. He then walked through the fire, which burned off his headgear and cloak but left his body unscathed. After this Ömer's followers—the Malamatiyya-yi Bayramiyya—wore no distinguishing garments (Mahmud of Califà, Ka'tâb, quoted in A. Gölpınarlı, Melâkîkât, melâkîkât, Istanbul 1941, 41; 'Âtâ'î [q.v.], Dibây-i ıskhâk 'îk, Istanbul 1268/1851-2, 65). The real reason why the Malamatiyya wore no distinguishing clothing must, in fact, have been because their heretical beliefs led to occasional persecutions, and their survival could depend on concealing their identities from the authorities. To wear identifiable clothing would invite investigation. However, the sect continued to absorb new adherents right down to the 13th/19th century, by which time it had long since become an orthodox Sûfi group, accepting the authority of the Şâhâna [q.v.] (J. P. Brown, The derwishes, London 1868, repr. 1968, 61. On the orthodoxy of the later Malamatiyya, see Brown's translation of a nishâa by La'înu'd-Dîn 'Abd al-Bâkî, in op. cit., 232 ff.). The legend of Ömer's dispute with Ak Shams al-Dîn suggests that their rivalry was personal. This seems probable since, although Hâdîdi Bayrâm had nominated him as his successor or khâtî [q.v.], Ak Shams al-Dîn had been one of the last to join the group, so displacing candidates of "forty years" standing. His nomination no doubt aroused jealousy. However, the essential split was doctrinal, and it was doctrinal differences that caused it to be permanent. For example, there are no surviving 9th/15th century Malâmî writings to give an account of the original doctrines and affiliations of the sect. Links with Badr al-Dîn of Simawne [q.v.] and the early Şâfawiyya [q.v.], through Ömer's and Hâdîdi Bayrâm's connection with Shâykh Hâmid have been suggested (H. J. Kissling, Zur Geschichte des Derwischordens der Bajramijje, in Süd-Ost Forschungen, xx [1956], 237-68). The writings of 10th/16th and 11th/17th century Malâmî shâykhs, however, clearly reveal the sect's doctrines and permit speculation as to its 9th/15th century origins. These show that the sect espoused Şâ'ism of a Hallâджian type, striving not, as orthodox Şûîs, for fânâ' fi'lîlah—the total loss of individual identity in God—but believing in the manifestation of God in the individual member of the sect. "Know that the Mirror of Man is the outward form of the Merciful God", in the words of Ahmed the Cameleer (d. 952/1545-6), or "The kibla is Man", in the words of "The Hidden" İdrîs (d. 1024/1615) (quoted by A. Gölpınarlı, op. cit., 59, 127). The orthodx ü Reşîm, with some justification, regarded this form of Şâ'ism as leading to a disavowal of the Şâhâna, the true source of divine authority, since its adepts believe the divine authority to be within themselves. This disavowal, the ü, belief in a divine face in the human face: "Today, O heart, look at the beauty of the Beloved's face", and in a ghazal [q.v.], "The Hidden" İdrîs, there is a reference to the indisputably Şûî concept of "The Seven Lines" of the face as a visible form of the fîthâ [q.v.], which in turn represents the Sum of the Universe (i.e. God plus what is beside God): "The Seven Lines are the 'Mother of the Book' (i.e. the fîthâ). They are the visible testimony from God. Oghlan Shâykh also makes the Şûî equation between the "Name" (ism) and the "Named" (mussânmâ): "You whose name is Man gives news of the Named". Furthermore, one of his ghazals is a nazîra of one by the Hallâджi martyr Nesîmî [q.v.] (d. 820/1417). These Şûî echoes occur in poems of the 10th/16th and early 11th/17th centuries, but it is possible that the doctrines themselves date from the earliest days of the sect in the first half of the 9th/15th century, since this was the period when the disciples of Fadî Allah [q.v.] were actively preaching Şûî doctrines in Anatolia and Syria (see H. Ritter, Die Anfänge der Şûî-sekte, in Orients, vii [1954], 1-54; Ibn Hadjar al-Asqâlanî [q.v.], Inbdîl-ghumr, Cairo 1973, 136; for the Şûî influence in Edirne in 848/1444, see F. Decroly, Les Amuratc à Amuratc, in Orients, iii [1950], 229-65). Ömer the Cutler and his followers may well have absorbed their doctrines.

A distinguishing feature of malâmî writings is their exhortation to believers to conceal their beliefs from the "ignorant", meaning non-members of the sect. In this they resemble the original Malamatiyya; but concealment of belief had the immediate practical purpose of preventing persecution by the Ottoman authorities. They also maintained that "although there can be no place like Man for the manifestation of God's essence" (Oghlan Shâykh, quoted by A. Gölpınarlı, op. cit., 52), God can be manifest only in a "believer" that is, a member of the sect. Non-believers are mere "animals".

The Malamatiyya began as a sect in central Anatolia and appear not to have spread beyond this region until the first quarter of the 10th/16th century. Ömer's kâtî, Benyâmín or Ibn Yâmîn (d. 926/1520) came from Ayâsh near Ankara [q.v.]. His successor, Pir 'Ali Dede (d. 935/1528-9) was a native of Aksaray [q.v.], where he is also buried. The Malâmî shâykhusm al-Dîn, a kâtî of Ahmed the Cameleer, came from the region of Ankara (Aşkî, op. cit., 70). In 960/1553 he was imprisoned and executed in the citadel of that town. He still had followers in the nearby region of Haymana, whom the Ottoman government investigated in 975/1568 (Muhâmmeme defter, text in
A. Refik, *On altinci asirda Rafizilik ve Bektasilik*, Istanbul 1932, 24-5). By the time of Husam al-Din's end, however, the sect had spread far beyond the region of its origin.

The expansion began in 934/1528 when Ismâîl, the son of Pîr 'Ali Dede, known as Oghlan Shaykh, began to preach in Istanbul. For a year he preached and performed ceremonies, apparently in mosques, attracting many followers, including soldiers (*'Atâ'î*, op. cit., 79). These were probably *kapûkûlî* troops stationed in the capital. In 935/1529, after numerous warnings and condemning *fatâwâ* [*q.v.*], the authorities executed him on the At Meydanâ, with the sanction of a *fatâwâ* from Kemal Paşa-zaâde [*q.v.*].

The underlying question in the trial of Oghlan Shaykh was whether or not he accepted the authority of the *shâârâ*, and of course its officially appointed interpreters, the Ottoman *sâlamâ?.* However, the examination centered specifically around the question of whether he and his followers regarded the gurjar doctrine which constituted their *dhikr* as *iðhâm* [*q.v.*], obligatory worship, or simply as a permissible (*muðâbâ*) religious ceremony. To regard it as *muðâbâ* did not occur the death-penalty: it merely branded its practitioners as “dissolutes”, to be corrected by flogging (ta^zîr). However, to regard it as *iðhâm* (ta^zîr). However, to regard it as *iðhâm* (ta^zîr).

Since the term *iðhâm* refers specifically to the forms of obligatory worship laid down by the *ssâhî*, to claim any other form of worship as *iðhâm* is to arrogate to oneself the authority which properly belongs to the *shâârâ*, the revealed command of God. This Oghlan Shaykh did, and, furthermore, defended his position with quotations from the *Kurâ* and *Hadîth* [*q.v.*] (*John Rylands Library, xxii, 228). It may have been Ahmad the Cameleer who established the sect in his native region. Its itinerant profession would also have given him the opportunity to proelytise in different areas. A later *shâârâ*,* "The Hidden" Idris, also travelled a great deal, making frequent trips as a merchant to "Belgrade (Belgrad), Plovdiv (Filibe), Sofia, Edirne and Gallipoli (Gelibolu)" (*'Atâ'î*, op. cit., 602). It is likely that travelling *shâârâ* such as these both spread the sect and maintained contact between members in different regions. By whatever means it spread, it is clear that by about 1560 Malami doctrines had reached and had become deep-rooted in Bosnia. There is no obvious reason why this should have been so, but it is worth noting that pre-Ottoman Bosnia had been a centre of dualist Christianity, with remnants of the Bogomil sect surviving into the Ottoman period, showing that Bosnia had long been receptive to heterodox forms of religion.

The Malami *shâârâ* Hamza, a *sâlamâ?* of Husâm al-Din, was a Bosnian by birth. His public preaching in Istanbul led to his execution there in 968/1561 and to an investigation of his followers in Bosnia, of whom “many were arrested and executed” (*'Atâ'î*, op. cit., 70-1). *'Atâ'î*’s report (loc. cit.) that a *râflâjî* [*q.v.*] committed suicide in grief at his execution suggests that he, like Oghlan Shaykh, had a following among the *kapûkûlî* troops.

The execution of Hamza, like the execution of Oghlan Shaykh, had the effect of creating a new martyry, and this added further to the *shâârâ’s* reputation, so that a *shâârâ* could be known as the Hamzawîs until the last days of the sect (*Brown, loc. cit.*). Nor did the persecutions in Bosnia after his death eliminate his followers in the area. In 981/1573, the year of similar investigations in Thrace, the Imperial *Dâvân* received reports about “disciples of the heretic Hamza, who was previously arrested and executed” and ordered the *sandik* beyes of Hercegovina (Hersek [*q.v.*]), Bosnia and Pozega, and the beylerbey of Buda (Budin [*q.v.*]) to arrest and imprison them while awaiting further instructions (*Muhimme defter*, xii, 194). The authorities’ efforts seem again to have been ineffective, since in 990/1582, the *kâfis* of Zvornik, Gracanica and Tuzla in Bosnia again investigated a group belonging to the “sect of Hamza, who was executed when his heresy was proven” (*Muhimme defteri*, xlviii, 151). At the same time, the government clearly continued to treat with suspicion adherents of the sect in the capital. At an unspecified date, it issued a *fermân* for the arrest of “The Hidden” Idris, after the “great *shâârâ* of the city”, Siwâsi Efendi and ‘Omer Efendi, had publicly denounced him for heresy. Idris, however, avoided arrest by using his name Hâdîdji ‘Ali Beg in public, rather than his *sââmî* [*q.v.*] of Idris, and by spending most of his time in the seclusion of his own house (*'Atâ'î*, op. cit., 602; Kâbît Çelebi [*q.v.*]), and was a “disciple of Oghlan Shaykh’s father” (*Muhimme defteri*, text in A. Refik, *op. cit.*, 17). This frequent re-occurrence of Oghlan Shaykh’s name suggests that his martyrdom advanced the fortunes of the Malâmâtîyya.

Oghlan Shaykh brought Malâmâ doctrines to the capital. It is possible that Ahmed the Cameleer, a native of Hayrabolu in Thrace, where he is also buried (*'Atâ'î*, op. cit., 65), carried them into Europe. In 980-1/1572-3, the Imperial *Dâvân* ordered the *kâfis* of Hayrabolu and the *kâfis* of the neighbouring districts of Rodosçu (Tekirdağ) and Burgos (Lîle Burgaaz) to examine suspects in certain villages who were adherents of the martyred Malâmî Hamza (*Muhimme defteri*, text in A. Refik, *op. cit.*, 33-4; *Muhimme defteri*, xxii, 228).
Fedhleke, Istanbul 1286/1869-70, i, 373-4, after Ata'ī. The sect's last martyr was a certain Behšīr Ṭāgha who, together with "forty" disciples, was executed in Istanbul in 1073/1662-3. He apparently had a number of Ḥurūfīs in his following (A. Gölpınarlı, op. cit., 128, 158-60, after Laźizade ʿAbd al-Bākī, Siārīzarīyā).

There are, however, indications that, by the time of Behšīr Ṭāgha, the Malāmātīyyā had largely changed, or were changing their character to become an orthodox turīkā [q.v.]. The Bosnian Malāmī Ṣhaykh Ṣaheyn-i Lāmekānī (d. 1035/1625) (Farabī Celebi, op. cit., i, 71), for example, while still defending the sect's gyrating dance with the same hadīth as Qoghlān Ṣhaykh had used, apparently upheld the primacy of the Shari`a: "[The believer] should be a Ḥanāfī, a Sunni and pious ..." (quoted by A. Gölpınarlı, op. cit., 82). By the time of Laźizade (d. 1165/1751-2), the sect appears to have accepted without question the authority of the Shari`a. The report that the vizier Fīrūz Pasha [q.v.] (d. 1004/1595) became a disciple or murid of Ḥuseyn-i Lāmekānī is perhaps significant; as members of the Ottoman ruling establishment began to join the sect, it would, by definition, become orthodox.

The organisation and membership of the sect remains as obscure as the Malāmī themselves obviously intended it to be. It is not clear, for example, whether one kutb [q.v.], who could claim the allegiance of the entire sect. This was probably the case until the death of Benyāmīn (926/1520), when the order was confined to central Anatolia. 'Ata'ī (op. cit., 65), however, gives him three khālitā: his son Shaykh Ibrāhīm, Abū Leylī Shaykh Sūleymān and the influential Pir 'Ali of Akszaray. He then lists three khālitā of Pir 'Ali: Ahmed the CAMELEER, Pir Ahmed of Edirne (d. 1000/1591-2) and Shaykh Yaḥya the ḥalāfa (d. 989/1581-2). The last two appear to have been too young to have been Pir 'Ali's personal disciples, but the number of apparently very long-lived Malāmī shaykhī whom he lists, and other peculiarities, cast doubt upon 'Ata'ī's chronology. Among Pir 'Ali's successors, one should also mention his son Ismāʿīl Qoghlān Shaykh. Ahmed the CAMELEER's khālitā Hūseyn-i Lāmekānī (d. 1010/1601-2) and the "Hidden" Idrūs, Hūseyn-i Lāmekānī was a khālīf of the most influential khālīfs down to 1024/1615 seem to have been 'Omer—Benyāmīn—Pir 'Ali and his son—Ahmed-Ḥusām al-Dīn—Hamza—Hasan—Idris. However, another branch descended from Ahmed the CAMELEER: 'Alī al-Dīn of Vize (d. 970/1562-3) (for verses attributed to this shaykh, see A. Gölpınarlı, Türk tıskıven sırı antolojisi, İstanbul 1972, 119-31) and his khālīf Ghadanfer Dede, who won acquittal in his trial for heresy. His successors were, in turn, Bālī Efendı of Vize, his son Hasan and Emir Efendı of Kāsim Pasha.

The number of khālitās whom 'Ata'ī records after the death of Benyāmīn points to the success and spread of the sect from the time of Pir 'Ali. However, it is by no means certain that his list represents any kind of recognised succession or hierarchy within the order itself. The apparent confusion within the line of succession suggests that, as the sect spread over a wide area after 926/1520, it became less cohesive, with various khālīfs acquiring fame and a personal following not universally recognised by all members. It is possible, for example, that the following of 'Alī al-Dīn, Qoghlān Shaykh and Ghadanfer Dede did not extend beyond the region of Vize. The difficulty of communication within a widely-dispersed and under-ground order must have caused fragmentation, and the order probably had no recognised and formal hierarchy.

Information on the Malāmī leaders is inadequate, that on their followers is even more so. The recorded professions of the shaykhī suggests that it was largely a movement of artisans, although the verses and other writings of some of them suggest that they had received an education wider than a simple craft-training. The founder, 'Omer was a cutler, Shaykh Yaḥya the ḥalāfa, Ahmed the CAMELEER, and Hasan was a tailor who was "both director of a workshop, and in charge of guiding the people of the tıskıven" ('Ata'ī, op. cit., 169). Ghadanfer Dede was a tanner, and "The Hidden" Idris made a fortune as a merchant, but had begun his career as an apprentice to his uncle, who was a tailor to the Grand Vizier Rüstem Pasha [q.v.] ('Ata'ī, op. cit., 602). The list of Bosnian suspects in 990/1582 (Mühimme defteri, loc. cit.) refers to two of them as knife-grinders (darkāts), and to one of them as khalīfa, a title which, in this context, probably refers to that position in a craft-gilt (kafīla). However, Qoghlān Shaykh and Hamza seem also to have numbered kāfīlku troops among their followers, and the 981/1573 investigations in Thrace suggest that it had spread beyond the towns to the villages of the area.

The doctrines of the sect, which could lead its members to claim a source of divine authority outside the Shari`a, imply that they also disavowed the authority of the Ottoman dynasty which claimed, as a source for its legitimacy, to "prepare the path for the precepts of the Manifest Shari`a". The clearest statement of opposition to the dynasty occurs in a poem by Ahmed the CAMELEER, which he almost certainly composed during the reign of Sūleymān I [q.v.]: "If I could find the most minute message from your ruby lips / I would not buy the Kingdom of Solomon (Turkish: Sūleymān) for the smallest coin" (quoted by A. Gölpınarlı, op. cit., 59).

There is further evidence from the 990/1582 investigations in Bosnia. Part of the accusation against the group was simply that they had "declared lawful that which is harām" and "associated with women outside the permitted degrees" (Mühimme defteri, loc. cit.). These accusations, while quite possibly true, are simply stereotyped phrases found in most indictments of heretics. However, the additional accusation that one of them claimed to be "the Sultan who had succeeded Sultan Hamza", while others claimed to be "vixers", a "kādī" and a "defterdar" [q.v.], does suggest that this group, at least, did regard itself as self-governing and beyond the authority of the Ottoman state, whose titles and organisation it mimicked. While any evidence produced in a heresy hunt is suspect, this piece does seem credible in that it does not fit into the stereotyped pattern of orthodox accusations.

**Bibliography:** Given in article.

**MALANG** (etymology uncertain: not Pandjābī, possibly Persian; in Urdu, malang, masc. = "salt worker", fem. = "loose, wanton woman"), a term used in Muslim India, including in the Pandjāb but also in the Deccan, to denote wandering devizers of the Kalandari, br-sharī or antinomian type [see KALANDAR, KALANDARIYYA]. Dīmar Sharīf [q.v.] at one place of his Kānīn-i Islâm puzzlingly names their founder as Dgalāl al-Dīn Buhkārī, Maqṣūd-i Dīhānīānī-ī Dīhāņāngāh [q.v.], and at another, as Dīmanjātī, a disciple of Zinda ʿAḥmad Mādār (Islam in India, ed. W. Crooke, London 1921, 141-2, 172-3.
Malangs aim at total distinctiveness from the external world, in which are included the prescriptions of the Sharia as followed by the more orthodox, baqar Khattab Sufis, in order to enter the inner spiritual world. Hence the use of hashish and other narcotics is common amongst them, as is the wearing of a particular style of dress and type of long hair arrangement, together with the use of bangles, rings and other feminine ornaments to symbolise the Malang's role as the bride of God, hence subservient to Him; cf. the descriptions of Dja'far Sharif, loc. cit.

Bibliography: Dja'far Sharif, see above; H. A. Rose, A glossary of the tribes and castes of the Punjab and North-West Frontier Province, Lahore 1911-19, i, 579, iii, 57; M. T. Titus, Indian Islam, London 1930, 127, 130; Katherine Ewing, Malangs of the Punjab, intoxication or adab as the path to God?, in Barbara D. Metcalf (ed.), Moral conduct and authority, the place of adab in South Asian Islam, Berkeley, Los Angeles and London 1984, 357-71 (Ed.).

MALARYA, a neologism in Arabic for malaria, an infection of the blood by a minute plasmodium parasite. The disease is characterised clinically by fever, which is often periodic; varying degrees of anaemia; splenic enlargement; and various syndromes resulting from the physiological and pathological involvement of certain organs, including the brain, liver and kidneys. The severity of the disease is dependent on the age, health, and degree of immunity of the victim and the particular species of the plasmodium parasite. Under suitable environmental conditions, malaria is transmitted by the mosquito genus Anopheles; out of about 375 species of anopheline mosquitoes, more than 70 are vectors of the four species of human malaria, i.e. P. falciparum, P. vivax, P. malariae, and P. ovale. Although the geographical distributions of plasmodial and anopheline species are not uniform, malaria is today a serious endemic disease in most Islamic countries from North Africa to South-East Asia, evoking widespread eradication programs.

Malaria seems to have originated in tropical Africa in prehistoric times. With the Neolithic revolution, the infection appears to have spread and established itself in the great centres of riverine civilisation in Mesopotamia, India, South China and the Nile valley, from which it invaded the Mediterranean littoral. From these five foci, malaria extended its hold over most of the tropical world and much of the land in the temperate climates. Moreover, it appears that high gene frequencies of abnormal haemoglobins were created that protected human population against malaria and allowed for the exploitation of malarious areas.

Considerable attention has been devoted to the history of malaria and its deleterious effects on Graeco-Roman civilisation. It would appear, that malaria became endemic in Greece and Italy at least by the 5th century B.C.: Because of the prevalence of the disease, malarial symptoms were recorded in the Hippocratic corpus and later medical works (see W. H. S. Jones, Malaria and Greek history, Manchester 1909, ch. 3). Aside from simplistic cultural notions of degeneration, the major effects of malaria on a population are a high infant mortality rate and a reduction in its work efficiency.

Malaria appears to have existed from late antiquity until modern times in most of the regions where Islam was established as the predominant religion. The spread of rice cultivation in the medieval period, especially, may have significantly augmented the disease. The history of malaria in Islamic society, however, has not been the subject of any systematic investigation. The medical literature, particularly, has not been studied with regard to malaria; in one instance, al-Razi gives a case that had been misdiagnosed as malarial (E. G. Browne, Arabian medicine, Cambridge 1921, 51 f.; M. Meyerhof, Thirty-three clinical observations by Rhazes (circa 900 A.D.), in Isis, xxiii [1934], 332 f.). Generally, the descriptions of fevers (hama'id) in Arabic medical literature appear to be greatly dependent on the Greek medical tradition mentioned above. M. Meyerhof, 'Ali at-Tahar’s “Paradise of wisdom”, one of the oldest Arabic compendiums of medicine, in Isis, xvi [1931], 29 f.; idem, The “Book of treasure”, an early Arabic treatise on medicine, in Isis, xiv [1930], 71 f.; M. Ullmann, Die Medizin im Islam, Leiden 1970, 42, 137 f., 214).
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[see
AWASIM, THUGHUR] and was
frontier fortresses [see ‘AWASIM, THUGHUR] and was
used as a base for the summer campaigns into Byzan-
tium. In the time of 'Abd al-Malik, it reverted to the
Greeks, and was resettled by Armenian and NabatT
(i.e. Aramaic-speaking) peasants. In the course of the
2nd/8th century, Malatya was once more occupied by
the Muslims, rebuilt by Hisham, razed to the ground
by Constantine VI Copronymos in 320/932 by the
Ham-dād Sa’did al-Dawla of Mawṣil. When Nicephorus
Phocas reconquered Syria, he wished to rebuild and
to repopulate Malatya with Greek settlers, but they
refused to live there because of the town’s exposure
to Arab raids; hence Syrian Jacobites were in 969 invited
to settle there, with the result that by the year 1100
there were said to be 53 churches in Malatya and its
district, and 60,000 Jacobite and Melkite Christians
able of bearing arms (Michael of Tinnis and
Barbarra of Harim). During the years of Byzantine re-occupation,
Malatya was held for a time by the rebel and claimant
to the imperial throne Bardas Scleros (366/976-7), but
in the following century began the attacks of the
Turkmens. The first raid is recorded in the Syriac
and Armenian sources as taking place in 1058, or slightly
earlier in the reign of Constantine IX, and soon the
Greeks were being by-passed by Turkmens raiding as
far as Kyseri and beyond, making their tenure of
Malatya impossible. Hence it was held for a while by the
Armenian Phularets as the centre of his
ephemeral principality on the thughur, under caliphal protection. Despite help from the Prankish Crusaders, recent events were unfavorable; the Seljuk sultans were generally the holders of power there, in alliance with the Ayyubids. In 628/1231 the Mongols penetrated to Hisn Ziyâd and the neighbourhood of Malatya, and after their victory at Kose Dagh near Siwa in 641/1243, Malatya was on two occasions besieged by the Mongols and its vicinity laid waste; then in the time of the Il-Khan Abaka (663-80/1265-82), Malatya fell within the share of the Seljuk sultanate of Rûm allotted under Mongol suzerainty, to Ghiyath al-Dîn Mâlûd b. 'Izz al-Dîn Kay Kâwûs. It is from the Seljûk period that the oldest monument in Malatya, the Ulu Djamâ', stems.

In the 12th and 13th centuries lived the two great Syriac historians, both born in Malatya, to whose chronicles we mainly owe our knowledge of the history of the town: the patriarch Michael I (1126-90), son of the priest Derya, who belonged to the family of Kindasi in Malatya and the Mafr'îyân Gregor Abu 'l-Faradj called Barhebraeus (1226-86 [see Ibn al-Abbî]), whose father, the baptised Jewish physician Ahrôn, had restrained his fellow citizens in Malatya from stupidly flying before the Tatars (Baumstark, Gesch. d. syr. Lit., 290-300, 312-20). Michael's principal authority, Ignatius (d. 1104), was also metropolitan of Malatya (Baumstark, op. cit., 291).

The increasing weakness of the Seljûks about 1300 favoured the formation of local Turkmen and Armenian petty states, especially in the east of Asia Minor. According to Abu 'l-Fidâ', Christians and Muslims in Malatya in those days lived on the best of terms, with the 10th/16th century. A first list of taxable inhabitants.

Malatya for the next few decades belonged to the Mamlûk sultans. As their remotest province, it was ruled by Halâb in 791/1389 the scene of a great rebellion led by the governors Mintâf and Yîlbogha against Barkûk [q. v.]. About this time, the Turkish family of the Dulghâdîr or Dhu 'l-Kadr-oghlu [see dhu 'l-ka'dîr] began to rise to power in the region of Malatya and Albistan, where they ruled till 921/1515 under Mamlûk suzerainty. About 794/1391-2, Bayezid I conquered the town, and in 903/1490 Timûr, by the battle of Koc Hisâr (922/1316) it fell into the hands of Selim I [q. v.] who destroyed the Dhu 'l-Kadr-oghlu. This was the cause of his war against Egypt, which was rapidly decided on the field of Mardj Dâbîk [q. v.]. At a later date under the Ottomans, the quwyûb to which the sağıdîk of Malatya belonged was still called Dhu 'l-Kadrîyâ.


2. The Ottoman and modern periods.

Reliable information on the size of Malatya begins with the 10th/16th century. A first list of taxable inhabitants was prepared in 924/1518, shortly after the end of Mamluk rule. In 929/1522-3, the town possessed 1,540 taxpayers, who probably represented a total population of 6,900-7,000 inhabitants. Almost forty years later, in 967/1559-60, the number of taxpayers had risen to 1,946. By this time, the total population should have amounted to about 8,700 inhabitants.

Malatya's commercial importance during the 10th/16th century was great enough to warrant the construction of a covered market (bedestân). In addition, the existence of a bridge toll collected at the Kirkgoz bridge, a Seljûk structure over which the
road to Siwas crossed the Tokhma Suyu, equally shows that 10th/16th century Malatya played a certain role in local and interregional trade. Moreover, it seems also during this period the town was located at a road at least one major kaghan [q.v.]. Of the constructions which existed in the middle of the 10th/16th century and produced appreciable revenues for the Sultan's treasury, nothing at present remains. But in 1046/1636-7, Sultan Murad IV's kapudan-ı derya, Silahdar Mustafa Paşa, had a new kaghan constructed, which survives today and about whose original shape accurate information can be found in numerous documents. This kaghan, in which several hundreds of camels could be stabled, probably possessed military as well as commercial functions.

For the 11th/17th and 12th/18th centuries, only indirect information concerning the population of Malatya is available. In ca. 1068/1657-8, the town consisted of 293 taxable units ("auird-khane"). At the beginning of the 12th/18th century, the town consisted of almost 100 taxable units ("auird-khane"), while the number of houses inhabited by tax-paying families amounted to about 370. Even if a large number of people lived in one house, the town must have declined appreciably between 967/1559-60 and the early 12th/18th century.

Throughout the 11th/17th century, Malatya, as described by travellers such as Ewliya Çelebi and the early 12th/18th century. Both the gradual decline of Malatya, and the rise of Aspuzu were accelerated by eternal factors. In 1838-9 described by travellers such as Ewliya Celebi and the early 12th/18th century. have declined appreciably between 967/1559-60 and while the number of houses inhabited by tax-paying families amounted to about 370. Even if a large number of people lived in one house, the town must have declined appreciably between 967/1559-60 and the early 12th/18th century.

Aspuzu were accelerated by eternal factors. In 1838-9 described by travellers such as Ewliya Celebi and the early 12th/18th century. have declined appreciably between 967/1559-60 and while the number of houses inhabited by tax-paying families amounted to about 370. Even if a large number of people lived in one house, the town must have declined appreciably between 967/1559-60 and the early 12th/18th century.
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MALAY PENINSULA. 1. Geographical considerations. The Malay peninsula, together with the Borneo states of Sabah (formerly North Borneo) [see BORNEO in Suppl.] and Sarawak, became the Federation of Malaysia in 1963. The population of the Federation in 1977 was estimated at 12.74 million, of whom 10.5 million lived on the peninsula, and the ethnic composition (according to 1970 census figures) was approximately: Malay 46.8%, Chinese 34.1%, Indians 9%, Dayaks (including Ibans) 3.7%, Kadazan 1.8%, other native groups 3.2%, and others (Eurasians, Arabs, Siamese, Filipinos, Indonesians, etc.) 1.4%. While almost all Malays, Indonesians, and some of the native groups are Sunni Muslims of the Shâfi'i school, the other ethnic communities are mainly Christian, Buddhist and Hindu." "Peninsular Malaysia", as the Malay peninsula is officially known to distinguish it from the Borneo half, covers some 131,794 square kilometres and comprises the eleven states of Perlis, Kedah, Penang, Perak, Selangor (in which is located the separate Federal Capital Territory of Kuala Lumpur), Malacca, Johor, Negri Sembilan, Pahang, Trengganu and Kelantan.

Peninsular Malaysia's unique location explains much about its prominent role in the history of Islam in Southeast Asia. Lying athwart the Strait of Malacca, the Malay peninsula is in the southernmost extension of mainland Southeast Asia and forms, with the islands of the Indonesian archipelago, a large
breakwater between the Pacific and Indian Oceans. Until the advent of air travel, seaborne traffic moving between the major civilisations of the East and the West was forced to sail through either the Sunda Straits, separating the Indonesian islands of Java and Sumatra, or the Malacca Straits. The latter was indeed almost the only passageway used until the Sunda Straits became better known in the 10th/16th century, with the invention of ships capable of open sea sailing and with the discovery of the winds known as the "Roaring Forties", enabling ships to sail quickly and easily from east coast Africa to Indonesia.

The Malay peninsula is also strategically located in terms of the seasonal monsoon winds circulating over the Indian Ocean and the China Sea. With the onset of the southwest monsoon in April, the winds blow from the Indian Ocean on to the Sumatra coast then in May across the Malay peninsula. While this monsoon gradually decreases, the northeast monsoon develops in the northern part of the South China Sea in October. It reaches a peak in January, when it covers all equatorial Southeast Asia except for Java and southern Sumatra, and then slowly lessens in intensity until the cycle begins again in April. Sailing ships in earlier centuries were dependent upon these winds to move quickly between east and west, and experienced mariners soon realised that the Straits of Malacca were ideal as a harbouring place because they were sheltered from the winds and were the beginning and end points of the monsoon winds.

Another important geographical consideration is the Malay peninsula's virtually inaccessible interior and its long coastlines. Along the whole length of the peninsula for about 483 km is a north-south mountain range varying between 914 and 2,134 m. above sea level. This main range and inhospitable interior jungles have been the main barriers to trans-peninsular contact by land. On the opposite shore of the Straits, in Sumatra, fairly similar conditions are found. From very early on, therefore, inhabitants living on the Malay peninsula and east-coast Sumatra have regarded the rivers and seas around them as the primary means of contact with one another. The Straits of Malacca between the west coast of the peninsula and the east coast of Sumatra became an internal lake linking the people living in lands adjoining it and helping to create a basically common culture. Communication between these peoples was often even closer than that between those living on the west and east coasts of the peninsula itself.

2. Early contact with the outside world. It is generally accepted that by the 2nd century A.D. there were Indian traders in the area of the Straits. The search for gold may have provided the initial impetus, but soon a profitable exchange of local products with Indian goods sustained the trade. The participation of the Chinese and other traders from the East and the Indonesian archipelago, all using the Straits as a convenient harbouring place and later exchange site, was an added attraction to Indian traders. Entering native chieftains quickly seized the opportunity to make their particular settlement the centre of trade. The few places which developed into major entrepôts had responded successfully to the demands of foreign merchants and provided the physical facilities and the legal and governmental apparatus to assure the rapidity, fairness and security of trade.

Through contact with Indians, the Malays were introduced to religio-political and cultural ideas which struck a familiar chord, since both societies shared a basic Monsoon Asian belief system. What was different and hence attractive to the locals was the elaboration and refinement of these ideas from India which had been a result of the incorporation of the Indo-European Aryan culture to local Monsoon Asian belief. Although little is known of how this "Indianisation" process occurred in the Malay areas, its success can be gauged by the survival of Indian terms, themes, and practices in present-day Malay language, literature and court ceremonies. India, then, was regarded from early times by Malays as the homeland of a rich culture worthy of consideration and emulation.

China's contact with the Malay peninsula was much more limited since it only began using the Straits more to reach the West from about the 5th century A.D. Even then, China's political philosophy regarding the self-sufficiency of the kingdom discouraged official involvement in international trade. Nevertheless, some trade under various guises and rationalisations did occur and was carried on principally by Persians and Arabs in the first millennium A.D. Only later in the period of the famous Ming voyages of the late 15th/16th and early 19th/18th centuries did the Malay areas begin to appreciate the splendour and the might of the culture from China. Like India, China now became regarded by Malays as a respectable source of goods and ideas.

A third group to have visited the Malay areas in earlier centuries was the Arabs. By the 3rd/9th century, Arab traders knew a large part of Southeast Asia, but appeared to have neglected this area in favour of the lucrative China trade. Although Arab sources mention the northwestern and eastern coasts of Sumatra, the Malacca Straits down to Palembang, Johor, part of the Riau-Lingga archipelago and Pulau Tioman, there is no hint of organised Arab trade with these areas until the mid-4th/mid-10th century. By the 7th/13th century, Arab trade to Southeast Asia was all but superseded by that of their Muslim brethren from India, and it is to them that the spread of Islam through the archipelago is generally attributed.

3. The coming of Islam to the Malay lands. The Malay areas were accustomed to regard India as a source of respectable and exciting ideas, and they welcomed Indians bearing tidings of Islam in the same way that they had greeted their predecessors with their Hindu-Buddhist ideas. Although the question as to which Indian group was responsible for the conversion of Southeast Asia may never be answered conclusively, the direct relationship between trade and the spread of Islam is rarely denied. After the fall of Baghdad and the destruction of the 'Abbasid caliphate by the Mongols in 657/1258, the spice route from the east through the Persian Gulf, up to the Levantine coast, and thence to northern Europe, was effectively closed. A new route now went from the east to India, then to aden in southern Arabia, through the Red Sea up to Alexandria, and thence northward. Since the authorities in Egypt refused any but Muslim trading as far as Alexandria, the Muslim ports of Cambay, Surat and Diu in Gujûrât province of India acquired great importance as trans-shipment centres for spices. Growing demand for Eastern spices by a prosperous Renaissance Europe and the cessation from the 8th/14th century of direct Chinese trade to India brought the Gujûrâti merchants into great prominence as intermediaries in the spice trade. Their great numbers in Malacca [q.v.], the major emporium in the Malay-Indonesian archipelago in the 9th/15th and early 10th/16th centuries, facilitated the work of Muslim missionaries in spreading the ideas of Islam in the region. By the beginning of the 10th/16th cen-
tury, in addition to the thousand or so Gujarati merchants resident in the city of Malacca, there were about three to four thousand others always en route being transferred to another. But the Gujaratis did not have the exclusive control of trade to Southeast Asia. There were substantial numbers of other Indian traders from the Malabar and Coromandel Coasts in South India, as well as from Bengal. In fact, some of the strongest arguments, based on local traditions and survival of certain religious terms, have been made for a Southern Indian origin of the Islamic ideas which came to Southeast Asia.

A theory has recently been advanced which does not attempt to single out any particular group for the honour of bringing Islam to Malay shores. Instead, it suggests that there was a general Islamic "fall-out" around the shores of the Indian Ocean which "showered" the Malay areas. When the Portuguese fleet rounded the Cape of Good Hope in 904/1498, they entered what has been described as an "Arabic-speaking Mediterranean". The extensive trading network which stretched from east-coast Africa to India was dominated by Muslims, and Arabic was the lingua franca. Malays had already long been a part of this trading world in which the Muslim network was simply the latest development. A 6th/12th century Arab account mentions Malays from Záboğ (identified with Sriwijaya, a kingdom which flourished in the Straits of Malacca area between the 1st/7th and 8th/14th centuries) participating in the trade to east coast Africa, while an 8th/14th century Arabic source describes a trip from China to Sumatra on a junk manned by Malays. The latter had moved from being simply engaged in facilitating the trade of others to active traders themselves. They, therefore, according to this theory of "fall-out", were already subject to Islamic ideas prevalent in the Indian Ocean area.

Another theory concerning the coming of Islam to the Malay lands points to an eastern route, from China to Champa in central Vietnam and then to the western half of the Malay-Indonesian archipelago. The participation of Muslim Arabs and Persians as shippers for the Chinese traders in earlier centuries, and the later movement of Malacca and the Straits of Malacca to Chinese traders, would have provided the vehicle for movement of ideas from Muslims in China to these trading intermediaries. Early Chinese contacts with the Malay areas, especially with the 9-10th/15-16th century kingdom of Malacca, had already made such an avenue for ideas both acceptable and respectable.

4. The adoption of Islam by Malay society. A foreign Muslim trading colony is said to have existed at some time in the 4th/10th century in Kalah [q.v.] a place tentatively located in the northern part of the Malay peninsula. Other evidence of early Muslim activity on the peninsula itself is scattered and difficult to corroborate. In 965 a Muslim tombstone was found in Kedah bearing the Arabic date 291 A.H. (903 A.D.). Another find was a gold coin in Kelantan identified with Sriwijaya, a kingdom which flourished in the Straits of Malacca area between the 1st/7th and 8th/14th centuries (903 A.D.). Another find was a gold coin in Kelantan which identified with Sriwijaya, a kingdom which flourished in the Straits of Malacca area between the 1st/7th and 8th/14th centuries). Participating in the trade to east coast Africa, while an 8th/14th century Arabic source describes a trip from China to Sumatra on a junk manned by Malays. The latter had moved from being simply engaged in facilitating the trade of others to active traders themselves. They, therefore, according to this theory of "fall-out", were already subject to Islamic ideas prevalent in the Indian Ocean area.

Another theory concerning the coming of Islam to the Malay lands points to an eastern route, from China to Champa in central Vietnam and then to the western half of the Malay-Indonesian archipelago. The participation of Muslim Arabs and Persians as shippers for the Chinese traders in earlier centuries, and the later movement of Malacca and the Straits of Malacca to Chinese traders, would have provided the vehicle for movement of ideas from Muslims in China to these trading intermediaries. Early Chinese contacts with the Malay areas, especially with the 9-10th/15-16th century kingdom of Malacca, had already made such an avenue for ideas both acceptable and respectable.

4. The adoption of Islam by Malay society. A foreign Muslim trading colony is said to have existed at some time in the 4th/10th century in Kalah [q.v.] a place tentatively located in the northern part of the Malay peninsula. Other evidence of early Muslim activity on the peninsula itself is scattered and difficult to corroborate. In 965 a Muslim tombstone was found in Kedah bearing the Arabic date 291 A.H. (903 A.D.). Another find was a gold coin in Kelantan identified with Sriwijaya, a kingdom which flourished in the Straits of Malacca area between the 1st/7th and 8th/14th centuries). Participating in the trade to east coast Africa, while an 8th/14th century Arabic source describes a trip from China to Sumatra on a junk manned by Malays. The latter had moved from being simply engaged in facilitating the trade of others to active traders themselves. They, therefore, according to this theory of "fall-out", were already subject to Islamic ideas prevalent in the Indian Ocean area.

Another theory concerning the coming of Islam to the Malay lands points to an eastern route, from China to Champa in central Vietnam and then to the western half of the Malay-Indonesian archipelago. The participation of Muslim Arabs and Persians as shippers for the Chinese traders in earlier centuries, and the later movement of Malacca and the Straits of Malacca to Chinese traders, would have provided the vehicle for movement of ideas from Muslims in China to these trading intermediaries. Early Chinese contacts with the Malay areas, especially with the 9-10th/15-16th century kingdom of Malacca, had already made such an avenue for ideas both acceptable and respectable.
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[q.v.] were similar to the seances of the local shaman (pawang); and the healing powers attributed to the Sufi (pawang) were a trait also associated with the traditional village doctor (bomoh). The successful co-existence of Islamic and local spirit practices is clearly demonstrated in a 12th/18th century Malay text from Perak, the Misa Melayu. It describes how, when the sultan was ill, prayers were offered to the Prophet, the saints, as well as the ancestors. Pawangs commonly ascribed their incantations to the Hindu deities Siva and Brahma, as well as to Lukman al-Hakim, father of Arabian magic [see LUKMAS]. Among Malay farmers today there are various Kitab Tuh, Islamic works on magic, saint worship, and other practices considered to be only vaguely Muslim. One of the most well-known of these works is the Taj al-Malik (Tagi al-malak) respected among Malay farmers as the standard source on Islamic magic.

Another factor which may have facilitated conversion to Islam was the introduction of Muslim tales into the already vast international repertoire of stories found among the Malays. Tales of Islamic heroes appealed to the people as much as the heroes of the well-known episodes from the Indian epics, the Mahabharata and the Ramayana. Stories of the lives of Muslim saints were a source of entertainment and religious edification, and treatises on magic and divination helped confirm Islam as another important, if not the most superior, source of spiritual power for the Malay community.

One other reason should be cited for the adoption of Islam as a religion among Malays. In all levels of society, there would have been people who would have understood the basic teachings of the religion and seen their value for this life and for that in the hereafter. For such people, the act of embracing Islam was a spiritual commitment to the basic tenets preached by the Prophet Muhammad.

5. The role of Malays and the Malay language in the propagation of Islam. The conversion of Malacca to Islam [see MALACCA] was an important factor in that kingdom's rise to become one of the greatest commercial emporiums in the 9th/15th century world and the centre for the propagation of Islamic knowledge in Southeast Asia. With Malacca as the hub of a vast international trading network, which included even the easternmost islands of the Indonesian archipelago, Malay and other traders prepared the way for more formal conversion by Muslim missionaries. Malacca's predominance on the Malay peninsula meant that Islam quickly became established as a religion in all the vassal courts and riverine settlements.

The incorporation of the Malay peninsula and other areas in the archipelago into the Islamic ummat provided a basis for united action against the Christian Europeans who began appearing in the area from the beginning of the 10th/16th century. But unity was more a hope than a reality, and in 917/1511 the famous entrepot kingdom of Malacca fell to the Portuguese, to be replaced by new centres of power in the Islamic world itself, these writers read, wrote, and discussed in Arabic.

For anyone wishing to go beyond the few rudiments of Islamic law and doctrine, a knowledge of Malay was essential. Even in those few manuals written in other regional languages there were numerous Malay words. But the more important information was contained in kitabs, which are works written in Malay but derived and compiled from Arabic sources. In general, only the introduction, the conclusion, and a few comments are the original work of the local "author", while the remainder is simply a translation. These kitabs were the principal tools of Islamic learning for many who were unable to read Arabic. One inhabitant in early 19th century Malacca describes how a poor Arab sayid (Malay, sayid) from the Hadramawt with a knowledge of both Arab and Malay gave lessons on Islam for five dollars per year per pupil. The first text used was the Ummu 'l-baharin (Umum al-baharih), and then he went on to other manuscripts, all in Malay, to teach canon law, matters concerning prayers and similar devotional practices, various branches of Islamic knowledge and didactic stories. Malay, then, had become a language of Islam and an instrument for the wide circulation of religious ideas throughout the Southeast Asian Islamic world.

6. Impressions of Islamic institutions before the mid-19th century. There is very little material about Islam in the Malay peninsula before the early period of British rule in the mid-19th century. What one knows about Islamic institutions before this must perforce remain as impressions from scattered and often disparate evidence in Malay sources and contemporary European reports. It appears that one of the most important Islamic officials in the Malay states was the kadi (kdi). In early 12th/18th century Johor, the kadi was ranked next to the principal ministers as the most powerful individual in the kingdom. His respected status has been a result of his Muslim learning, which would have still been considered to be a rare achievement in the Malay world at this time. Even in the early 19th century, an episode is related in the Hikayat Abdullah of how the rare appearance in Malacca of a learned sayid from Atjeh resulted in a virtual self-imposed seclusion of those who previously had claimed to be local religious scholars. The kadi appeared to have had close ties with the royal family and may even have married into local royalty. His knowledge of Islam would have made him in the eyes of the local people a superior individual with access to strong spiritual powers. But as the number of Muslim
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teachers and scholars increased, especially in the sec-

ond half of the 18th and 19th centuries, the kadi
generally lost his unique standing. Nevertheless, in
the 19th century he was still described as “presiding
over a number of mosques”.

The only indication that one has of a religious
hierarchy, although not necessarily an official one, is
from the Misa Melayu. At the occasion of the opening
of a new palace (mahalai), which coincided with the
Prophet Muhammad’s birthday, special celebrations
were arranged with the secular and religious guests
seated according to rank. On the first level was the
sultan and his religious counterpart, the sharif; on the
second level the nobles and the ulama; on the third
level the court attendants and the imam; on the fourth
level the district official (hulubalang) and the khatib;
and on the fifth level the official in charge of a settlement
around a mosque (penghalu mukim) and the bilal (i.e.
the muezzin); on the sixth level the ordinary people
and the experts on religious matters (lebai and alim);
and on the lowest level, the foreign traders, itinerant
travellers and the religious mendicants (fakir).

The sharif family was especially honoured in Perak,
but everywhere else in the Malay peninsula, descen-
dants of the Prophet, whether sayid or sharif (Malays
rarely distinguished between the two), generally were
 accorded a high place in society and even regarded as
suitable marriage partners for the sultans' daughters.
In the pre-19th-century sources rarely speak of them until
the arrival of Hadramawt sayids and sharifs in the ar-
chipelago from the mid-12th/18th century. Once
again, as the kadi in Johor in the early 12th/18th cen-
tury, the prominent position of the sayid or sharif was
most likely due to his religious knowledge, which
would have been substantially greater than most other
Muslims in the kingdom. But more important, the
sharif or sayid had an even greater claim to respect and
honour among the Malays because of his direct des-
cent from the Prophet.

While there does not appear to have been any of-

ficial hierarchy extending from the chief religious
figures at the court to the other Muslim officials in the
kingdom, there was a definite ranking at the village
level. The person usually lost his unique status
village family, was the head of the village prayer
house (surau), which functioned as the gathering place
for Friday prayers, village Islamic rituals, village
education, and certain community-wide religious
celebrations. Mosques were usually found only in the
larger settlements and in the towns. Below the imam
was the khatib who delivered the Friday sermons and
performed the wedding ceremonies. Next in line was
the bilal, who called the faithful to prayer and of-
ficiated at funerals; and finally there was the penghalu
mukim, combining both secular and religious ad-
ministrative duties, who kept the mosque in good
order, assisted in ceremonies, reminded the faithful of
the Friday services, reported absences to the imam and
beat the wooden gong outside the mosque to summon
the people to prayer. The kadi and the village elders
screened individuals before selecting them for these
posts. Funds for the partial remuneration of these
religious functionaries and for the upkeep of the surau
or mosque were obtained through a collection of the
annual zakat and fitrah (zakāt al-fitr), the taxes or alms,
from the villagers.

Other than the small village Islamic officialdom,
with the kadi at the apex in charge of a number of
village suraus or mosques, there is no mention in the
sources of any united kingdom-wide religious hierar-
chy. A study of the state of Kelantan suggests that above
this village hierarchy may have functioned a
nominally state-wide authority of a mujāfi and kadi with
the various other officials associated with the religious
courts. But in other states the picture is less clear, and
the only reference one has of any united Islamic effort
is when holy war is declared against the Europeans.
But such calls for Muslim unity were mainly unsuccess-
ful since personal, ethnic, and state rivalries and
antagonisms often proved stronger than the appeal to
a common religious bond.

7. Islam in British Malaya. Only in the 19th
century with the establishment of British rule in
Singapore (1819) and the Malay peninsula
(1874-1919) did a more formal organisation of Islam
occur. The British long maintained the pretense that
they were merely advisers to the Malay sultans, while
effectively exercising control over all aspects of
government except “religion and custom”. This lat-
ter sphere was regarded as being under the jurisdic-
tion of the sultans. Unable to exercise much authority
in matters of government, the sultans in the last two
decades of the 19th century created a religious
administration modelled after the centralised
bureaucratic system imposed by the British to govern
the Malay states. In Kelantan, which together with
Trengganu, Perlis and Kedah were under Siam until
1909, religious administrative change occurred
toward the end of the 19th century more as a result of
attempts to forge a more cohesive provincial reform efforts than to
any British example.

By the second decade of the 20th century, most
states had a form of centralised Islamic bureaucracy
which was co-ordinated by bodies such as Perak’s
Council of Chiefs and Ulamas, Kelantan’s Council of
Religion and Malay Custom, Selangor’s various com-
mittees under the State Council, and Johor’s Council
of Ministers. These bodies, which included the state
Mufti (Shafi’ul-Islam) and the Chief Kadi as ex-officio
members, were appointed by the sultan and served as
his religious advisers. What differed significantly from
the past was the presence in these organisations of a
majority of non-Islamic officials from the royal
household and senior chiefs, a development which
reflected the limited opportunities now open to the
traditional ruling classes in the new British colonial
government. Their participation in the newly-
formalised religious hierarchy further strengthened the
long-standing mutually supportive relationship be-
 tween religious and secular authorities. This
alliance guaranteed that any Islamic reform move-
ment which threatened to weaken the established
religion would find little favour among the ruling
classes. It is noteworthy that the reformist Wahhābī
movement which made such a great impression in In-
donesia, especially in Sumatra at the end of the 18th
and 19th centuries, created barely a ripple in the
Malay peninsula.

In the new Islamic bureaucracy, the previously
independent village Muslim officials became incor-
porated into a system which bound them closer to the
secular authorities than ever before. Although im-
plementation of policies from the centre was often dif-
ficult because of the relative inaccessibility of some of
the villages, the new religious structure did reinforce,
at least in the eyes of the people, Islam’s traditional
support for the ruler.

Islamic scholarship, too, became much more
organised and extensive in the peninsula in the 19th
century. One major factor in this development was the
new Islamic intellectual activity being fostered in such
centres as Atjēh, Palembang and Riau. Malay
translations from the Arabic of authoritative Muslim
treatises on doctrine, law, exegesis, commentary,
Sufism, prayer and catechism were produced, together with popular religious works in Malay which now also included the purity of Islam, made it an exemplar of Islamic thought and attitudes for the rest of the Malay world. From the beginning of the 19th century, reformist Islamic ideas were encouraged on Riau, as were the Sufi mystical brotherhoods divested of their "accretions". In the congenial atmosphere of the Riau court, particularly that of the Raja Muda on the island of Penyengat, religious writings and theological debates flourished, attracting Muslim scholars from all parts of the archipelago.

One of the members of the Raja Muda family and a prominent Malayan scholar was Raja Ali Haji ibni Raja Ahmad (ca. 1809-ca. 1870). He encouraged the recruitment of Islamic teachers and was sufficiently regarded as an Islamic scholar himself to have been consulted on religious doctrine by the royal family and even appointed as the religious adviser to the Raja Muda. He was greatly influenced by al-Ghazālī's Ḥikmat al-dīn and Nasihat al-mulūk, as can be seen by Raja Ali Haji's application of theological and ethical argument in viewing the Malay past in his monumental work, the Tuhfat al-nafsi. Raja Ali Haji also had sisters and sons who promoted the study of Islam in such groups as the Persikatan Rasyidah. But Raja Ali Haji remained the dominant intellectual figure in Riau, and his religious ideas became the basis for many of the views expounded later by the Virtual Muda group in Singapore.

The Straits Settlements of Malacca, Penang and Singapore, geographically and culturally on the edge of Malay society, contributed further to the development of Islamic thought in the region. Created as an administrative unit by the British in 1867, the Straits Settlements were cosmopolitan centres serving as a gateway for the flow of labour, capital and ideas to the Malay Peninsula. The wealth and dynamism of Penang and Singapore, enjoying the protection of British rule, fostered religious and political ideas which were less acceptable in the Malay states. A heterogeneous Muslim community became resident in these straits, particularly in Singapore, since it was an important port of call for Southeast Asian Muslims going on the pilgrimage to Mecca.

From the last two decades of the 19th century until about 1920, when Penang challenged its position, Singapore had a reputation as a principal centre of Islamic learning. Muslims from Southeast Asia, India, and the Middle East gathered in the city to debate the latest religious ideas, and Islamic tracts in Arabic were translated and simplified into Malay for consumption throughout the archipelago, a practice which had already begun in the 9th/15th century in the heyday of the Malacca kingdom. No stronger comment can be made concerning the vitality of Islam in Singapore than to mention that those in the archipelago wishing to study Islamic law or theology went either to Mecca or to Singapore. The establishment of a number of hand lithograph presses in Singapore in the late 19th century operated principally by Jauzi Penakan (those of mixed Malay-Indian origin) enabled the publication of a growing body of Islamic literature in Arabic, Malay and even in some regional languages. The generally liberal attitude of the British authorities toward religious activities in the Straits Settlements facilitated the publication of works and journals not in favour with the religious establishment in the peninsula.

In July 1906 a periodical Al-Imam, modelled intellectually after the Egyptian periodical al-Manār, began publication in Singapore, promoting the modernist Islamic ideas of the Egyptian thinker Muḥammad b. Ḥaddūd al-Andalusi. Al-Imam's readership was small, limited mainly to the intellectuals in urban areas, its ideas did percolate to the countryside in the peninsula. The presence of Al-Imam's representatives in most Malay states and the interest which it generated among religious teachers in the modernist Islamic schools, the madrasahs, assured the transmission of its viewpoints to an audience outside the cities. This, and other similar publications, advocated a return to the original strength of early Islam and rejection of accretions to Islam which had prevented the revival of the Malay nation. A number of madrasahs began to be established introducing a more modern curriculum than that offered by the pondok ("hut") schools, which employed the method of recitation and exegesis by a teacher as the principal means of imparting religious knowledge to the pupils. The madrasahs were intended to put into practice the ideas advanced in the modernist Islamic publications. Instruction was by no means confined to Islam, and such commercial subjects as mathematics, history, English, business, techniques for wet-rice agriculture, and soap- and soy sauce-making were also introduced to instruct a good Muslim how to survive and flourish in a modern society.

Because of the traditionally supportive role between the religious and secular authorities in the Malay states, the modernist Islamic press attacks on established religious officialdom became viewed as an attack on the ruling classes. Attempts were made to prevent entry of these publications into the peninsula from the Straits Settlements. In 1934 there was a public burning of a tract on free will written by a Malay modernist who had studied at al-Azhar university in Cairo. But the debate could not be stifled. Opponents of the movement referred to the modernists as Kaum Muda, the "Younger Faction", while reserving for themselves the more respectable appellation of Kaum Tua, or "Older Faction". The modernists objected to their label, since they regarded themselves as the true "Older Faction" who advocated a return to the original pure teachings of the Prophet. Despite the forcefulness of the rhetoric in the modernist Islamic literature and the progress made in the establishment of madrasahs, the impact of modernist ideas was much less in the countryside than in urban areas. With the British creation of Malay vernacular schools throughout the countryside, and the introduction of Kur'ān lessons within these schools, the village Muslim officials were able to strengthen their influence among the people. Their new formal positions provided them with security and respectability, and reinforced their traditional ties with the existing secular authorities. The opposition of these village Muslim officials to the modernist Islamic ideas being propagated via the Straits Settlements seriously weakened the impact of such ideas in the Malay countryside. During the Japanese Occupation in Malaya (1942-5), the links between the ruler and the Islamic hierarchy were further reinforced, since more of the secular functions of the ruler were removed, leaving him basically only with religion as an area of responsibility.

8. Islam since independence. Since the independence of Malaya in 1957, there has been constitutionally a separation between Church and State. The various sultans are regarded as the head of religion in their respective states, and in Malacca and Penang, which have no sultans, the quintessentially-
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The elected Paramount Ruler (Yang Dipertuan Agung) is regarded as the religious head. Since 1948 every state has had a religious affairs department, a type of council of the religion, the Treasury or Beyt al-Mal, and a department of zakat. While Islam is the proclaimed official religion of Malaysia today, freedom to worship any other religion is guaranteed by the Constitution. The protection of the non-Muslim citizen is evident in the controlled application of hukum syara and Shari'a law. The religious courts (mukhunam syar'i) deal mainly with Muslim personal laws, especially with marriage, divorce and property matters, but have no jurisdiction over non-Muslims. In any conflict between the religious courts and the civil courts, the latter prevail.

The most significant religious development in the peninsula since independence has been the dakwah movement. Dakwah is described in Malaysia today as a call inviting those who are not yet Muslim to embrace the faith, and those who are Muslims to practice it in their lives. The movement stresses Islam as demo, a total system, which provides an effective alternative to Western materialism and secularisation. The movement seems strongest among government officials, teachers, and young urban Malays from English or Malay schools, rather than from Islamic educational institutions as one would have expected. Even among Muslim students studying abroad, there has been a noticeable increase in dakwah participation.

The origins of the movement can be traced directly to the government's policy after 1969 to increase Malay enrolments in the universities. Many of these graduates, who became teachers or bureaucrats in the education system, were the dakwah activists of the 1970s. The movement gained popularity, particularly after 1974, when government restrictions on student political activity on the campuses led many to re-channel their discontent via the dakwah movement, with its stress on Islam as a total system. So pervasive is the movement that the term dakwah has been used to categorise behaviour (returning to the simple, less materialistic life style), dress (wearing short praying veils for women, and the turban and long white, green, or black robes for men) and organisation (any group viewing itself as advancing the cause of the movement). Such dedication is encouraged by a steady supply of Islamic literature, both in Indonesian and English, now filling the bookstores in the urban areas.

The basic dakwah ideas are in the tradition of earlier Islamic reform movements, such as Wahhabism and the modernism of Muhammad 'Abduh. They all preach the rejection of 'corrupt' Islamic accretions and the return to the purity of Islam as practised by the Prophet. And as in earlier reformist waves, the dakwah movement is seen as a threat to the existing religious and secular authorities and has been resisted by both. In the villages, many of the Muslim officials reject the movement and have managed to retain the loyalty of the villagers. In the urban areas, where the movement is strongest, traditional religious officials have to a large extent been sheltered by the government's cautious attitude toward the movement. The government has sought to contain or domesticate the movement by creating its own dakwah organisations within the various departments. While fears have been expressed concerning the possibility of an Islamic revolution along the lines which have transformed Iran into a theocratic state, the more realistic concern is the movement's threat to disrupt the stable unity painstakingly created by the nation's leaders between the Malays and the large non-Muslim Chinese and Indian minorities in the country. The movement is viewed suspiciously by some of the latter as yet another instrument by which the Malays would justify their dominance over the other ethnic communities.

The strength of the traditional relationship between the religious and secular authorities has thus far succeeded in diverting dakwah energies along the least disruptive channels. Unlike earlier reformist movements, however, dakwah activities have become much more forceful and prominent because of the resurgence of Islam and power throughout the world. Yet one can still detect in the movement, and the attempts by established authority to contain and mould it, the process by which new ideas have always filtered into the Malay peninsula. The Malays are now undergoing a re-examination of their religion and society and will no doubt, as in the past, select only those ideas which will best strengthen and make more meaningful their chosen way of life.


**MALAYS, a people of South-East Asia.** The Malays speak Malay, one of the languages of the Austronesian language family. Inscriptions from the area of Palembang in Sumatra dating from the 7th century are the oldest evidence of Malay. They show that Malay functioned as an official language in an Indonesianised kingdom. It is sometimes assumed, on somewhat tenuous ground, that this region of Sumatra and the islands off its east coast are the homeland of the Malay-speaking peoples of South-East Asia.

The Malay language takes three forms. It is a series of local dialects; it is a *lingua franca*, and it is the official language of Indonesia, of Malaysia, of Brunei and one of the national languages of Singapore. Its speakers rank sixth in number amongst those of other world languages. Most of these, however, do not have Malay as their first language. Malay is spoken also in Southern Thailand, in Sri Lanka by descendants of slaves brought there, and in the Netherlands by 40,000 Moluccan Malays. What is sometimes called Cape Malay is actually not Malay at all, but Afrikaans with unimportant Malay influence. As the official language of Indonesia [see Indonesia, iii. Languages] it is one of approximately 800 languages. It is spoken as a local dialect in the southern part of Sumatra, around the city of Medan on that island and in the islands of Bangka, Bilton, and in Riau; in Kalimantan it is spoken around the rim of the island; in Java it is spoken as a local dialect in pockets along the north coast. "Moluccan Malay" is one name given to several varieties of the local dialects in Eastern Indonesia. From a linguistic point of view, the situation of dialects has not yet been properly studied. Trew notes that the varieties of types of influence—via traders, religious figures, wanderers and others—has left "an intricate complex of Malay, Malay-like and Malay-influenced languages and dialects". In Malaysia, the language of Johor and Riau is considered the correct language. There is much divergence from this form of Malay. However, linguistic study does not yet allow us to specify how many dialects can be isolated.

Malay already existed as a *lingua franca* during the period of Portuguese activity in Eastern Indonesia. Its status as a national language was furthered by its use by both Dutch and British in dealing with their colonial subjects. The Japanese replaced Dutch and English with Malay during World War II and thus helped development of Malay as a language of administration and learning. This marked the beginning of efforts to expand the use of the language that continues to the present. Malay is more of a success as a national language in Indonesia than in Malaysia. It has often become the language of domestic life in Malay for Indonesian cities, as well as the language of youth. The complicated Malay linguistic situation makes it difficult to isolate the speech groups are therefore not. In Malaysia the term *himpunan*, meaning "son of the soil" is used to distinguish Malays from Chinese and Indians. When it is so used it refers to native speakers of Malay who are Muslim and born in Malaysia. The same term in Borneo, however, refers to tribes who may or may not speak a form of Malay. Though the term *himpunan* is recent, the notion, as Gullick notes, goes back to British rule. Before colonial times, it is doubtful that an equivalent term was used by anyone to designate themselves, Malay speakers rather referring to themselves as inhabitants of certain places or followers of certain rulers.

Before the colonial period, Malay states were typically situated at the mouths of rivers. Revenues collected from the control of trade were the source of the ruler's power. With these revenues, the ruler maintained a band of retainers. Before the coming of the British, peasants fled from one area to the next as they felt pressure from rulers to pay taxes or perform labour services. The limitation of aristocratic power and the bringing of peace to the Malay Peninsula allowed for the building of permanent Malay settlements. It resulted also in immigration from Sumatra to the central areas of the peninsula. Rubber became a major smallholder crop between 1910 and 1920 and thus a mainstay of the Malay economy on the West Coast. In other states, rice became the chief crop. The growing of those crops along with fishing, the cultivation of copra and palm oil, work on estates and in the civil service comprise the chief occupations of Malaysians today.

It is more difficult to isolate a notion of "Malay" in Indonesia with its more complicated linguistic and ethnic composition and different colonial history. What have been termed "Coastal Malays" have been little studied. Pigeaud has used the Malay word meaning "coastal" to term the culture that includes coastal Malays as well as other groups, "Pasissir culture". Hildred Geertz has elaborated this notion. She sees Pasissir culture as developing around the spice trade of the 14th to the 18th centuries and associated with the spread of Islam. In this process, Malay culture was mixed with other influences—Javanese and Makassarese as well as Arabic and south Indian, with different mixtures evolving in different localities. In addition to Islam, Geertz stresses an orientation to the market and the development of literary forms as features of Pasissir culture. As was the case in the Malay states, a system of status was tied to actual political power so that office was not a sure sign of authority, rulers having to validate their power through the maintenance of retainers.

Malays are Sunni Muslims. Their religious institutions vary from place to place. There is usually a village religious official, often termed a *lebai*. In the traditional states, there were religious officials, including *kadis*, associated with the courts as well as religious functionaries independent of the states and connected often with mosques or with religious boarding schools in the countryside. Peripatetic teachers from the Middle East as well as the pilgrimage have long been important vehicles of influence. The oldest Malay texts which show Muslim influences come from Trengganu in Malaysia and Atjeh in Indonesia. Both date from the 14th century. Tomb inscriptions showing adherence to Islam date from the 15th century. (J. SIEGEL)

Of pre-Islamic Malay literature, nothing is known. As far as may be concluded from a few old-
scriptions in Hindu script, it seems that Malay was written in Kawi-like characters, but literature, in its earliest known form, is written in Arabic letters only. The oldest manuscripts are preserved in the Cambridge and Oxford libraries; they date from the last years of the 16th and the first decade of the 17th century. The only literary-historical evidence of the existence of written literature in the 16th century is the mention, in a 17th century chronicle, of the use made of a royal library at Malacca at the time when the Portuguese endeavoured to capture that town (1511). Malay literature, as it presents itself now, seems for the greater part original. Hardly any of the chronicles, tales and poems are derived from Arabic sources directly, most of the religious and semi-historical romances having been translated from Persian; but all these literary products are imbued with the Muslim atmosphere, being full of Arabic words and phrases and laden with Islamic theory. There are, it is true, some indigenous farcical tales, and some fables, especially the sometime highly appreciated mouse-deer tales, moreover some original romances with Hinduistic influences, and several adapted old Javanese tales, that do not betray real Islamic influence; but the very fact that all these books are written in Arabic characters makes them overflow with Arabic words in a way that shows that they belong to Islamic mentality. In this short account, there will be no mention of literary products going back to the great Sanskrit epic poems, nor of the tales that do not show traces of Muslim influence; only in so far as Malay literature has Islamic features will it be treated here. The originally genuine Indonesian deer-fable has undergone an Islamic correction. The historical writings, more or less mythical and semi-romantic, are almost absolutely Islamised. To that class of works, like e.g. the chronicle Seraph Malay, and other ones, as the chronicles of Kutawaringin, Kutai, Atjeh and Pasai, are to be reckoned. A partly historical but for the greater part fictitious, romance is the Hikayat Hang Tuah. A host of romances, dealing with foreign princes and princesses and their endless adventures, has been spread over a great part of the Malay reading East-Indian world; the titles of all those popular, but for European readers less attractive, books, may be found in the catalogues of Malay manuscripts at Leiden, Batavia and London. Some books of fiction have been translated from Persian, Arabic or Hindustani. A group of them is to be traced to the Hitopadesa-collection, another one to the Tuti-nama-series, a third one to the Badar! cycle. Only exceptionally have foreign authors written in Malay; e.g. the Rádpút Núr al-Dín al-Ránírf, who wrote a great encyclopaedic chronicle at the instigation of an Atjehnese queen. A very great number of texts deals with the former prophets, the Prophet Muhammad, his family and friends. Those works, like e.g. the romances of Amír Hamza and Muhammad b. al-Ḥanafiyya, have Persian originals. The purely religious books cannot be regarded as Malay literature.

Poetical literature has a different character. The real Malay kind of poetry, though not devoid of Persian influences, is the pantun, i.e., popular quatrains, whose first two kinds deal with a natural fact, or a well known event, and are intended to prelude, phonetically, the third and fourth lines, that contain the real meaning of the usually erotic poem. The other "genre" is the sha'ir. Its form is the stanza of four rhyming lines. Some of these very extensive overloaded poems are from the Javanese, some others are versified versions of prose romances, moreover

historical events, love-scenes, religious matters, mystical speculations etc. are dealt with in innumerable sha'ir.

P. van Rónkel.

The development of Malay as a modern literary language is generally said to begin with the writings of Abdullah bin Abdul Kadir Munshi, 1796-1854 (known as Munshi Abdullah), who introduced a colloquial style and who relied on his own observations for the content of his writing. The Islamic features of the literature that developed after Munshi Abdullah are difficult to specify. The progress of modern literature meant a decisive break with older forms, such as the sha'ir, with their strong Muslim overtones. At the same time, the development of contemporary forms such as the novel and short story can be seen as means of continuing the expression of traditional social tensions which often centred around Islam. Writers from the 1920s and 1930s who were responsible for the acceptance of modern styles were mostly from the Minangkabau region of Sumatra. Taufik Abdullah has shown that a continuous tension and resolution between Minangkabau tradition which featured matrilineal descent and Islam resulted in the perpetual generation of new social forms. The modern novel and short story as exemplified in the works of writers such as Marah Rusli, born 1889, Nur Surat Islandar, born 1893, and Sutan Takdir Alisjahbana, born 1908, can be seen as continuing the expression of this tension. At the same time, one cannot point to a specifically Islamic literature, though writers such as Hadi Abdul Malik Karim Amrullah, born 1908 (known as Hamka) continue to deal with Islamic themes.


MALAYSIA. Political developments since 1957. The Federation of Malaya (consisting of nine peninsular Malay states plus Singapore and Melaka) achieved sovereign independence within the Commonwealth on 31 August 1957. The written constitution (amended at various times since) provided a
strong central authority comprising the Yang di-Pertuan Agong (the constitutional monarch who is elected at five-yearly intervals by and from the nine hereditary Malay Rulers), a partially nominated Senate and a fully elected House of Representatives. The Malay Rulers remained heads of their respective states (though Governors occupied this position in Penang and Melaka), each of which was provided with an executive council responsible to the state assembly. The Rulers were also confirmed as heads of the Islamic religion in their states. For a society where differences between Malays, Chinese and Indians are marked, a single nationality was created with provisions enabling all persons to qualify for citizenship either by birth or according to requirements of residence, language and allegiance. Though this would allow the proportion of non-Malay citizens to rise steadily, it was made acceptable to the Malays by constitutional safeguards for their religion, language and "special position" in public service, education, land reservations, etc. Lawyers and politicians have had some difficulty reconciling the historic principles of "the special position of the Malays" with the more modern concept of "common nationality".

Tunku Abdul Rahman's Alliance coalition of the United Malays National Organization (UMNO), Malayan Chinese Association (MCA) and Malayan Indian Congress (MIC) was intended to make compatible the interests of the three major communities. The arrangement allowed Malay political hegemony and non-Malay domination of the economy in the short term while holding out the prospect of a gradual breakdown of these respective preserves. The Alliance majority was confirmed at the 1959 elections and on 1 August 1960 it was confident enough to end the Emergency which has been declared on the outbreak of the communist insurrection (June 1948). Conservatives, educationalists and rural developmental policies were launched to improve the economic lot of the Malays.

On 27 May 1961 the Tunku proposed the formation of "Malaysia" from Malaya and the British dependencies of Singapore, Brunei, North Borneo (Sabah) and Sarawak. Neither the Tunku nor Lee Kuan Yew (Chief Minister of Singapore) believed that an independent Malayominated Singapore could survive on its own, while the former was confident that the peoples of Borneo would counter-balance the Chinese of Singapore. Reassured about their military base in Singapore, the British were prepared to decolonise the rest of their Southeast Asian empire via the Malaysia plan. Despite protests in Borneo (e.g. the Sarawak United People's Party; Azahari's revolt in Brunei, December 1962), the Coghislold Commission and a UN Mission separately concluded that the majorities in Sabah and Sarawak favoured Malaysia which was inaugurated, but without Brunei's membership, on 16 September 1963.

The new federation faced problems within and without. Sukarno condemned it as a "neo-colonial" conspiracy and "frontline" between Indonesian and Malay-dominated forces. In July 1963, the Indonesian and the Malayan-Commonwealth forces lasted until May 1966, while the Philippines laid claim to Sabah. Relations between Kuala Lumpur and some state governments were also strained. The Pan-Malayan Islamic Party (PMIP) controlled Kelantan, and the federal government had to intervene in the affairs of Sabah and Sarawak to ensure state governments to its liking. Lee Kuan Yew's commitment to a "Malaysian Malaysia" challenged the Alliance formula for the harmonisation of communal differences and roused UMNO "ultras". In August 1965, Singapore was forced to secede from Malaysia. Nevertheless, the Alliance had increased its majority in the 1964 federal elections.

The elections five years later, however, were bitterly contested. The PMIP and some Malays within UMNO criticized Tunku Abdul Rahman for "giving in" to the Chinese, while the Democratic Action Party (DAP), Gerakan and People's Progressive Party complained about the disadvantages suffered by non-Malays. Reduction of the Alliance majority, particularly the MCA's poor performance, provoked demonstration and counter-demonstration which spilled into inter-communal violence in Kuala Lumpur on 13 May 1969. Probably many hundreds were killed. Parliamentary government was suspended until February 1971.

1969 is a turning-point in the modern history of Malaysia. Tun Abdul Razak, for years the Tunku's deputy, assumed the leadership of government, first as Director of the National Operations Council and later as Prime Minister (September 1970 to January 1976). Razak evolved a strategy for stability which was continued by Hussein Onn (1976-81) and Mahathir (since 1981). The Rukunegara (national creed) was proclaimed, but public and parliamentary debate of "sensitive issues", notably the paramountcy of the Malay Rulers, the special position of bumiputras ("princes of the soil", i.e. Malays and other indigenous peoples) and the citizenship rights of non-Malays, was outlawed. Authoritarianism has been a characteristic of Malaysian government; in 1960 when the Emergency ended, the executive equipped itself with even wider emergency powers by amending the Internal Security Act, and detention without trial and news censorship have been features of the period since the return to parliamentary government in 1971. The coalition has been enlarged to incorporate former opposition parties, including the Parti Islam Sa-Malaysia (PAS, previously PMIP), between 1973 and 1977, but not the DAP. This National Front (NF or Barisan Nasional), like the old Alliance, has been dominated by UMNO. In the 1974 elections, the NF won well over two-thirds of the federal seats (the amount needed to amend the constitution) and control of all 13 states.

Perhaps the most significant result of the 1969 riots was a shift in economic planning. One of the most prosperous countries in Asia and enjoying an enviable growth rate, Malaysia has nonetheless suffered from rural poverty and an uneven distribution of income. To break down the communal compartmentalisation of society, in which bumiputras were identified with traditional activities while Chinese and Indians were obviously associated with the modern sector, the New Economic Policy (NEP) was devised. Through a series of Five Years Plans (1971-5, 1976-80, 1981-5), the NEP has aimed to eradicate poverty and to increase the bumiputras' share of corporate wealth to 30% by 1990. There is tension between these objectives, and irritation arising from their immediate pursuit or failure to attain long-term goals could exacerbate communal relations and popular grievances. Since independence, the economy has diversified considerably and the manufacturing sector has been developed, but Malaysia still relies on the export of commodities (petroleum, rubber, tin, palm oil, timber and more recently cocoa) and is thus vulnerable to world-market fluctuations. Since the mid-70s, government has been aware that world recession might upset the timetable of the NEP. So, too, might the rapid growth of population (currently at 2.7% p.a.) which, according to the 1983 estimate,
totalled 14,744,000 and is ethnically divided in the approximate proportions of Malays 47%, Chinese 33%, Indians 9% and Borneo peoples 9% (plus 2% others), and is distributed geographically between Peninsular Malaysians 83% and East Malaysians 17%.

In foreign affairs, too, the early 1970s saw a shift in emphasis. The Anglophile Tunku had stayed firmly in the Western camp; though Malaysia had not joined SEATO, the Anglo-Malayan (Malaysian) Defence Agreement (AMDA) had underwritten the country's security, and Malaysia had supported the US in Vietnam. In 1971 AMDA was replaced by the Five Power Defence Arrangement (Australia, Britain, Malaysia, New Zealand, Singapore) in which Britain played a less prominent role. At the same time, Malaysia became interested in the neutralisation of the region through the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN, 1967). Without compromising its anti-communism, it established diplomatic relations with China (1974). Communist expansion and Sino-Soviet rivalry in Indo-China since 1973 has been tackled by Malaysia as an ASEAN matter rather than through the Commonwealth, in which the present Prime Minister shows little interest.

In 1975-6, world recession, resurgent terrorism, political crisis in Sabah, corruption involving the Selangor Chief Minister and the death of Tun Razak (January 1976) might have shaken the régime, but the calm control asserted by Datuk (later Tun) Hussein Onn was endorsed by the 1978 elections. In July 1981 he was succeeded by the more abrasive Datuk Seri Dr Mahathir Mohamad, a vigorous champion of Malays within a "Greater Malaysia". "Leadership by example", "Malaysia incorporated" and "Look East" are some of the slogans illustrating his drive for administrative efficiency, entrepreneurial zeal and international repute. Since the NF's landslide victory in the elections of April 1982, however, he has been embarrassed by a constitutional wrangle with the Rulers, a financial scandal arising from the Bank Bumiputra's involvement in property development in Hong Kong, the Islamic revivalism of PAS and the defeat of the NF party (Berjaya) in the Sabah state election (April 1985). Though Mahathir's command of UMNO, the NF and the country is unassailable at the moment (June 1985), he has to counter the blandishments of PAS and guard against splits between NF partners and within parties such as the MCA and MIC, which are notoriously disunited. Apart from the politics of the moment, some are exercised by the fear of a slump in Malaysia's economy whose continuing buoyancy is essential to the integration of this new state.


MALAZGIRD. 1. The town. The modern Turkish Malazgird constitutes a district (îliş) centre in the province (il) of Muş in eastern Anatolia. The area surrounding the town is rich in cuneiform inscriptions, and it is possible that the battle between Tiglathpileser I and the Nairi kings took place in the area. The name of the town itself, which probably goes back no further than the Parthian period, in Old Armenian is recorded as Manavazakert, Manavazakert and Manazkert, while the oldest Arabic form is Manazjird. It has been supposed that this name preserves the memory of the Urartu king Menas of Van, whose name is mentioned in many inscriptions which have been found in the Malazgird area.

Very little is known about the town's pre-Islamic history. Constantine Porphyrogenitus remarks that the local dynasty who held Malazgird in the 4th/10th century paid tribute to the Byzantine Empire. However, the members of this dynasty, which originally had been subordinate to the Bagratids, bore Arabic names, the nasta derived from Malazgird being very prominent. The name of the town itself, which probably goes back no further than the Parthian period, in Old Armenian is recorded as al-ManazT. Thus, during the campaign of the Hamândi Sayf al-Dawla into eastern Anatolia (328/940), we hear of a prince of Malazgird named ʿAbd al-Hamîd. In 353/964 a ghulam of Sayf al-Dawla's conquered the town, and in 359/969-70 it was taken by the Byzantines. The Byzantine occupation of Malazgird must have been very brief, for in 382/992-3 another Byzantine army tried to take possession of the town, this time without success. On the other hand, 446/1054-5 Malazgird must have once again fallen into Byzantine hands, because Ibn al-Athîr records that in 446/1054-5 Malazgird resisted a siege by the Saljûq Toghrîl Beg.

However, the main event in the history of the town was the battle of Malazgird between the Saljûq sultan Alp Arslan and the Byzantine ruler Romanus Diogenes (463/1071) [for details, see 2. below]. The outcome of this battle led to the gradual settlement of Anatolia by Turkish nomads and then townsmen, and to the establishment of the Rûm Saljûq sultanate in central and eastern Anatolia.

On the other hand, the town of Malazgird itself never played a prominent role, neither in the Saljûq nor during the Ottoman period. During the 7th/13th century, the name of Malazgird is occasionally mentioned in chronicles (particularly Ibn al-Athîr), but no references can be found concerning the economic life of the town. Equally sparse is the material for the Ottoman period. Thus it has not been possible to locate an enumeration of Malazgird tax-payers in the tahrîrs of the 10th/16th century, although an Ottoman document from the year 1001/1592-3 refers to a sandâq of Malazgird, in the wâjdât of Diyârbekir, which was inhabited by the Kara Ulas nomads (Başbakanîk Arşıvi, Divan-i hûmayûn Ruus Kalemi, 253/46a, p. 63). However, Kâtib Celebi (Djihan-name, 426) makes a brief reference to the existence of the town, which in the 11th/17th century could be reached in two days' travel from Erzurum. Moreover, the town lay on a road connecting Adilecevaz and Bitlis, which was used by the Ottoman army on one of its campaigns in 1480 (Irâk).
villages, the main settlement containing 213 houses and 19 shops. The kada, then as now, as the cultivation of wheat, barley, beans, and maize. Vegetables and industrial cultures (sunflowers, sugar beet) were being encouraged by government projects. The number of craftsmen was low, and the cildm possessed no industry. According to the Il yilhi of Muq published in 1973, the town had by 1970 grown to 10,711 inhabitants (1975: 13,094). A hydroelectrical power plant had been established, so that Malazgird is now supplied with electricity. As an administrative centre, the town also provides educational services for its district: a high school (lis) was opened in 1971, and the construction of a cultural and sports centre began about 1970. An irrigation project had equally been undertaken by 1970, and the first producers’ cooperatives were making their appearance. However industry continues to be practically absent from the cildm of Malazgird.


2. The battle. As noted above, the most important event with which the name of the town is connected is the battle of Manteincourt fought in Dhu ’l-Ka’da’s (August 1071 between Alp Arslan [q. v.] and Romanus IV Diogenes. This event is treated by a variety of sources, Byzantine Greek, Armenian, Syriac and Arabic. The most valuable account is surely that of Attaliates, who was present at the battle itself as well as being an adviser of the Emperor, whereas that of Psellus, tutor of Michael VII Ducas who was to replace Romanus on the imperial throne after the battle, is hostile. Although Cahen (1934, see Bibli.) was critical of Attaliates’ detailed testimony, more recently Vryonis and Cheynet (see Bibli.) have reinstated him as the prime source for the battle. A relevant Western source is the Gesta Roberti Wiscardi of William of Apulia (see Bibli.); other later Christian writers such as Michael the Syrian and Matthew of Edessa are strongly anti-Byzantine, viewing the Sâl’djik invasions of Anatolia as divine retribution for the Emperors’ treatment of non-Melkite religious minorities of the empire. There is no contemporary Muslim account, the earliest extant one being that of Ibn al-Kalânisî (d. 555/1160), but the long description by Sîh b. al-Djawi (probably deriving from Ghârs al-Nî’ma Muhammad b. Hîdâl al-Sâbî’s lost Usân-l-tawârabî) is, among other Muslim sources, detailed and valuable.

The policy adopted by Romanus when he became Emperor in January 1068 was to take the offensive against the Muslim enemy beyond the Byzantine frontiers rather than to wait for raids to take place, and the campaign which culminated at Malazgird was the last of three conducted by the Emperor himself, for which he left Constantinople in spring 463/1071, aiming to secure against the Sâl’djik the fortresses of Aklâhî [q. v.] and Malazgird. Alp Arslan was for his part besieging Edessa in the spring, but on hearing of the arrival of the Byzantine army in the east, decided to move in that direction, probably via Mawsil and Khûy, to assemble reinforcements. Romanus detached a contingent of his army under the Byzantine Pope Michael the Syrian to take Akhlat, whilst his own army took and garrisoned Malazgird itself. Preliminary skirmishes took place, during which time some of the Uze (sc. Ghuzz) mercenaries in the Byzantine army deserted to the enemy, whilst Roussel and the Georgian Joseph Trachaniotes fled westwards from Aklâhî, deserting the Emperor, at the approach of Alp Arslan. The Muslim side offered peace, but Romanus refused any terms, feeling that he had numerical superiority and being unwilling to throw away the immense effort put behind his campaign. The Muslim sources emphasise Alp Arslan’s pessimism before the battle, but the fact that the battle took place on a Friday meant that the force of universal Muslim prayer was felt as an advantage (cf. al-Husaynî, Aqhdî al-dawla al-sâl’djik, 47-9, which purports to give the text of special prayers offered up throughout the Sunni world at the caliph al-Kârim’s orders).

Although the figures in the Muslim sources for Romanus’s army (from 200,000 to 400,000) must be exaggerated, the Emperor must, despite defections, have had superiority in numbers; Cheynet estimates his army at probably 60,000, with much baggage and impediment. Its morale however was not high, and its composition very heterogeneous; amongst foreign mercenaries are mentioned Franks, Arabs, Rûs, Pechenegians, Georgians, Akk hazians, Khazars, Ghuzz, Kipchak, Scyths, Alans and Armenians. Alp Arslan is generally credited in the Muslim sources with having 15,000 troops at the battle. The exact date of the battle has not hitherto been established with certainty, but the fact that it was a Friday in Dhu ’l-Ka’da seems to limit the possibilities to 20 Dhu ’l-Ka’da/19 August or the next week; in fact, astronomical indications, confirming Attaliates’ information that the night before the battle was moonless, point to 27 Dhu ’l-Ka’da 463/26 August 1071, as is shown in a recent popular book on the battle, A. Friendly, The dreadful day, London 1981, 178. The exact location of the field of battle is likewise uncertain, though it was along the road between Malazgird and Aklâhî; the al-Rahwa road between Malazgird and Akhlat; the al-Rahwa (cf. Yakût, ii, 880) of Sîh b. al-Djawi, Ibn al-Djawi and Ibn al-Adîm seems most probable.

The course of the battle is described in most detail by Attaliates and by the anti-Romanus, later writer Nicephorus Bryennius. A Byzantine return to camp at nightfall seems to have been interpreted as a retreat; the rearguard under Andronicus Ducas left the field, leaving the army’s rear unprotected; and in the later stages, the Sâl’djik forces lured the Greeks into ambushes. The Emperor was captured and was honourably treated by Alp Arslan; several sources record the famous conversation in which the sultan asked Romanus what treatment should be meted out to him. A peace agreement was drawn up, the precise terms of which are not known, but which probably included a ransom, the cession of various frontier fortresses, and the provision of troops and annual tribute to the sultan; but since during Romanus’s brief captivity, Michael VII Ducas had been proclaimed Emperor and Romanus was eventually blinded and
killed by his supplanter (August 1072), it is likely that these terms were never put into force anyway.

Romanus's defeat seems to have sprung in part from inadequate intelligence about the movements of the Akkâl force, which was to rejoin him, and a poor choice of terrain, one favourable to the Sâlîjûks' mounted archers; but internal dissensions within the Byzantine empire, moreover, had been reflected in the army itself, for Andronicus Ducas, cousin of the future Emperor Michael VII, had been ill-disposed towards Romanus. A Fâtîmîd involvement in the campaign was also suggested by Hamdâni (see Bihâl), but this remains speculative.

Was the battle indeed "the greatest disaster of Byzantine history" (Grousset)? In many ways, it was the decade of internecine strife within the Empire after the battle which harmed the Empire more and allowed Turks to infiltrate Byzantine territory. Byzantine prestige abroad was certainly harmed by the ignominy of Romanus's capture, and some Crusader chroniclers (e.g. William of Tyre) see Western European involvement in the Levant as dating from this time with the Franks replacing the Greeks as upholders of Christianity against Islam there. The Muslim historians, for their part, tend to over-dramatise the event, probably because it was the only major military confrontation during the infiltration process.


MALDIVES [a group of islands in the Indian Ocean.]

1. History and social organisation

The Republic of Maldives, formerly a Sultānate, forms an independent Asian state located in the north-central Indian Ocean some 650 km. south-west of Ceylon (q.v.). The name “Maldives” is a foreign designation, probably derived from the Sanskrit māladvipa, “garland of islands”; the indigenous name Divehi Rājje “island realm” is gradually assuming some international currency.

The Maldives Archipelago consists of a narrow, 750 km. long chain of coral islands, lying scattered on a north-south axis between lat. 7°6' N. and 0°42' S and long. 72° and 74° E. The country is divided into nineteen administrative atolls, comprising an estimated 1,196 islands, of which 211 are presently (1980) inhabited. According to the 1977 Maldivian Government Census, the total population was 143,469, of whom 29,555 lived in Male, the capital and only town of the archipelago.

The Maldives were said to have been settled by the first of several waves of Sinhalese in the 5th or 4th century B.C., though both legend and scientific evidence point to the presence of an earlier Vedvōd or Tamil population (Bell, 1940, 16; Maloney, 1980, 28-71). The islands seem never to have passed under Ceylonese political control, however, and with the exception of a brief period of Portuguese domination (1658-1558-73) have remained effectively independent throughout recorded history.

Little is known of the history or culture of the Maldives Islanders in the pre-Islamic period. There are indications both of an indigenous praligious pantheon (in which Rānāmārī, a powerful deity of sea and storm, may have played a leading role), and of Hindu influence, both etymologically (Maloney, 1980, 51) and archaeologically (a Shivalingam, possibly indicating the site of a former Hindu temple, was excavated in Arij Atoll, Ariyaddu Island, in 1959). It is clear, however, that from ca. 300 A.D. onwards, Theravada Buddhism emanating from neighbouring Ceylon came to dominate the archipelago (Bell, 1940, passim; Reynolds, 1974, 1978; Maloney, 1980, 72-98). Thus by the 4th/10th century, Buddhist monasteries and stupas existed throughout the country, especially in the southern and central atolls.

The initial advent of Islam to the islands remains shrouded in mystery. However, it is clear that the existence of the Maldives must have been known to Arab (and Persian) mariners even in pre-Islamic times, and it is therefore reasonable to assume that Muslim merchants and sailors first visited the remote archipelago as early as the 1st/7th century (Forbes, 1981, 62-77). For the next four centuries, Buddhism remained established as the dominant religious creed of the islands, though it is possible that, during the 4th/5th/10th-11th centuries, some of the northern atolls fell under the political and cultural influence of the (Hindi) Chola monarchs Rājarāja I and Rājendrā I (Sastri, 1953, 220; Forbes, 1979, 138). During this period a mixed Arabo-Maldivian population, albeit of small size, must have developed at Male, in some respects paralleling the development of the neighbouring Mappila [q.v.] community of Malabar [q.v.] and elsewhere on the Indian Ocean littoral. As with the Mappillas, this nascent Maldivian Muslim community is likely to have wielded economic, political and cultural influence out of all proportion to its numbers.

According to the Maldivian Ta'rikh (a historical chronicle dating from the early 12th/18th century—see Bell, 1940, 18-43), the last Buddhist monarch of the Maldives, who bore the Sinhalese-style birudā (epithet) “Siri Bavanāḍītta”, was converted to Islam by a Muslim visitor to the islands on the 12th day of Rabī‘ II 548 (1153 A.D.), upon which he adopted the Muslim name and title “Sūlān Muḥammad al-ʻĀdī”. Certain controversies surround this event. Thus, according to Ibn Baṭṭūṭa (who visited the islands between 1343-4 and again in 1346), the shaykh responsible for the conversion was a Māghribī styled Abu l-Barakāt al-Barbārī, a Sunnī Muslim of the Mālikī madhhab (text, iv, 127; English tr. Gray, 1882, 14). In contrast, the Maldivian Ta'rikh ascribes the conversion to one Shaykh Yūsuf Shams al-Dīn Tabrīzī, by whose almost certainly a Persian or perhaps a Turk, of uncertain rite (Bell, 1940, 18-19). Today, Abu l-Barakāt is officially recognised as the shaykh responsible for the conversion, and his tomb stands in Malé’s Henveru district, the most venerated ziyāra in the country.

Other early epigraphic evidence ascribing the conversion to Shams al-Dīn is extant, however (Bell, 1940, 190; Forbes, 1982), and the exact role played by the Mālikī shaykh “al-Furūsān” (who was venerated throughout the country) remains uncertain.

Following the conversion of Muhammad al-ʻĀdī to Islam, both the Ta'rikh and Ibn Baṭṭūtā's Riḥla are agreed that the new faith was rapidly embraced by all Maldivians. Recently-translated epigraphic evidence casts doubt on this claim, however. Thus according to a copper-plate grant (lomdfdnū) preserved at the Bodgala Mosque in Malé, more than half-a-century after the initial conversion, it was necessary for the Malé authorities to send a military expedition to crush an “infidel” (presumably Buddhist) king in the south of the country (a transcript of this lomdfdnū is currently in press at Malé). It may be safely assumed, however, that by the late 7th/13th century the country was universally Muslim, a situation which remains unchallenged today.

Following the initial Portuguese assault upon the traditional trade network of the Indian Ocean, much of the indigenous, Muslim-dominated trade of the Malabar region was re-routed via the Maldives, thus exposing the islanders to more direct and regular contact both with Arabia and with Islamic South-East Asia. This development led in turn to an increased (and unofficial) Portuguese interest in the islands, culminating in the brief but destructive Portuguese occupation when, between 965-81/1558-73, Malé passed under the control of the hated “ʻAdīri ʻAdīri” and “the sea grew red with Muslim blood” (Ta'rikh: Bell, 1940, 26). In response to this Portuguese aggression, the Maldivians, under the inspired leadership of Muhammad Bodū Takurufānū, a son of the ʻAbdūl of Utīm in the north of the country, waged an unremitting guerilla struggle. By 981/1573 the Portuguese were forced to withdraw, and Muhammad Takurufānū became sultan. One last result of the Portuguese occupation was a change in the madhhab followed by the Maldivians. Thus according to the Ta'rikh (Bell, 1940, 27), following the expulsion of the Portuguese it was discovered that the Maldivian ʻāsma' had been decimated, and that no shaykh of the Mālikī madhhab remained alive. At this time there chanced to be a Muslim from southern Arabia, Muhammad Qāmāl al-Dīn Ḥuważ, who bore the Muslim name and title “Sūlān Muḥammad al-ʻĀdī”. Therefore, Male authorities to send a military expedition to crush an “infidel” (presumably Buddhist) king in the south of the country (a transcript of this lomdfdnū is currently in press at Malé). It may be safely assumed, however, that by the late 7th/13th century the country was universally Muslim, a situation which remains unchallenged today. 

Following the initial Portuguese assault upon the traditional trade network of the Indian Ocean, much of the indigenous, Muslim-dominated trade of the Malabar region was re-routed via the Maldives, thus exposing the islanders to more direct and regular contact both with Arabia and with Islamic South-East Asia. This development led in turn to an increased (and unofficial) Portuguese interest in the islands, culminating in the brief but destructive Portuguese occupation when, between 965-81/1558-73, Malé passed under the control of the hated “ʻAdīri ʻAdīri” and “the sea grew red with Muslim blood” (Ta'rikh: Bell, 1940, 26). In response to this Portuguese aggression, the Maldivians, under the inspired leadership of Muhammad Bodū Takurufānū, a son of the ʻAbdūl of Utīm in the north of the country, waged an unremitting guerilla struggle. By 981/1573 the Portuguese were forced to withdraw, and Muhammad Takurufānū became sultan. One last result of the Portuguese occupation was a change in the madhhab followed by the Maldivians. Thus according to the Ta'rikh (Bell, 1940, 27), following the expulsion of the Portuguese it was discovered that the Maldivian ʻāsma' had been decimated, and that no shaykh of the Mālikī madhhab remained alive. At this time there chanced to be a Muslim from southern Arabia, Muhammad Qāmāl al-Dīn Ḥuważ, who bore the Muslim name and title “Sūlān Muḥammad al-ʻĀdī” (q.v.).
a Maldivian "ddim who had spent many years studying at the Shafi'i centres of the Wadi Hadramawt and at Zabid in the Yemen. He was subsequently appointed khadij by the Imam of Mitha and from this time the Mālikī maddhab was replaced by the Shafi'i one as the formal rite of the Maldives.

From 981/1573 to the present day, the Maldives have remained effectively independent, though in 1887 an agreement was signed between Sultan İbrahim Nūr al-Dīn and the British Crown by which the islands assumed British protectorate status in matters of foreign policy, but retained internal self-government. In 1932 a constitution was introduced for the first time, though the Sultanate was retained for a further 21 years, when the First Republic was established under the Presidency of Muhammad Amin Dīdī. In 1954, following the overthrow and death of the latter, the Sultanate was briefly re-established. However in 1968, three years after the attainment of full independence from Britain, the Sultanate was finally abolished and a Second Republic proclaimed under the Presidency of Ibrahim Nasir. Today, the President of the Republic of Maldives is Maumoon Abdul Gayoom, a graduate of al-Azhar who is fluent in both Arabic and English.

The people of the Maldives Islands are predominantly of Indo-European origin, being linked ethnically and culturally with the Sinhalese people of Ceylon and the inhabitants of Minicoy Island, now grouped with the neighbouring Laccadive Islands [q. v.] to the north. Other important constituent elements in Maldivian culture are the Dravidian and the Arabo-Muslim ones. Maldivians are 100% Sunni Muslims of the Shafi'i maddhab. The only non-Muslims to be found in the country are foreign experts or businessmen, all of whom are resident on a strict temporary basis, and none of whom may acquire property or Maldivian nationality without first becoming Shafi'i Sunni. The Ismā'ili Bohra community (originating from Gujārat [see BHOJRAS]) which dominated Maldivian trade from the late 19th century to the early 1950s has been expelled, and their solitary mosque (in Male) has passed under Shafi'i control. Unlike the neighbouring Laccadive Islands, the Maldivian Muslims are partly patrilineal, nor is "caste" a factor, though class distinctions were—and in some cases remain—strong. Maldivian Islam is therefore distinguished by considerable orthodoxy at the official level. At a popular level, however, it is characterised by an unusually widespread belief in spirits and in all manner of dīnī, as well as by the extensive practice of fadīta (cf. Sanskrit pandita, "a learned person"), a religio-magical science widely accepted throughout the archipelago and described by Maloney (1980, 242-73) as "a parallel religious system". Today the Maldivian religious establishment—which draws much of its inspiration from the reformist ideologies with their roots in Arabia and elsewhere in the Middle East—is anxious to limit the role played by fadīta in Maldivian society, and actively discourages sihura (cf. Ar. sīhūr 'magic'), fadīta's black magic counterpart. Despite these pressures, however, widespread belief in fadīta and in a plethora of dīnī persists, providing intriguing evidence of parallels between popular Islam in the Maldives and in its counterpart in the Malay-Indonesian archipelago.


2. Language and literature. The Maldivian language, called Divehi, is an Indo-Aryan tongue closely related to Sinhalese, with which it shares some distinctive features as the half-nasals before voiced stops and the "umlaut" of e to i in certain positions. It maintains the distinction, now lost in Sinhalese, between dental l and retroflex l. It was formerly written in a script derived ultimately from Brāhmī and closely resembling earlier forms of Sinhalese script. This script, known as Dīsī akuru ("Maldivian letters"), survives on tombstones and inscriptions and in some manuscripts, but was gradually replaced during the 18th century by a script called tana, written from right to left (which facilitated the use of Urdu or Persian loanwords written in Arabic script). This script contains 24 letters (one of which is known as alif, though it has more than one function). It was a local invention; the first nine letters are forms of the Arabic alif; the remaining 15 are components of dāʾīma, which is defined as "palatization".

No ancient literature has survived. Surviving writings on palmeleaf are mostly magical or medical treatises. A few historical works exist, though not generally available for inspection. Learned works were sometimes written in Arabic; thus an Arabic tawārikh of the Maldivian Kingdom (Dīdehi rajā) exists, compiled in 1725 and brought up to date in 1821, as well as some 18th-century histories in Maldivian called Rādiwalī ("line of Kings"); these histories all begin from the time of adoption of Islam in 548/1153. Surviving poems include Dīṣī raṭwarī ("The song of Dīsī"), an obscure romance of travels in the Indian Ocean dating from about 1810.

It is only with the 20th century that books became common and duplication of texts was practised. Grammatical formulation of the Maldivian language may be dated from the publication of Sullam al-arīf by Shāhīk Hādīrīn Rūghī in A.H. 1355. Amīn Dīdī, Chief Minister and later first President of the Maldives (1909-54), was a prolific writer and encour-
aged and promoted literary compositions by others. Literary magazines feature among the early competitions became fashionable at the time. Amīn Dīnī also wrote historical and biographical works, including a history of the Maldives during the 1939–45 war.

There was also a tradition of religious writing, usually of a commentarial character. Literary figures of the recent past who wrote on both secular and religious subjects are Ṣayḥāḥ Saḥāl al-Dīn (d. 1950) and Bodufinavagū Sīdī (also known as Ṣafī al-Dīn) (d. 1969). Most of their works remain in manuscript.

**Bibliography:** H. C. P. Bell, The Maldives Islands: monograph on the history, archaeology and epigraphy, Colombo 1940. (C. H. B. REYNOLDS)

MALHAMA (A) in modern times designates an epic [seen ḥamāsā] and also corresponds to a usage already in evidence in the Old Testament, where malhāmā is applied to the wars of Yahweh (I Sam. xviii, 17, 20, 28), but in the Islamic Middle Ages this word means a writing or a series of a divina character, the Malhamat Dāniyāl [cf. dāniyāl]. It is a question of a collection of meteorological signs with their divinatory meanings, derived from the day of the week on which 1 January falls (from the Saturday to the Friday), eclipses of the moon, following the same order, lightning, thunder, the appearance of halos around the sun and the moon, a rainbow, the appearance of a sign in the sky and earthquakes. This first series of signs is followed by another, referring to the effects of the winds on events, those of days of the week and those of days of the week on which 1 Thoth of the Coptic year falls, and the first day of the Arab year (cf. Istanbul ms. Bayezit, Veltūnī Ef. 2294,3, fols. 58-65).

Another recension of this malhama (Istanbul, Bağdat Vehbi 2234, fols. 1-6a) enlarges the range of these predictions based on the lunar mansions, thunder according to months, eclipses of the moon, earthquakes, new moons, a rainbow, parhelions (al-gubāb ‘a‘la waḍgh al-qahma), the moon’s disc, snow, hail, clouds, comets, the blowing of winds, rains, etc.

A third recension (Istanbul, Reisülkuttab Mustafa Ef. 1164,2, fols. 15a-95a) enumerates the signs and information supplied by “celestial and terrestrial phenomena; a chapter on physiognomy, according to the calendar of the Christians, Muslims, Jews, Armenians and Copts. This compilation contains, in addition, various calculations, information on the festivals of the Harranians, where Ibn al-Bahlūl refers to the Führst (of Ibn al-Nadim), whose author he gives as Yaḥyā b. Ḥātim Ḥanā (؟) (تهن), and an account of the Mandaeans of Wāṣīt. One table brings together prognostics derived from atmospheric phenomena; a chapter on physiology (based on the Kannad al-Mansor of Abū Bakr al-Rāzī and other writings); symptoms of poisons and their antidotes; signs of the humours which predominate in the body; rules for the purchase of slaves; the diagnosis of illness; the recognition of horses’ illnesses; a compendium of dream interpretation.

There followed (fols. 94a-140a) preceded by a section on the festivals of the Harranians, where Ibn al-Nadīm refers to the Shadjara al-nuṣraīya (fols. 1b-2b) and (3) the Risāla al-ḥarīfija al-arba‘a, containing: (1) an anonymous commentary on al-Shaṭfara al-nuṣraīya (fols. 9a-140a) preceded by the Risāla al-burḥān fi ’alāmah madhī al-ḥājr al-ṣumā‘ (fols. 1-92b) of ‘Abī b. Ḥusām al-Dīn known by the name of al-Muttab (d. between 975 and 1576/1577).

With this current of apocalyptical malhama, malhāmā [cf. l. q. l. a. a. om. asd.], became associated.


**MALHŪN (malhūn)** designates the state of the language which served for the expression of certain forms of dialectal poetry in the Maghīb, as well as this poetry itself. Although the verse composed may be generally intended to be intoned and chanted by amateurs or professionals with a momentary musical accompaniment, this term does not come from lāhn “melody”, as Muhammad al-Fāṣī
would have it (Abad al-Dhiyā, 43-4), but from 'lahana (cf. Djirārī, Kasīda, 55-7) understood in the sense of "to stray from the linguistic norm" i.e. from literary Arabic [see Tanīn al-Samā'ī]. In the Maghreb there are various forms of popular poetry in dialect which grew up there or were imported [see in particular Bukāla, Ḥawfī and Zādjal], but, although the distinction may not always be perceived or even perceptible, mulhūn properly so-called, which also has various names such as kasīda ṣagāiyta or 'ilm māshaḥū/miḥāb because this art was innate (see Djirārī, 54-64) or simply kām, comprises more specifically strophic poems or ones derived from the classical kasīda [q.v.], whose fundamental characteristic appears to be (apart from liberties taken by poets) the tendency to use an internal rhyme, the first hemistichs of all the lines rhyming throughout the poem or in each of the strophes.

In the present article, we will not neglect Tripolitania, and we will concern ourselves with Tunisia, where popular poetry is still very much alive, but more particularly with Morocco and Algeria, for it is concerning these two countries that there is the most information, due to the significant number of bards (gawwalīr, pl. gawwādīn) and poets (nāṣīm, ṣayyād) who were famous there from an earlier period, and due also to the abundance of works which have been published concerning them. However, we must limit ourselves to citing those of whom are the most renowned and, as it is impossible to reserve a notice for each of them in this Encyclopaedia, we will indicate in brief the principal references which concern them, asking the reader to refer to the general bibliography, where the titles will be given in their complete form.

The origin of mulhūn. Mulhūn does not appear to have arisen from any of the categories of poetic production in dialectal Arabic with which Spain [see Zadjāl] and the Near East (see Sa'īf al-Dīn al-Hillī, al-'Aṣīl al-ḥāli, ed. W. Hoenerbach, Die vulgáresische Poesie, Wiesbaden 1956) were already acquainted in the Middle Ages. Ibn Khālūdūn, to whom the merit, among other things, must be acknowledged of taking popular poetry into account, does not use the word mulhūn, but he forms at the end of the Muḥaddith (in 417 ff.; French tr. de Slane, iii, 445 ff. Eng. tr. Rosenthal, iii, 466 ff.) some examples of townspeople's poetry which he calls 'arāḍ al-balad and whose creation he attributes to an Andalusian by the name of Ibn 'Umayr who had emigrated to Fās. It is a strophic poetry with a double rhyme which Ibn Khālūdūn regards as deriving from the maragākh [q.v.] and whose structure is similar to certain pieces of urban mūlḥūn (see A. Tahar, Poésie populaire, 363 ff.). The author of the Mukaddima adds that Ibn 'Umayr respected i-'āb, but that the Fāsīs abandoned it because it did not interest them. Despite its undeniable value, this evidence does not allow us to ascertain the period in which the first manifestations of the genre which concerns us arose; that of Leo Africanus [q.v.] (10th/16th century) is not of much more help; he says in fact (Description de l'Afrique, 214-15) that there were in Fās many poets composing love poems in the 'vernacular' and, each year, on the occasion of the festival of the Prophet's birthday (mawlid/mulūd) [q.v.], a piece of verse in his praise [see Mawīldiyāt], but it is quite likely that the "vernacular" in question was Hispanic Arabic, as this must also have been the language of the 'arāḍ al-balad. According to G.S. Colin (in Inscription au Maroc, 224-7; EI, art. MOROCCO, vol. 2), two periods are to be distinguished in the evolution of popular poetry; during the first, which stretches until the beginning of the Sa'dīds (middle of the 10th/16th century), Moroccan poetry in dialectal Arabic was a direct heritage from al-Andalus and was expressed in Hispanic Arabic, having become the "classical" language of the sa'dāf; the second begins in the 10th/16th century, and it is under the "Bedouinising dynasties" of the Sa'dīds and ʿAlawīds (from 1076/1666) that mulhūn properly so-called, a special language influenced by Bedouin dialects made its appearance and developed. The word designating, in Algeria, the popular poet (gawwalī and not kawwalī), the significant number of bards belonging to nomadic or at least rural tribes, and the fact that the oldest specimen of the genre which have been preserved date from the 10th/16th century, seem to lend credence to G.S. Colin. However, this mulhūn was not born overnight, and it is probable that the Arab tribes who had emigrated into North Africa in the 9th/11th century had preserved their traditions and that they composed some verse in their own dialect; only a study of the language of the most ancient remnants of dialectal poetry could shed some light on this problem. It is actually dangerous to contest G.S. Colin's theory by citing, as Djirārī had done (549-60), poets earlier than the 10th/16th century, without taking account of the language—which is really hard to define—that they used in their compositions.

Whatever may be the case, the first who is known was one called Abū ʿAbdūd who lived in Fās at the end of the Waṭṭāṣīd dynasty (first half of the 10th/16th century); he is famous in Morocco for a "war poem" (harbī) inspired by the battle of 942/1536 between Waṭṭāṣīds and Sa'dīds, at which he was present (Rabat ms. G594; see E. Dermeignon and M. El Fasi, Poèmes marocains, 96; M. El Fasi, La Pensée, no. 1 (November 1962), 68; M. al-Fasī, Adab al-miṣri, 46). Two poets of the same period, the Moroccan al-Maḍjīdī b. ʿAbd al-Majīdī (q.v.), author of well-known quatrains which constitute a category on their own, and the Algerian Siḍī Lāḥīḍār Bāḥhīlīf al-ʿAkhḍār, alaṣar al-ʿAṣāb b. ʿAbd Allah b. Makkhūfī, of the Mostaganem region, are counted among the earliest; in a poem on the Battle of Mazagran delivered against the Spaniards in 965/1558, he says that his people participated in this combat in person, so that if this detail is authentic, he supplies a valuable chronological reference; the works of this bard are still appreciated, so that it has been possible to collect them in a Diwan published by M. Bekhoucha in Rabat in 1951 (31 poems, among which figure several panegyrics of the Prophet, which are still sung by the tolba, in funerary vigils, to the tune of the Burdā [q.v.]; see also J. Desparmet, Blida, 146-66; idem, Chansons de geste, 195, 216-19; Sonneck, no. 112; M. al-Kāḍī, Kanz, 7-15; A. Tahar, index).

The principal poets from the 10th/16th century to the present. In the second half of the century there lived another Moroccan originally from the Tafsīlt called Abū Fāris Abū al-ʿAṣīz al-Maghrawī (d. 1014/1605) who has also remained famous, to the point that there is a proverb: ʿĀlāb khāʾi, gībt mānkhā w-al-Maghrawī "Everything tall is empty, except the palm-tree and al-Maghrawī" because he was very tall and expressed such wisdom in his verses that sanctity was attributed to him (see Rabat ms. Bibl. Royale 594; Aubin, Le
move men and women at weddings” (S. Bencheneb, in Initiation à l'Algerie, 302; see Sonneck, no. 32; M. Ben Cheneb, Itineraire, Desparmet, Bédia, 8, Kadi, Kanz, 134-42, 147-9; A. Hamidou, Poèmes maghrebin, 1007-30; Bekhouche, Poèmes érotiques, 6-33; idem and Sekkal, Printanières, 124-7; Belhalfaoui, 72-91; Tahar, index; al-Dhawhari al-Hasan 285-316; his Divan (31 poems) was collected and published in Tlemcen in 1370/1951 by M. Bekhouche.

'Ali Kūra (end of the 12th/13th century), of the Relizane region who celebrated Platonic and mystical love (see Belhalfaoui, 148-3; Tahar, 208, 210).

Ibn Swikāt (Bessoukiet), an Oranian of the same period, whose achievement was translated into his opposition to the Turkish occupation, although al-Bakkālī claims that he was a Turk (see A. Cour, Poésie politique, 486; Belhalfaoui, 144-7, on his dying horse; Tahar, index).

'Ali al-Baghdādi, a Moroccan poet of the same period, whose fame rests on a kūtāda entitled al-Harrīs (watchman = rakīb of the Andalusians = gardener of the troubadours), which is a little satirical comedy (French tr. E. Dermenghem and M. El Fasi, Poèmes marocains, reproduced in H. Duquaire, 213-22 and E. Dermenghem, Les plus beaux textes arabes, Paris 1951, 322-31; see also M. al-Fasi, Adab shābī, 61-2).

Ibn Hammādi of Relizane (early 19th/20th century) who extolled love and the Prophet (see Belhalfaoui, 149-52; Sekkal, 293-8).

Ibn 'Ali: this poet who is cited by al-Bakkālī must be Muhammad b. 'Ali wuldū Rznī of Tafilāl (d. 1237/1822), whose best known work today in Morocco is a love poem in which the tājīmīn (‘young hawk’) symbolises the loved one (text and French tr. by M. El Fasi, Le tachoun (le petit faucon) de Ben 'Ali Chérif, in Hespéris-Tamuda, vi [1965], 39-52; see also Sonneck, no. 39; Aubin, 343; Bekhouche, Poèmes érotiques, 115-54; idem and Sekkal, Printanières, 75-89; M. al-Fasi, Adab shābī, 60-1); he is notable for his composition of a poem (preserved, but inaccessible) on Bonaparte’s expedition to Egypt (see Dījarī, 625-7).

al-'Amīr of Meknēs (middle of the 13th/14th century), who attracted attention on account of his poems called dījarīya full of reflections of a political character which led him to make predictions about future events (see M. al-Fasi, Adab shābī, 62; Dījarī, 627-8).

al-Hādīdī Muhammad al-Nādīrī of Marrakesh, son-in-law and copyist of Mthlīrad (see below), who left many panegyrics of the Prophet, a poem in which he alluded to an eclipse and a mantikha of Hamdūn b. al-Hādīdī (see Ibn al-Haḍīrī in Suppl.) which is preserved in Rabat ms. 396/D (see Aubin, 343; Bekhouche and Sekkal, Printanières, M. al-Fasi, Adab shābī, 58; Dījarī, 616-19).

His contemporary Kaddūr al-'Alāmī of Meknēs (d. 1266/1850), who is one of the most popular; that al-Bakkālī, who was his master, cites him among his authorities is an indication of the prestige which he already enjoyed. This illetterate poet, who claimed descent from 'Abd al-Salam b. Maghār [q.v.] and led a pious life, is a kind of saint regarded as possessing thaumaturgical gifts; moreover, he recounts several miracles in his poems which he composed with extreme facility. There appears to have been no attempt to collect his works, but a certain number of them, preserved by his disciples and nāris (also called in Morocco hafīd < haffīd), still enjoy great popularity, even in the humblest circles. Siddī Khaddūr, who belongs to the urban school, is the author of zarāf, a genre dealing with mystically religious subjects and of kāyd (bāsā’īd) to which a religious character is attributed, even when they have an en-
tirely erotic appearance. One of his most famous compositions is that in which he tells the story of his house, sold, miraculously recovered and transformed into a much-frequented darse. He was later buried. His biography, which figures in Ibn Zaydân (Ihâf, v., 336-52) has been discussed by M. T. Buret, in Hespéris, xxvI (1938), 85-92 (see also Lakhdar, Vie littéraire, 337-8; on his verses, see the Ihâf, loc. cit.; Sonneck, no. 12; A. Fischer, Literatur, nos. 17, 26, 29, 34; Lévi-Provençal, in Arch. Berb., iv [1919-20], 67-75; Kâdi, Kan, 143; Bekhoucha, Poèmes érotiques; J. Bouin, in Hespéris, 1959/1-2, 87-103; M. al-Fâsi, Adab shâbî, 62-3; DjirarT, 629-39; Tahar, index; Belhalfaoui, 47, for whom a line of Kaddur rightly recalls the beginning of a famous poem of Rutebeuf).

Abû 'l-Âtâ'îbâ, who is doubtless Murâbâb Abu 'l-Âtâ'îbâ (Mârb Bû Lebîthâ), an Oranian poet, author of ghazaâtatâ (see Desparmet, Chansons de geste, 195; M. al-Fâsi, Adab shâbî, 56, 58).

Al-Bakkâli further cites an Ibn 'Ârûs, who is perhaps identical with al-'Ârûs al-Tilâmânî (see Desparmet, Chansons de geste, 195, 205 ff.), and four other unidentified poets.

On the other hand, several great names have been omitted and, although the limits of this article do not perhaps identical with al-'Ârûs, has already been cited as a specialist in humorous kasidas which have been preserved and published at the end of his Diwan (lit. Tunis and Fas n.d.; ed. Meknès, n.d.), he himself made the subject of a study, al-Nâr al-lâmîc âl-bârîrâ fi tâdjamât Muhammad al-Harrâk.Rabat ms. 960; see Lâvi- Provençal, Chofra, 343, n. 8).

Tuhamî al-Mâdgharî (d. 1273/1856) whom we have already encountered, composed also in classical Arabic; his works consist of some occasional poems, khamryeytât and ghazal, as well as the panegyric of the prince Muhammad b. 'Abd al-Rahmân (see Sonneck, no. 14; Kâdi, Kan, 162-4; Desparmet, in Bull. Soc. Géogr. Alg., xxii [1917], 40-51; M. al-Fâsi, Adab shâbî, 63-4; Un poème marocain inédit: «les Bourcevs» de Thami al-Ouldâgh, recueilli et traduit par M. El Fasi et E. Dermerghem, in L'Islem et l'Ocident, Cahiers du Sud, 1947, 434-8; DjirarT, 643-9).

Ahmad al-Ganduz, who lived in the reign of Mawlây 'Abd al-Rahmân (d. 1238-76/1823-59) and his son Muhammad (1276-90/1859-73), is the author of an elegy on the first and poems in honour of the Hamâdshâ [q.v.] in Suppl. (see DjirarT, 650-2). al-Mâdgharî al-Turkumâni (d. 1303/1886) is regarded as a specialist in humorous kasidas (see Sonneck, no. 11; M. al-Fâsi, Adab shâbî, 64).

Idrisb. 'Ali, surnamed al-Hanâsh (d. 1319/1901), left a classical darse and a kasida in khamma [q. v.] in addition to his poems in muhîn (see DjirarT, 665-7).

Several more or less renowned Moroccan poets might also be cited in the three principal centres of composition; Fâs, Meknès and Marrakesh (see al-Fâsî, Adab shâbî, 64; DjirarT, 534-704, passim).

In Algeria, we should not pass over in silence the Tlemceni singer of love, Muhammad al-Sahlâ (end of the 12th/18th century), whose works enjoy a lasting success (see Sonneck, nos. 29, 30; Desparmet, Bîda, B.; J. Joly, Répertoire algérois, 58-66; Bekhoucha, Poèmes érotiques, 70-111 (on Muhammad b. Sahlâ and his son); idem and Sekkal, Printanieres, 122-4; Hamidou, Poèse vulgaire, 1025, 1037; Belhalfaoui, 170-9; al-Djouânhî al-biânî, 371-88). His son Abû Madyan (Boumediène) followed his father’s example and also sang of love (see Sonneck, no. 31; El Boudali Safir, in Hanât. al-Djârîr, no. 61 [1958], 35-7; Tahar, index; al-Djouânhî al-biânî, 389-97).

In the 19th century, Ibn al-'Abâbîs (Belabbès) of Mascara, combined with love poetry philosophical and political themes (see Belhalfaoui, 116-19), while his fellow citizen Hâbbîb b. Gannûn (Benguenou) composed principally during his long life (1767-1864) erotic poems (see Bresmier, Cours, 90-91; A. L. Algiers 1846, 83; A. Tahar, in Bull. des Ét. Ar., no. 12 [1943], 42-3; Belhalfaoui, 92-9; Tahar, index).

The most famous gawwâl is, however, Mu'tâfâb b.
Ibrahim (Maṣṭfa ban Brähim, 1800?-67), whose rich Diwdn was collected by cAbd al-Kadir cAzza (see below); having had much success with women and celebrated love at length, this Oranian bard, following a valiant adventure, had to seek exile in Fez, where he expressed his nostalgia in a highly-esteemed poem, al-Gomi "the dove" ([Diwdn], no. 34, 242-84). He then returned to his country and, like all his compatriots on returning from exile, ceased to sing of women in order to turn to religious poetry. Some of his poems are still sung at weddings and circumcision feasts.

For the beginning of the 20th century, the most popular of the gawwdlin appears to have been ʿAbd Allāh b. Kerrīw of Laghwāt (d. 1921), whose romances are still appreciated (see J. Joly, in R Afr., lii [1909], 285-303; [Hunā ʿl-Djazāʾir, no. 13 [1954], 22, no. 27 [1954], 27-8; S. Bencheneb, in Initiation à l’Algérie, 302; Tahar, 87-9).

The poems of Tripolitanian origin gathered by Sonneck (nos. 16, 17, 45, 101, 102) are generally anonymous and come from the Mahāmāt tribe. As for Stemme (Beduinenlieder), it was an informant from the Matmāta, illiterate but provided with a collection, who supplied him with his documentation on Tripolitania and South Tunisia. The specimens collected by P. Marty (Chants lyriques) at the beginning of the century in this latter region are all anonymous; those which Stemme reproduced in Märchen und Gedichte, relying on an informant from Tunis, are also unnamed, whereas the authors of some of the 23 Tunisian poems which figure in Sonneck’s collection are known, but are not very old and barely go back to the 19th century. Among them can be cited ʿAbd Allāh b. Bū Ḳabā a al-Kāfī (no. 107) who, like Maṣṭfa b. Brähim, entrusted a message to a pigeon in a strophic Ḳāricsī. Sāsī b. Muḥāmād (19th-20th century) of the Dīḥākīyyīn (nos. 46, 65, 67, 75) who describes at length the horse and its rider (no. 65) as well as a hunting party (no. 67); Uṭḥmān Uḥdī of Bīzerta, who celebrates (no. 106) the construction of a bridge; Aḥmād b. Ḳūḏūja who exalts the merits of the saint ʿAlīgīṣa al-Mannūbīyya [q.v.]; finally Aḥmād b. Muṣā (d. 1893; see Briquez) to whom is attributed, probably wrongly (see Marzukl, 1981, 107-9), a poem of 29 lines, of which one only, packed with proverbs and maxims, is introduced by a letter of the alphabet followed by a word beginning with the same letter; however, this poem (Ālīf al-ʿaḍāb) is more likely to be the work of Aḥmād Mālāk from Sīaḥ, who was his contemporary and lived in a period where popular poetry had developed, in part due to the impetus given it by Ahmad Bey (1253-71/1837-55). The Diwdn of this latter poet, who deals with all kinds of subjects (social, wise, religious, but also amorous, satirical and rural) was published in the form of extracts by Muḥammad al-Marzūkī, Aḥmād Mālāk, Ḳūḥair al-Ḥunām wa ʿl-Mahāmāt, Tunis 1980. Mālāk is described here as an epic poet, but we do not know exactly whether it is him or Ḳūḥair who is the author of a kind of narrative poem inspired by the legend of Ḳūḥair al-Ḥunām; the latter was made the subject of another poem of Sālim al-ʿAyḍūdī that M. Marzūkī published and studied, with the preceding poem, in Ḳūḥair al-Ḥunām, shābtaṣiyah, Tunis 1976.

In our own time, mahānūn is always very much in favour in the whole of North Africa. Eqirār further cites (671-87) several contemporary Moroccan poets who bear witness to the vitality of dialectal poetry. In Algeria, Muḥammad ʿAbābūs (d. 1953), surnamed the “Bard of the tribes” (ghusir al-aṭalāḥ), expresses "philosophical" ideas, e.g. on peace and fraternity (in [Hunā ʿl-Djazāʾir, no. 10 [1953], 16-17); Al-Tāhir Ṭarāḫūb greets the spring, the month of Ramadan, the feast of the sacrifices, tells of a journey to Sicily and eulogises the Prophet in two poems of 126 lines each (see [Hunā ʿl-Djazāʾir, no. 11, 14 [1953], 43, 44 [1956], 56 [1957], 61 [1958]).

In Tunisia, the government encourages not only the study of popular poetry of the past, but also the composition of poems on the occasion of anniversaries of national events which have marked the recent fortunes of the country: festivals of the Revolution (18 January), Independence (20 March), Victory (1 June), the Republic (25 July), the Day of the Occupiers (15 October), as well as that of the birth of President Bourguiba (3 August); the Minister of Cultural Affairs publishes, under the suggestive title ʿUkāziyya [see ʿUkāz], a selection of these occasional poems. The authors will not be cited, as they are still alive, but by way of information we will note that the ʿUkāziyya of the years 1977-80 and of 18 January 1981 contain a total of 73 poems by 24 poets, among whom several provided 4 to 10 compositions.

Subjects treated in mahānūn. As suggested by the preceding, poetry in dialectal Arabic covers the same fields as that which is expressed in literary Arabic, and the classical genres are present in it, sc. mādīḥ, ḥūṣūṣ, ḥashāl, etc., but certainly in different proportions. As S. Bencheneb rightly remarks (in Initiation à l’Algérie, 302), the gawwdlin “derive their inspiration from all sources, chivalrous adventures as well as love stories, miracles as well as everyday life”; for his part, G. S. Colin (in Initiation au Maroc, 226) makes out poems which are amorous, mystico-erotic, satirical, political (against the French presence), didactic (or on wisdom themes), burlesque, to which must be added those which celebrate wine (mystical or not), sing the beauties of nature, glorify the Prophet and the saints or eulogise a person living or dead. M. al-Fāṣī presents (Abad ʾaḥī bi, 51-6) a comprehensive list of the subjects treated, and Dijirārī devotes a very long discussion (198-529) to the poems of the Moroccan mahānūn which he analyses with great care. Although no statistics are available, we cannot help but remark on the important place occupied by love in the poems of these poets. Dijirārī notes 5 lines, of which each one only, packed with proverbs and maxims, is introduced by a letter of the alphabet followed by a word beginning with the same letter; however, this poem (Ālīf al-ʿaḍāb) is more likely to be the work of Aḥmād Mālāk of Sīaḥ, who was his contemporary and lived in a period where popular poetry had developed, in part due to the impetus given it by Ahmad Bey (1253-71/1837-55). The Diwdn of this latter poet, who deals with all kinds of subjects (social, wise, religious, but also amorous, satirical and rural) was published in the form of extracts by Muḥammad al-Marzūkī, Aḥmād Mālāk, Ḳūḥair al-Ḥunām wa ʿl-Mahāmāt, Tunis 1980. Mālāk is described here as an epic poet, but we do not know exactly whether it is him or Ḳūḥair who is the author of a kind of narrative poem inspired by the legend of Ḳūḥair al-Ḥunām; the latter was made the subject of another poem of Sālim al-ʿAyḍūdī that M. Marzūkī published and studied, with the preceding poem, in Ḳūḥair al-Ḥunām, shābtaṣiyah, Tunis 1976. Among the Bedouins, beside love, nature and animals, both wild and domesticated (horse, camel, pigeon), are very often celebrated in accordance with archaic tradition, and hunting with the falcon is a traditional theme (see above, al-Ḥādīṭī ʿl-Ṣis and Gen. A. Margueritte, Chansons de l’Algérie), while wars between tribes gave further inspiration to the bards of the south at the times when these wars were still endemic (see P. Marty, Chants lyriques).

As the poets enjoy much freedom, some acts of daily life and family events are a source of inspiration which is not negligible (we will mention notably a poem on the death of his wife, a relatively rare theme in Arabic verse, see Marzukl, 1981, 115-22; G. S. Colin, Aṣḥāb al-Sawād al-Šārīr al-Ṭūrī).
Some dramatic events which made a deep impression also find an echo in popular poetry. Venture de Paradis had collected Une chant algerien of the XVIIIe siecle of 114 lines (published in Réfr., xxxviii [1894], 325-45) and was also lamented in Malhûn. It has been seen that the earlier that Bonaparte’s expedition to Egypt was made the subject of a Moroccan poem, just as the construction of a bridge at Bizerta had been celebrated in its time.

The events which have so far been alluded to until now have a lesser weight, in the eyes of the Maghrûbis, than the conquest and colonisation of North Africa. In Algeria, they have, since 1830, given rise to a whole series of compositions (see e.g. Gen. E. Daumas, Mœurs et coutumes de l’Algérie, 1858, 160-74, on the capture of Algiers; J. Desparmet, La conquête racontée par les indigènes, in Bull. Soc. Gogra. Alger., cxxxii [1932], 437-56). The resistance of the amîb ‘Abd al-Kàdir [q.v.] was bound to find an echo among malhûn poets, such as Kàddûr wuld Muhammad al-Bûrûjî, called Bû Ngàb (d. 1850), of the Mascara region (see A. Cour, Poésie politique, 473-75; Kàddûr, Kanz, 92, 94, 96, 100, 104-6; Moh. Abderrahman, Enseignement de l’arabe parti, 1923, 44 ff.) or Tàhiîr al-Hâwàwa, which fought him, was taken prisoner, then eulogised (see A. Cour, Poésie politique, 478-83; Kàddûr, Kanz, 75-85; Desparmet, Élégies et satires, 48-9).

In a general way, the poets who tackle political themes deplore what they consider as the ruin of Maghrûbi civilisation, and pour out their sarcasm on that which their conquerors bring them (see Desparmet, Élégies et satires). Opposition to the French penetration is manifested indirectly in some poems which the malhûn poets, such as Kàddûr wuld Muhammad al-Bûrûjî, called Bû Ngàb (d. 1850), of the Mascara region (see A. Cour, Poésie politique, 473-75; Kàddûr, Kanz, 92, 94, 96, 100, 104-6; Moh. Abderrahman, Enseignement de l’arabe parti, 1923, 44 ff.) or Tàhiîr al-Hâwàwa, which fought him, was taken prisoner, then eulogised (see A. Cour, Poésie politique, 478-83; Kàddûr, Kanz, 75-8; Desparmet, Élégies et satires, 48-9).

By way of example, we will cite Muhammad b. al-Khûyyar (Belkhirî) who was deported to Corsica after taking part in the insurrection of the Awdâl Sidi Shaykh of 1864-6; he addresses a prayer to God and expresses in touching terms his nostalgia, in a poem which deserves to be cited among the works composed by prisoners (see Sonneck, nos. 44; Kàddûr, Kanz, 177-9; Tahar, 74-88). The 38 poems gathered by P. Marty in southern Tunisia, between 1902 and 1907, are classified into 4 categories (see Chants lyriques) according to the subject which inspires them: love, war between tribes, nature, and finally the situation created in Tunisia by the installation of the French protectorate; in this ‘modern cycle’ (for the other poems are older) some poets express their surprise and their anxieties or glorify the epic action for independence of some rebels, whilst others discover in the new themes material for irony or for reflection (see e.g. Sonneck, nos. 70 and 71, against the French in 1881).

The two World Wars have also found an echo in malhûn French, whose Amîb ‘ Alîgîn is that is probable that the events which took place in Algeria from 1954 to 1962 have given rise to a certain form of heroic poetry, but the author of the present article only possesses in this connection some works of poets writing in French. In southern Tunisia, al-Fîtrî Tlijîb (d. after 1943) derives his inspiration from the political and military situation during the Second World War, and uses symbols to express his loyalty with regard to the French authorities who had thrown him into prison; but horses and camels are not absent from his work, which has been collected in a Diûân and published by M. Marzûkî (Tunis 1976). Today, the ‘Ukâzîyya performances are eloquent, and the patriotic themes are greatly developed in them.

Transmission and preservation of malhûn. As was said at the beginning of this article, the compositions of poets earlier than the 10th/16th century, if they existed, have not been preserved. It can be still ascertained that, among the Beduins, the gawwâlî was used to go, in the manner of troubadours, from encampment to encampment, from the house of a notable to the tent of a tribal chief in order to provide a spectacle on the occasion of festivals: wedding, circumcision, anniversaries, etc., being accompanied by a rudimentary orchestra playing the oboe, flute and tambourine, while, sometimes, dancers complete the troupe. Several authors who have described these festivals (e.g. C. Trumellet, Les Français dans le désert, 249-61; P. Marty, Chants lyriques, in RT, 1936/1, 96) stress the transmission of the traditions of song in families. “It is rare”, adds Marty, “for them to make them publicly known or for a stranger to be allowed to record them ... But the refrains are known by everyone or at least learnt and remembered at once, and the whole audience, especially the women who are always very excited, repeat in chorus this refrain, which is ordinarily indicated by the two last rhymes of the couplet.” In southern Algeria, a distinction is established between the gawwâlî of the poet, who improvises and modifies the works of others, and the fîsîbî who improves and modifies from his own inspiration a theme which is learnt and known, without always distinguishing exactly what he has remembered from what is of his own creation. In Morocco, Aubin (343) says with regard to the kasîda that “it is the work of a poet who, himself, is not a musician and who is content to provide professionals with his compositions and entrust them with retaining them from house to house. The latter learn by heart the new song and apply to it a known tune which appears to suit it.” M. el-Fasi confirms this information (in Hespera-Tamuda, vi [1965], 39) and states that the town poets who compose kasidas without ever writing them “entrust them to the memory of a hâfîdû or râvi who teaches them to the îsîbîy (wâygh), pl. of šîbî” who sing to classical ‘Andalusian’ music, have an orchestra formed by the lute, the ràhid (rebeck) with two strings, the tambourine (tarr) and the violin.”

Thus, as among the ancient Arabs, the popular poets do not make a point of writing their compositions, more especially as they are often illiterate, and the executants, who trust to their extraordinary memory, only rarely transcribe them in notebooks (dhânîd or) on loose leaves, so as more surely to retain
the dialectologists and ethnologists have sometimes succeeded in procuring some of these documents, and in 1898 A. Fischer could have at his disposal, in Tangier, a rich collection (Malhūn, 253) of poems in dialectal Arabic, all anonymous, and some poems of well-known classical authors, such as al-‘Abbas and al-Ahnaf, Ibn al-Rūmī, Abu l-‘Atāhīya, Abu Nuwās and al-Mutanabbī. Not all investigators have been as fortunate, and H. Stummes (Beethovenlieder, 2-3) that he was refused the permission of examining a collection whose existence he knew of. Thejealous care with which the written documents are preserved by their owners is a constant trait of which researchers do not cease to complain (see e.g. the complaints of Dījrārī, 5, whose entreaties often met with no response, or of Marzūkī, Malhūn, 6). In a general way, in a period in which the tape recorder did not exist, the investigators had to be content with collecting from the mouth of more compliant informants, some texts which they transcribed and, in many cases, translated. Jeanne Joun relates (in Hesperis, 1959/1-2, 78) that she was able to have a Moroccan girl or woman, whose father owned a collection of the works of Kaddīr al-‘Alamī (see above), recite a kasīda “which he was often pleased to chant aloud for the joy and edification of his family who appreciated it very much” and had ended by learning it by heart. Fortunately, Dījrārī (700-3) supplied some scattered manuscripts, to reconstruct at least partially some diwān and publish them in Arabic script, in spite of the inconvenience that this procedure presents (see below). Fraudulent attributions are doubtless more numerous than those which have been laid bare, but, after all, this poetry is a common patrimony, and it is not of great importance that the authenticity of each poem be exactly defined. As P. Marty relates (Chansons lyriques, 67), the author of at least partially some diwāni and publish them in Arabic script, in spite of the inconvenience that this procedure presents (see below). Fraudulent attributions are doubtless more numerous than those which have been laid bare, but, after all, this poetry is a common patrimony, and it is not of great importance that the authenticity of each poem be exactly defined. As P. Marty relates (Chansons lyriques, 67), the author of a certain collection, whose title is all anonymous: “The singers do not, however, have to divide them so as to perpetuate their rule over the eyes of many, to bring these works to light, was to do the work of a salvaging enterprise to rescue from oblivion the little which remains of popular poetry”. No one ever really believed in the propaganda which aroused this speculation on “linguistic partition”, and especially not A. Tahar who, an ardent admirer of malhūn, had begun to study it well before the independence of Algeria; in 1933, in fact, he has presented an (unpublished) mémoire on Ben Guen- noun and, some years later, promised his collaboration to Henri Pérès. The latter, after having given in the BFA, no. 1 (1940), 17-19, a general bibliography of Algerian popular poetry, published (ibid., no. 4, 111-15) under an engaging title (Pour un corpus des poésies populaires de l’Algérie), a list of 85 gawawālī whose works had to be collected and edited according to a necessarily subjective order of urgency. In the period, five diwān were in the course of preparation, but to our knowledge, only three of them have been published: those of Sidi Lakhdar (who came quite low in the order of urgency), Ibn Amāsib (see above) and Mīṣfa bān Bāŕi (see below). Actually, the project of H. Pérès was quite ambitious and difficult to achieve integrally, but it is regrettable that it was not more largely known. As a result of efforts put in by a number of collectors, the popular poetry presents as an authentic element of the national patrimony, an eloquent representative of the personality of a country and evidence of a sensibility which cannot always be expressed in classical Arabic, the author of the present article accepted the supervision of three theses on this subject: those of Abdelkader Azza (Maṣṭa bān Bārbī, barda l’Oranais et chantre des Bani ‘Azza), M. Belhalfaoui (La poésie arabe maghrébien d’expression populaire) and A. Tahar (La poésie populaire algérienne (malhūn). Rythmes, mères et formes). All three have been printed, but only the latter in exten- so (Algiers 1975); to elaborate on the first, which was treated in H. Pérès’ list, the candidate had collected the works of Maṣṭa bān Bārbī and had transcribed them in Arabic and Latin script and commented on them; but the publishing of this work has been abandoned, exclusively in Arabic. (D. ( = Dukkūr) ʿAbd al-Kādir ʿAzza, Maṣṭa bān Bārbī, ʿAmīr u-wa-maddāḥ al-kabbāl al-ʿawhrānīya, Algiers 1977). The case of the second is entirely different, for M. Belhalfaoui, in order to publish it in Paris in 1973, had to remove the apparatus criticus and transcriptions into Latin script, so as to present a literary study only—of high quality and very suggestive—as well as a selection of poems reproduced in Arabic script and translated. Actually, a fourth thesis ought to be added, that of Mohamad El Moktar Ould Bah, which was submitted in 1969, but has remained unpublished; it is a collection of Mauritanian poems in literary as well as dialectal Arabic, which the author presented in a Introduction à la poésie mauritanienne (1650-1900), published in Arabe (xvii [1971], 1-48); a paragraph in it was devoted to the popular poetry which is expressed in the dialect of the country, Hassānjīya, and is called ḍaḥī (dakhāī), although, in an unspecified work of Muhammad al-Yadali, it also bears the name malhūn; the reader will find several examples of this in this Introduction (which he will be able to supplement with Ahmad al-Shinkēlī, al-Wasīṭ fi tārīxmubtā ṣīnātī Shīνītī, Cairo 1960, studied by A. B. Miske, in BIFAN, B, xxxi [1968]; A. Leriche, Poésie de l’Algérie, BIFAN, B, 1954, 1227-56; D. Cohen, Hassānjīya, 236-43; H. T. Norris, Shingiṭī folk literature and song, Oxford 1968). It is essential to insist on the necessity of not estric-
tting oneself to publishing in Arabic script the texts gathered, if one wants to write a useful work and present a study which can be used beyond the limits of one land or indeed region. The efforts of M. El-Fas to explain how he arranges the Arabic writing so as to allow the correct reading of a text (Hesperis-Tamuda, vi [1965], 45) would certainly have been more conclusive if he had added to the good translation of the poem studied a transcription in Latin script, especially as his article is in French and is addressed to a public who may well be ignorant of Arabic. For his part, Djeriári doubtless devised an analogous system, but could not prevent the printer from omitting the vowels and reading signs, conscious though he was of the difficulty that is encountered in reading a dialectal poem. The vowels which figure in the ʿUkṣiyiyat and in certain publications of M. Marzuki are useful, without being totally satisfactory. The thesis of A. Tahar proves that it is possible to produce works which combine a care to preserve the poems in their Arabic script with a concern to make them appreciated and studied by Arabists and, thanks to translations, to procure proper evidence to nourish Arabic script with a concern to make them appreciated and studied by Arabists and, thanks to translations, to procure proper evidence to nourish fruitful studies in comparative literature.

The language of malhūn. If we have insisted on the importance of presenting transcriptions and translations (accompanied by suitable annotation), it is also because this poetry is not always perfectly clear; the differences of interpretation which can be brought forward among qualified experts are an irrefutable proof. With regard to Morocco, E. Aubin (343) writes: "The song—qacida—is composed in the common language and permits, consequently, the dialect of each province", which would appear evident. On the other hand, A. Fischer (Liederbuch, p. ix) distinguishes, midway between the dialectal (Vulgärsprache) and the classical (Schriftsprache), some poems in a mixed language (Mischsprache), and G. S. Colin (op. laud., 225) describes, for his part, the language of popular poetry as a "kind of literarised poetic koine, based on common Moroccan Arabic, but influenced above all by Bedouin dialects. "It seems furthermore", he adds, "that this poetry may be of Bedouin origin". This last suggestion seems very plausible, and one cannot help thinking of the poetic koine of the pre-Islamic period which transcended the speech of the tribes and tended to a certain unity. Mutatis mutandis, a similar phenomenon has been able to take place with malhūn which serves so to speak as a common language for poets of different regions, without extending, however, to the whole of North Africa. On the other hand, the literary genre also represented was not limited to the Bedouins and countryfolk, and it must be recognised that a more or less independent malhūn developed in certain towns and adopted, besides, some rather different structures (see below).

Given that the language of popular poetry has still not been studied in depth, in spite of the efforts of M. al-Fasī (Lughāt al-malhūn), it is best to be very prudent and beware of any peremptory assertion. M. Bethalhaoui (53-4) describes malhūn as "a language whose expression, while remaining popular and current, possesses a vocabulary which is sometimes entirely that of classical Arabic, with some minor modifications; some forms which are often actually the same as those of classical Arabic, without our losing sight of the notable differences in morphology and above all the semantic evolutions which confer here and there on the dialectal expression a stamp sui generis far removed from the classical source. We believe that we can assert that the dialectal language—that of the people and that of the bards—is today remarkably similar to that which was already attested in the works of El-Maghraoui or Lakhdar Ben Khlouf and Abderrahmane El-Mejdoub, all three of the 16th century and, he could have added, of different origin. Here we have a highly optimistic assertion, and certainly an imprudent one in the present state of our knowledge. Even if the language of the bards appears palpably that of the people, one cannot fail to remark some differences, which thorough comparisons and exhaustive inventories would reveal more clearly. Proofs of these particulars are not lacking: A. Joly (Poésie moderne) and Abdelkader Azza (at the end of his original thesis) gave a list of words which do not figure in Beauissier's dictionary; M. al-Fasī (Lughāt al-malhūn, 199) recognises that the language of malhūn is not easily intelligible, and Djeriári writes (6): "It has not been easy for us to understand these texts, especially those which were recorded in writing, because of the evolution of the language and our ignorance of the meaning of many words. And their pronunciation." M. Marzuki takes care to explain, at the end of each of the poems that he publishes, the difficult terms, and often claims that only the context enlightens them. Fortunately these exist a number of texts in malhūn transcribed in Hebrew characters, so that further studies in this respect will probably yield useful information.

When the poets are educated (like al-Mandasi in the 'Afrika), it is understandable and inevitable that they use classical words and forms (omitting the nawb and certain short internal vowels), but the illiterate poets themselves, formed by the tradition and example of their masters or predecessors, are acquainted with some of them and use them in their compositions. Some at the very least provide food for thought; thus the word nawb (wine), already poetic in classical, is quite frequent in malhūn; is it a case of a borrowing or a survival from the poetic tradition brought by the conquerors and consequently a pre-classical word? As Djeriári has rightly perceived, it is the whole problem of the Arabisation of North Africa which is hereby posed (see W. Marçais, Comment l'Afrique du Nord a été arabisée).

Apart from classical words, certain poets go as far as inserting in their verses, as a pleasantry (l. 'l-dahik; Sonneck, no. 117, of 'Ali b. al-Ṭāhir of Djellā, some French words (or Berber, notably in Mauritania) possessing the required syllabic quantity, and this remark must lead us directly to another problem which appears to be a very difficult one, that of metre.

The metrics of malhūn. The first researchers who concerned themselves with popular poetry were Arabists, naturally inclined to look for connections with classical metrics, but they stumbled against the problem of identifying the rhythm and proposed various solutions. H. Stumme (Tunisische Märchen und Gedichte, 87-103) detects in the verses studied a metre based on accent, then discovers in the Bedouin malhūn of Tunisia and Tripolitania (Beduinenleiter, 24, 38, 39, 40, 44, 45) some iambic lines of classical poetry. W. Marçais (Tiemen, 208-9) discerns in his turn in the haeji [q.e.] a classical basit. R. Basset finds a radjaz magdža in Une complainte arabe, 4. However, J. Desparment (Blida, 445) considers that the rhythm of the malhūn is based on the "numeration of syllables which are accentted in conformity with dialectal pronunciation". For G. S. Colin (in Initiation au Maroc, 225 and ÉP, art. mocco, vii/2), the metre is "based exclusively on the number of syllables of each line (as in French)". S. Bencheneb (Chansons satiriques, 90) emphasises the number of syllables and the rhyme. A.
Málhún

Chottin (Musique marocaine, 134) is of the opinion that
the rhythm rests on the number of syllables and on
an accentuation which he can hardly define. E.
Demengheng and M. El Fasi (Poèmes marocains, 99)
imply that the málhún is characterised by the number
of syllables and the rhyme. For Azza, it is the number
of syllables which characterises the version of Ban
Brâhim. Djarârî (131-46) recognises that the metre of
al-Kâlîf [q.e.] cannot be applied to málhûn, and says
that the Moroccan zadâljâbîb have particular tafîlât
which they call sarîf and which are of two kinds: the
dândan (dândûn) and mâli mâli, owed respectively to
al-Maghrawi and al-Masmûdi (592-6). M. al-Fâsi,
who undertook a study in depth of the structure of
málhûn, also considers ('Arâd al-málhûn, 8-9) that
the rhythm is syllabic, but remarks that certain poems
pose quite complicated problems.
A. Tahar, after having been won over to the view
of S. Bencheneb, not without taking into account the
accentuation (Métrique, in BÉA, no. 11 [1943], 1-7),
edevoured to deepen his study of the question and
finally discovered and explained, in his thesis cited
above, a new theory which appears attractive. Given
that Maghrîbi Arabic possesses only end short open
syllables (CV), while such syllables are preserved in
literary Arabic in the body of the word, a line in
málhûn cannot be scanned according to the classical
metrical rules. In ál-málhûn, all the syllables are thus long
(CCC, CS) or overlong, and the latter (CCV, CCVC,
CCGC, CCGG, CCSC, CGCC, CCSC) present a particular
importance. So, after having examined a considerable
number of lines and separated the syllables which they
contain, this scholar has come to the conclusion that
the rhythm of the málhûn is essentially characterised
by the identity of the number and the place of the over-
long syllables in the lines of a poem. Here is an exam-
ple taken from the work of the Moroccan Kâddûr
al-Álamî:

In spite of the impressive number of examples
cited, this theory does not seem to be applicable to all
poetry in málhûn, at least when one attempts to put it
into practice on written texts; however, it is worthy of
being taken into consideration.

Pursuing his researches, A. Tahar has tried to
determine the different 'metres' according to the
number of syllables and the place of the over-long
ones and, in imitation of al-Kâlîf, has even given
them names. For example, the line above belongs to
metre no. 1, called al-šûr 'the old', formed by two
decasyllabic hemistichs with four over-long syllables
in the first and three in the second. In all, seven
metres have been distinguished, but some of them
contain a considerable series of variants, so that the
question, in so far as it is of interest, would have to be
reconsidered. In any case, pp. 176-349, which are
devoted to the analysis of the metres, have the addi-
tional advantage of containing a mass of verse
reproduced in Arabic script, transcribed and
translated.

The structure and forms of málhûn. In an
urduzât of some 5,000 lines, al-Ukhrâm fi málhûd3
al-šûrân, which is a veritable encyclopedia (see M.
Lakhdr, Vie litteraire, 93-5), 'Abd al-Rahmân al-Fâsi
(d. 1096/1683 [see al-Fâsi in Suppl.] approaches the
'sîm mizân al-málhûn (see Djarârî, 62) and counts 15
decasyllabic hemistichs with four over-long syllables,
of which the last is al-šûrân al-djârî; one might
as well say that one can hardly make use of this docu-
ment where wazn appears to designate at once the
form and the rhythm. Anyway, analysis is com-
plicated by a confusion in the terminology and the ex-
tension of the word málhûn to everything which is
composed in dialectal Arabic, and notably to zaqâl, in
which is included the êkàsîd, also known as grîbîs. In
fact, although the forms of mâlûn may be extremely
varied, it is permissible to distinguish, for the sake of
simplication, two principal categories: the Bedouin
type and the urban type.
Among the Bedouins and the townsfolk who follow
the Bedouin tradition, we meet with isometric poems
generally described as êkàsîd or êkàsîd (gûlûd/gûfîd) and
recalling the old êkàsîd, with, however, some essential
differences: the bi- or tripartite frame is not com-
pulsory; the rhythm (see above) has nothing in com-
mon with classical metres and especially the kàfîsîa,
the final rhyme, is doubled by an internal rhyme, i.e. all
the first hemistichs rhyme also within themselves. For
example, the line Kâddûr al-Álamî cited above
belongs to a poem in which the odd hemistichs end in
-dî, and the even, in -rî; in al-ÁBahîlî's poem used at
the beginning of his treatise, the rhyme respectively in
-dî and -rî (G. Boris, Documents, 166-7) reproduces a
satire of seven lines rhyming in
-rî and -ân. The examples could be multiplied, and it
suffices to go over the great collections in order to take
account of the importance of internal rhyme, which
appears so fundamental that it is respected even in the
case where the bard takes the liberty of changing the
rhyme of the second hemistich in each line.

The word êkàsîd (et var.) naturally applied to poems
of the preceding type, is extended, among the
Bedouins themselves to a strophic structure which, far
from being uniform, presents very numerous varieties
which it is impossible to reduce to only a few forms.
A. Tahar has undertaken a work analogous to that of
Ibn Sâna' al-Mulk [q.e.] on the masâqîlah [q.e.], and
one can only refer to his analysis (363-494). The sim-
elpest form to be recognised is constituted, in
Bedouin malûhûn, by a succession of strophes with a
double rhyme whose designation is variable from one
region to another. We are not able to enter here into
doing all these details, and will limit ourselves to recalling
that in Algeria these strophes, which alternate with
one another, are called btâdî and frâhdî, the poem be-
ing and ending with a btâdî; such an arrangement
is particularly regular in the Dînân of Msâfîn ban
Brâhim. In Morocco, the êkàsîd with a double rhyme
contains several divisions called kâsîm (pl. kûsm),
themselves having subdivisions whose terminology
does not seem clearly fixed. It is the same in Tunisia,
and this question will merit being made the subject of
an analysis in depth. Finally, the quatrain is also to be
met with in Bedouin mâlûhûn.

As for the urban type, which may be compared with
the arâd al-balâd cited by Ibn Kahlûdûn, it also presents
some variable forms, for the strophic arrangement
which is prevalent leaves the field open to all the im-
provisations, and the terminology, here again, is quite
confused. For example, in Algeria, a prelude (maùlâ'
or maâshibâ') is followed by strophes of two or three
parts: bi or arâbî, then kuft or bi, dâmé and kuft. The
structure and terminology of Moroccan mâlûhûn have
been made the subject of a thorough study by M. al-
Fâsi ('Arâd al-málhûn, Djarârî (147-73) analyses a
êkàsîd containing a prelude (sarrâh) intended to set the
rhythm and comprising an introduction (dhikûl) followed by two or three lines forming a nûwa, one strophe and one linking hemistich (rusûma); then comes the ksâm which follow a refrain (harba); the latter ksâm of which contain the name of the author and the date of the composition clearly announced or in a cryptic form and, for the latter, by means of the Maghribi ab-qâd [q.v.] (an example in Behlafaloui, 168).

In his edition of the Tarshûn (Hesperis-Tamuda [1963], 39 ff.), M. El-Fasi divides the poem into: ksâm of introduction followed by a harba (refrain), then four other ksâm constituted by a strophe (nûwa), a harba (still refrain), a ksâm and a harba. So we see that the structure of malhûn and the terms which designate the different parts of a kasita are extremely variable. The common point remains, nevertheless, the principle of the double rhyme, which tends to be quite widely respected in each of the constituent elements.

It is clear from all that precedes that the Maghribi malhûn which we have attempted to present concisely to the Arabist and comparativist an extremely extensive field of research. Although the corpus already available, thanks to dialectologists and enlightened amateurs, may as a whole be considerable, it will be desirable in the first place to collect the greatest possible number of poems preserved in the memory of the nûwa or in notebooks still too jealously guarded, to transcribe them in Arabic and Latin script and translate them or at least elucidate the obscure passages. The national radios today give a large place to popular poetry, and the singers hardly have reasons to refuse to communicate their répertoire; so it will be necessary to record it in such a way as to be in a position to resolve definitively the problem of rhythm and set to rights a terminology which seems anarchic, and finally to make an inventory of the vocabulary so as to determine the origin of the different elements which constitute it.

Bibliography: Although some references have appeared in full in the main article, they are repeated here also.

I.—There is a general bibl. on the Algerian malhûn, by H. Pèrès, in Bull. des études arabes (BEA), no. 1 (1941), 17-19; the same author completed it up to 1958 in L’arabe dialectal algérien et saharien: Bibliographie analytique avec un index méthodique (see ‘poésie’), Algiers 1958; a summary bibliography comes after the names of the poets listed by idem, Pour un corpus des poésies populaires de l’Algérie, in BEA, no. 4 (1991), 111-15.

The Malinke (i.e. "the people of Mali"), also known as Mandinka, of the large group of Mande-speaking peoples. Its ruler embraced Islam after a Muslim visitor had prayed for rain and had saved the country from severe drought. The Malinke of 17
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al-Bakri must have been one of several chiefdoms which, according to oral traditions, emerged among the Malinke during the 11th and 12th centuries. Mali thus reached that area of the Upper Niger river on their way to the goldfields of Burne, the exploitation of which began about that time.

Mali was Ghana’s successor as the hegemonic power in the Western Sudan. But in between (towards the end of the 12th century), after the decline of Ghana [q.v.] and before the rise of Mali, the Susu, a southern Soninke group, conquered territories to the north (Ghana) and south (the Malinke chiefdoms).

The Susu represented a traditional reaction to Islam, which by then had become a significant factor in quite a few chieftly courts. The Malinke war of liberation from the rule of the Susu was led by Sundjata, who became recognised as head of all the Malinke, with the title of mansa.

In the first half of the 13th century, following the victory over the Susu, the new kingdom of Mali expanded northwards to the Sahel. The termini of the trans-Saharan trade, where Muslim communities flourished, became part of Mali, and served as a link with the Muslim world north of the Sahara. As the small Malinke chiefdom turned into a multi-ethnic kingdom, with influential Muslim elements inside and extensive Islamic relations with the outside, the rulers of Mali became more oriented to Islam.

Mansa Ull (or Wall), son of the founder of Mali, extended the conquests of his father. He secured the northern frontiers of Mali in the Sahara, which permitted him to perform the pilgrimage to Mecca. He passed through Cairo during the reign of Baybars (658-76/1260-77). There was a long tradition of royal pilgrimages in West Africa, especially among the more powerful rulers. Ibn Khaldoun, to whom we are in debt for an excellent chronicle of the kings of Mali in the 13th and 14th centuries (ed. Paris 1847, i, 264-8), recorded also the pilgrimage of Sakôrû during the second reign of al-Malik al-Nâjir b. Kalâwûn (698-708/1299-1309). But the most famous of all royal pilgrimages was Mansa Mûsâ’s [q.v.], who visited Cairo in 724/1324.

Visits of kings of Mali to North Africa, Egypt and Mecca established the fame of Mali (often referred to as Taktûr in Egyptian chronicles) as a Muslim kingdom rich in gold. Religious, cultural and commercial relations between Egypt and Mali became more intensive. At home, the blessing (baraq) ascribed to pilgrims was respected by Muslims and non-Muslims alike and added to the authority of the king. The performance of the pilgrimage, and the encounter with the central lands of Islam, called the rulers’ attention to the laxity of Islam in their own lands. Mansa Mûsà pursued a more vigorous Islamic policy after his return from the hajj; he built new mosques and sent local ‘ulamâ’ to study abroad in Fâs. In 737/1337, Mansa Mûsà initiated the exchange of ambassadors and gifts with the Moroccan Sultan Abu ‘l-Hasan ‘Alî of the Marinid dynasty, which were continued under their successors until 762/1360-1.

The Moroccan traveller Ibn Baṭûta visited Mali in 753-4/1352-3, during the reign of Mansa Sulaymân, the brother of Mansa Mûsà. In many Malian towns, Ibn Baṭûta met residents from Morocco. Ibn Baṭûta’s account reveals strong traditional survivals in Mali beneath a veneer of Islam. Royal presence at the public prayer of the two Islamic festivals turned them into official ceremonies to which non-Muslims were admitted. With the return of Mansa Mûsà, the prestige of Islam was used to extort loyalty to the king during the khutba. As national festivals, the Islamic festivals had to accommodate pre-Islamic rites, which were among the sources of the king’s legitimacy. Ibn Baṭûta condemned this and other pre-Islamic customs at the court of Mali. But he also had words of praise for the devotion to the prayer of Malian Muslims, in particular the Friday prayer, and their concern with the study of the Qur’ân by heart. The ritual rather than the legal aspects of Islam were of greater significance. The precepts of the Share’â were observed only by foreign residents and by a small but committed group of local traders and clerics. Islam penetrated into African societies through the rulers’ courts. But it was in the purely Muslim towns, mostly commercial centres, that Islam was more vigorous and the ‘ulamâ’ were in authority. The kings of Mali respected the autonomy of these towns, the most important of which was Timbuktu [q.v.].

Timbuktu, which had begun as a summer camp and a trading entrepôt for the Tuaregs, developed into an important commercial town and a cultural centre of Islam since the 14th century. The Andalusian poet and architect Abû Ishâk al-Sâhilî, who accompanied Mansa Mûsà back to Mali from the hajj, died in Timbuktu in 1346. Timbuktu must have been by then an intellectual centre of some importance for al-Sâhilî to have settled there.

By the beginning of the 15th century, Timbuktu was “full of Sudanese barâkât” (al-Sa’îdî, Ta‘rikh al-Sudân, 51). One of the leading scholars of Timbuktu was Modibo Muhammad, who had come from the town of Kâbôra on the Niger south of Timbuktu. This town was mentioned by Ibn Baṭûta (iv, 395) together with Dîghâ, the people of which “were Muslims of old, and are distinguished by their piety and their quest for knowledge”.

Towards the end of the 14th century, Mali was weakened by rivalries over the royal succession and lost its hold over the Sahelian provinces. In 837/1433-4 Timbuktu passed into the hands of the Tuaregs. The political vacuum caused by the decline of Mali invited the expansion of the rising kingdom of Songhay [q.v.] into the area west of the Niger bend. The hegemony of Songhay over the northern section of the present Republic of Mali in the second half of the 15th and through the 16th centuries coincided with the most illustrious period in the economic and intellectual history of Timbuktu. The history of Songhay and Timbuktu may be reconstructed from the biographical treatises of Ahmad Bâbâ (d. 1036/1627) and from the mid-17th-century chronicles of Timbuktu, the Ta‘rikh al-Sudân by al-Sa’îdî and the Ta‘rikh al-Fattîkh by Ibn al-Mukhâtîr. Djenné, which was linked by the Niger waterway with Timbuktu, was the commercial and Islamic metropolis of the Sudanic hinterland. About the level of Islamic learning in Djenné, one may learn from the career of two of its sons, the brothers Muhammad and Ahmad Baghyughu, who moved to Timbuktu and were among the leading scholars there. From Djenné and its region, the Dyula and Marka, Muslim traders who spoke Malinke and Bambara dialects extended their commercial network southwards as far as the fringes of the forest. These traders were known also as Wangara. Their impact on Hausaland is recorded by the Kano chronicle (J. of the Anthropological Institute [1908], 70): “The Wangarawa came from Mali bringing with them the Mohammedan religion.”

The Songhay empire expanded mainly along the Niger river as far as Djenné in the south. Mali continued to have an arched, rather than a straight or even wavy, line of succession. But it was weakened by rivalries over the royal succession and suffered attacks until the beginning of the 17th century. Niani, the capital of Mali, was on the Sankarani, one of the
tributaries of the Upper Niger (today in Guinea). Because its ethnic and political base was deep in the Savannah, Mali survived longer than the two other powers of the Western Sudan, Ghana and Songhay. Both had their centres in the northern Sahel, exposed to external intervention: the Almoravids [see Al-
MURĀBĪTĪN] in the 11th century and the Moroccans at the end of the 16th century.

In 1591 a Moroccan expeditionary force sent by the Sultan Ahmad al-Mansūr [q.v.] defeated the Songhay army by its superior firearms and conquered Gao, Timbuktu and Djenné. Timbuktu became the capital of a pashalik, which soon became virtually independent of Morocco, and ruled by a hereditary military caste, the descendants of the Moroccan conquerors, known as al-rumūdi or arma. The pashalik survived until the beginning of the 19th century.

As seen from the north, through Muslim records, Mali was reduced to a kingdom of local importance during the 15th and 16th centuries. But the Portuguese, who about that time reached the Gambia, became aware of the powerful inland ruler of Mali, whose authority extended to the Atlantic coast. Mali’s westward expansion was consolidated by the migration of Malinke warriors, peasants and traders to the Gambia. In 1621, sailing up the Gambia river, the British adventurer E. W. Bovill met many hundred of Arab and Berber descent, who ‘have free recourse through all places’ even in times of war (Jobson, in London 1932, 17-8, §4, 106).

In Mali and Songhay, Islam had become integrated into the imperial texture ideologically and institutionally. Yet even the great mansis and ashikas, who had been exposed to external Islamic influences and rules, were attached to the pre-Islamic heritage of their people. Islam was confined to urban traders and ‘ulamā’. Similar patterns persisted into the 17th and 18th centuries, except that the rulers of smaller states, which had emerged as a result of the fragmentation of the great empires, had no contacts with Islamic centres north of the Sahara and had fewer and smaller towns. Consequently, Islamic influences were mitigated by traditional particularisms.

The BAMBARA, one of the major ethnic groups in present-day Mali, are closely related to the Malinke and speak a similar dialect. They call themselves Ban-
mana, and the term Bambara has the connotation of ‘infidels’. Under ancient Mali they were among the subject peoples, the common peasantry, who had no share in the imperial culture of which Islam was an important component. Following the disintegration of Mali, the Bambara entered upon a process of state-building, which culminated with the establishment of the powerful Bambara states of Segu and Kaarta in the 18th century. With Bambara clans in political authority, their chiefs came under Islamic influences.

Muslim elements penetrated the culture of the Bambara, but the latter remained tradition-oriented. They were treated as infidels by most of the militant Islamic leaders of the 19th century.

The northern frontiers of the modern Republic of Mali cut deep into the Sahara to incorporate important Arabo-Berber groups. Thus Mali, like Niger and Chad, accommodates both the pastoralists of the southern Sahara and the peasants of the Sahel and the savannah. Tension between these two elements is an important feature in the political life of these states. Though the present frontiers were determined by colonial France, the interaction between desert and Sahel has a longer tradition. The southern Sahara was of strategic importance for the Sudanic states as the outlet of the desert trade routes. On the other hand, the pastoralists of the southern Sahara were attracted, mainly during years of drought, to the more promising pastures of the Sahel.

Whenever a strong state dominated the Sahel (Ghāna of the 11th century, Mali of the 14th century and Songhay of the 16th century), its authority extended over the Tuareg of the southern Sahara. But in between these periods, the pastoralists pressed south. The most decisive and lasting invasion of the Tuareg into the Niger bend began in the second half of the 17th century with the decline of the power of the pashalik of Timbuktu.

The southern Sahara was not, however, only a threat to the Sahel, but also a source for religious and spiritual leadership. The most prominent scholars of Timbuktu, such as the famous Akīt family, were of Sahādja origin. The harshness of the desert pastoralists was mitigated by the marabouts, from holy families, whose religious prestige carried political influence. In the 18th century the Kunta [q.v.], a clan of Arab and Berber descent, established one of its centres in Azawad, north of Timbuktu. Their leader Sīdī al-Mukhtar al-Kunti (1728-1811) was venerated by the Tuareg warriors, and through them he extended his influence over the Bilma and Timbuktu. His religious authority expanded even farther as the head (mukaddam) of the Kādiriyah Sūfī brotherhood [q.v.], which was for the first time spread effectively among Islamic communities of the Savannah by Sīdī al-Mukhtar’s numerous disciples.

The introduction of Sūfism into the western Sudan contributed to Islamic revivalism and militancy, which bred the ghādāt movements. In 1830 Shekhu Ahmadu (Hū, Al-Muhammad), a scholar of Fulbe origin and a follower of the Kunta Kādiriyyah, initiated a ghāḍah against the Fulbe clan leaders in Massina who practiced mixed Islam. He also challenged the religious authority of the established ‘ulamā’ of Djenné, who sanctioned the existing socio-political order and reconciled it with the marginal role of Islam. The military success of Shekhu Ahmadu resulted in the creation of a theocratic state (known as dina) with its capital in the new town of Tamahallā. The state existed for over forty years under the successful rule of Shekhu Ahmadu’s son and grandson.

In 1852 Hamdallāh was conquered and destroyed by a rival mudghādh, al-Hādhūq Umar b. Sa’īd al-
Hādhūq Umar, whose way to his own land of Futa Toro, on the lower Senegal, had been blocked by the French, turned east against the infidel Bambara state of Segu. He then attacked the theocratic state of Ham-
dallāh, which he anathemised as an ally of the infidel Bambara. Behind this pretext was the fierce conflict between two Sīfī brotherhoods; the Kādiriyah of Hamdallāh and the Tūḍāniyyah of al-Hādhūq Umar. The Tūḍāniyyah represented a more rigorous, radical and populist way (tardah) which challenged the aristocratic, established way of the Kādiriyyah. The leader of the Kādiriyah Ahmad al-Bakkātī (grandson of the great Sīdi al-Mukhtar al-Kunti), who had first resented the militant aggression of Hamdallāh, now rose to oppose the Tūḍāniyyah threat of al-Hādhūq Umar. The forces which he mobilised fought al-Hādhūq Umar, who was killed in battle in 1864.

The latter’s son Ahmad ruled for almost thirty years in Segu, the former Bambara capital. His authority had to be enforced by his army, composed of Tokolor followers and local conscripts (sofa), against continuous resistance of local ethnic groups.
The French military commanders in their advance towards the Niger exploited the internal dissensions in the Tidjâni empire of Segu, until its final defeat in 1898. A number of different groups, like the Bambara, greedied their liberation from Tidjâni rule. Many of those who had been forcibly converted to Islam by the Tidjâni now returned to their ancestral ways.

During the colonial period (when the present Republic of Mali was known as the French Sudan), Islam progressed among most ethnic groups, winning over those who moved to the growing towns and those who joined the seasonal labour migration to the more prosperous colonies. With better roads and greater security, more clerics (marabouts) visited villages, converted non-Muslims and invigorated religion among long-established Muslim communities.

These marabouts helped the spread of Sufi brotherhoods. The younger and more vigorous Tidjâniyya expanded faster and further than the old Kâdiriya. But the Tidjâniyya in its turn was challenged by a new brotherhood, a splinter group, the Hamâliyya, named after its founder Hamâliyya (1883-1943). The French colonial authorities, seeking to avoid instability, intervened in defence of the old Tidjâniyya brotherhood. They deported Hamâliyya, harassed his followers and as in other cases of self-fulfilling prophecies, provoked the Hamâliists to violence.

In the 1930s, some young Muslim scholars who returned from studies at al-Azhar resented the growing influence of the Sufi brotherhoods and deployed the exploitation of the believers by the marabouts. The reformists, sometimes referred to as neo-Wahhabis, considered ignorance as the source of all evils and devoted themselves to the promotion of Islamic education, with emphasis on the teaching of Arabic. But to some, the capital of the French Sudan, was an important centre for their activities. Religious reformism and fundamentalism soon had political implications; at home they challenged the authority of the old marabouts, and abroad they subscribed to pan-Islamic ideologies. Both trends were considered a threat to the public security, and the reformists were closely watched by the French colonial authorities and their activities were severely curtailed. The reformists were among the first supporters of the radical, anti-colonial party, the Union Soudanaise (US - RDA).

The post-war political struggle in the French Sudan was between the US and the PPS (Parti Progressiste Soudanais). The latter was the party supported by the French colonial authorities and those who had most to gain from the Tidjâni empire and those who had been forcibly converted to Islam by the Tidjâni. The government also curtailed the activities of the US pursued a "scientific" though not an "academic" Islam in Tropical Africa, in The New Statesman and the middle Niger, c. 1750-1811, London 1972; A. A. Bakr, Ahmad Bâba de Tombouctou, 1847-1865, unpubl. Ph.D. diss., U. of Birmingham 1972; A. A. Bakr, Ahmad Bâba de Tombouctou, 1847-1865, unpubl. Ph.D. diss., U. of London (SOAS) 1974.


Aspects of the Islam in Mali, in Notes et études sur l'Islam en Afrique noire, Paris 1962; R. Schachter-Morgenthal, Political par-

MALIK, the Arabic word for king (pl. mUluk), stemming from the old Semitic root m-l-k (the Hebrew equivalent is melakk, Aramaic malkâ, Akkadian malku; Assyrian maltu, malka), which signifies "possession" and, by extension, "rule" or "government". As a kingly title, the term appears repeatedly in pre-
Islamic inscriptions from southern Arabia and the Syrian desert fringes (e.g. the Namâra epigraph of Imru' al-Kays, "King of the Arabs", from 328 A.D. [see TARGUMS]). The Kurâân mentions several historical and legendary kings (muluk), among them Pharaoh and Saul (II, 246-7; XII, 42 f.); and the hadîth discusses numerous others.

Islam, however, presented a new order in which God alone was "the King, the Truth", "the Possessor of Heavens and Earth" as the Kurâân says, "Say, O God, Possessor of sovereignty (malik al-
muluk), You give sovereignty to whomever You choose and take it from whomever You choose" (III, 26). In this view, heads of the community of believers, the caliphs, were vested with the exercise of God's sovereignty so that they could administer His divinely-created polity; yet its ultimate possession, as well as the kingly title, remained exclusively His. Ac-
cordingly, a man's claim to such a title was regarded as a contemptible feature of the prior, unholy order that Islam sought to replace (an analogous approach may be seen in the Old Testament, where the idea of human kingship is discredited as unfit for the pious community of the People of Israel; cf. Judges, viii, 22-3; I Samuel, viii, 4-20). Malîk thus came to con-
note the temporal, mundane facet of government—the antithesis of khâlîfah and imâm [q. v.]—which signified piety and righteousness. The Umayyads were termed mulîk and their rule mulk by their op-
ponents, who thus expressed disdain for an irreligious and worldly-minded government. Considered to be a term of abuse, malîk was not officially assumed by Muslim rulers in the early centuries of Islam; on the other hand, it was commonly applied, sometimes with unconcealed scorn, to non-Muslim monarchs.

The spread of the Islamic empire brought it under the impact of non-Arab traditions, which played a major role in shaping the Muslim concept of government in the early centuries of Islam. Under Sâsâni influence, authors of "Mirrors for princes", from the beginning of the 'Abbasâd period, introduced theories on the divine right of kings. God, it was stated, "bestowed upon kings His special grace (kâmâlah) and endowed them with His authority (sultânah)" (Khîb al-Tâdîf fi akhlâk al-malîk, attributed to al-
Dzhâzî, ed. Ahmad Zakî, Cairo 1914, 2). Discussing in great detail the privileges, duties and recommended conduct of kings, this literature emphasised the elevated status of a malîk within his community. The principles underlying these writings, distant from the initial Islamic theory of rulership, represented the revival of pre-Arab concepts in the formerly Persian regions of the empire.

The use of the royal title in such a manner gradually led to a modification in its import, and consequent-
ly to its adoption by Muslim rulers. Towards the middle of the 4th/10th century the Bûyûd, new rulers of the empire, were reviving the Sâsânî tradition of regnal epithet, and in the year 393/975 Ali b. Bûyû, one of the three founders of the dynasty, assumed the per-
sian title jâhânshâh (i.e. "king of kings") [q. v.]; and his nephew and heir, 'Abdul al-Dawla (338-72/948-83 [q. v.]) added malîk to his list of epithets (al-Makrîzî, Sulât, 28). Meanwhile, in the north-eastern prov-
cinces, Sâsânî rulers likewise assumed kingship as a measure of asserting their independence from the Bûyûd and Bûyûd dominion; on coins dating from the years 339/950-1, i.e. from the reign of Nâr b. Nasr (331-43/943-54), the latter is designated al-malîk al-umayyad. Later members of his dynasty employed the title in a similar way (S. Lane Poole, Catalogue of coins in the British Museum, ii, 100, 103, 105-6, 109-10, 115-16). Other non-Arab dynasties followed suit: Khârazmî, Qazanawîd and Saljuqî rulers called themselves malîk, usually in combination with honorific adjectives, e.g. al-kâmîl, al-salîh, al-îâdil, which accordingly became a highly common feature of mediavel Islamic titulature. On the western flank of the Islamic empire, Fâtîmid rulers in the late 5th/11th century similarly adopted malîk as their royal epithet. The Ayyûbids inherited it from them (one of Sâlâm al-Dîn's titles was al-malîk al-nâsîr), and in turn passed it on to the Mamûlûks. In the Bûyûd, Bâdiq, Fâtîmid, Ayyûbîd, and Mamûlûk states the title was not reserved for the heads of the monarchy alone, but was rather freely applied to princes, wazârâd and prov-
cincial governors as well (see examples in Hasan al-
Bâshâ, al-Alâkh al-Islâmîsâ, Cairo 1957, 496-500).

The increasing number of potentates identifying themselves as malîk gradually rendered the name less majestic, for it came to imply limited sway over one region among many, and subject to a supreme suzerain. Its devaluation, once again, was reflected in the fact that many a ruler assumed, in addition to malîk, other and more pretentious designations. Several Bûyûd heads of state (e.g. Djalâl al-Dawla, Bahâ al-Dawla) and Ayyûbîd ones (e.g. al-Âdîl) adopted the epithet malîk al-mulûk, modelled on the Persian jâhânshâh; while others called themselves al-sultân [q. v.], a title signifying a new sense of independent sovereignty. The Mamûlûks, in a similar manner, combined these last two names, iden-
tifying themselves as al-malîk al-sultân, while calling high-ranking governors in the Egyptian and Syrian provinces malîk al-umârâ' i.e. chief amir. In one in-
stance in the Mamûlûk state the term was employed in the feminine, as the regnal designation of Shâdîjâl al-
Durr [q. v.] (d. 655/1257), who entitled herself mulûk bi al-mulûmîn. Another occurrence of the name in the feminine was in India, where malîk was not other-
wise in use; the queen Râdiyya [q. v.] of Dîhil (634-7/1236-40), the only female ruler in Muslim In-
daia, adopted it in lieu of the title sultân carried by the male members of the dynasty.

The depreciation of the title was apparently the main reason for its disappearance in later times. The Ottoman Sultans did not commonly use it. By the time when they were in power, the name retained but little of its former glory.

In the 20th century, malîk has appeared again in the Muslim countries, carrying a new sense of grandeur. Following more than a century of contacts with Euro-
pean monarchies, the idea of kingship acquired new respect in the Islamic countries, and malîk lost its whatever sense, at least in its uncompromised form. Its reappearance was, thus, not a revivalisation of the old title but rather a calque of "king" or "roi" in the
MALIK — MALIK B. ANAS

modern European sense. The first to use malik in this novel sense was the Hashimite Husayn, the sharif of Mecca, who in 1916 declared himself "King of the Arab countries"; after some international discussion, he was recognised by Britain and France as "King (malik) of the Hijāḍ". The Ḥāḍimite kingdom of the Hijāḍ existed until 1925, when it was conquered by the Saʿūdī ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz Ibn Saʿūd, the Sultan of Najd. In 1926 the latter declared himself "Sultan of Najd and King of the Hijāḍ and its Dependencies", and in 1932 he merged the different units, thereby becoming malik of the "Kingdom of Saudi Arabia".

The style of royal titles reached the peak of its prestige in the Islamic countries in the 1920s, when several kingdoms were established. In 1920 the Ḥāḍimite King Husayn’s son, Faysal, was declared King of Syria; his monarchy lasted for four short months, at the end of which he left for ʿIrāq, where he became king in 1921. In the following year, the Sultan of Egypt, Fuʾād I [see FUĀD AL-ANWALL], followed the latter’s footsteps and assumed the title malik. In 1926 Amān Allāh [q.v. in Suppl.], the amir of Afgānistan, abandoned his former title and declared himself king; and in the same year the Imām Yahyā of Yemen was first recognised as malik in a treaty with Italy. Yemeni rulers, more commonly known by the title Imām, were thereafter formally acknowledged as kings in international documents. Muslim rulers continued to adopt the royal epithet in later years: in Trans-Jordan in 1926; in Trans-Jordan in 1946 the Ḥāḍimite amīr ʿAbd Allāh took the title "King of Trans-Jordan" (since 1948: of the "Kingdom of Jordan"); in 1951 the amīr Idrīs al-Sanūsī of Cyrenaica was declared malik of the nascent state of Libya; and in Morocco in 1957, the Sultan Muhammad V changed his title to malik, thus marking his intention to introduce a modern type of government.

By that time, however, malik was no longer the venerated and popular title it used to be in the earlier part of the century. Anti-monarchical revolutions and uprisings swept away most kings reigning in the Islamic countries—in Egypt in 1952; in ʿIrāq in 1958; in Yemen in 1962; in Libya in 1969; and in Afghanistan in 1973. Thus the last third of the 20th century has witnessed the abrupt disappearance of the standing of the kingly title, which has lost ground to more attractive alternatives inspired by leftist, revolutionary trends.


MALIK B. ABI 'L-SAMH AL-TA'N (d. Ca. 136/754), one of the great musicians of the 1st/7th century. According to a tradition given in the Aḥdāt, the famous ʿIshāk al-Mawṣill classed him among the four finest singers, of whom two were Mec-cans, Ibn Mubrīz and Ibn Suraydī, and two Medinans, Maʿbad and Malik.

His father, who came from a branch of the tribe of Tāyy, died when Malik was still very young; his mother, who came from the Kūrāyshite tribe of Maḥrūm [q. v.], had to leave the mountains of the Ṭayy because of famine and settled with her children in Medina. According to the Aḥānī again, Malik became fascinated by singing, and spent his days at the door of ʿAbd Allāh b. al-Zubayr’s son Ḥamza, listening to the latter’s protégé, the famous singer Maʿbad, and in whose company he spent the greater part of his time. One day, the amīr invited in the strange young Bedouin who had stationed himself at the door, and after a brief audition, instructed Maʿbad to teach him music. The relations between master and pupil were not always unequivocal. Subsequently, Malik attached himself to Sulaymān b. ʿAlī al-Ḥāшимī, who became his patron. When al-Saffādh came to power, he nominated his uncle Sulaymān as governor of the lower Tigris region. The latter installed himself at Basra and summoned thither his protégé Malik. After a short stay, Malik decided to return to Medina, where, after some time, he died at over 80 years old.

Malik learnt very easily the songs which he heard; but although he could easily remember the tunes, with all their nuances, he found it hard to remember the poetic texts. Even since his first meeting with Hamza, he showed a remarkable mastery in the exact and tasteful reproduction of the melodies of Maʿbad, whom he captivated when listening at the door. In regard to the words, he confessed frankly that he could not remember them. In accordance with the norms of the period, Malik was not considered as a creative artist and he himself did not consider himself as such. His practice was to declare that he was happy to embellish and enrich the works of others. Accordingly, he was in some way a musical aesthete whose whole imagination and energy were concentrated on the refinement and embellishment of the melody and on the beauty of its execution, rather than on the creation of new songs. Being careful to discover an exact expression of the facts just mentioned, he questioned his confèrre Ibn Suraydī about the qualities of the perfect musician, and heard this reply: "The musician who enriches the melody, has good wind, gives the correct proportion to the phrases, underlines the pronunciation, respects the grammatical endings of words, gives long notes their proper value, separates clearly the short notes and, finally, uses correctly the various rhythmic modes, can be considered as perfect". It is very likely that Malik embodied these qualities of the perfect musician.

Finally, Malik remained faithful to his origins among the people, for we read on several occasions that he took as the basis of this compositions folkloristic melodies which a mourning woman, a weaver, an ass-driver, etc., sang.


MALIK b. ANAS, a Muslim jurist, the Imām of the maḏhab of the Maliks, which is named after him [see MALIKIYYA], and frequently called briefly the Imām of Maḏa. 1. The sources for Malik’s biography.

The oldest authority of any length for Malik, Ibn Saʿūd’s account (d. 230/845 [q. v.]), which is based on al-Wākidī (d. 207/822 [q. v.]) and which places him in the sixth class of the Medinan "successors", is lost, as there is a hiatus in the manuscript of the work; but it is possible to reconstruct the bulk of it from the quotations preserved, mainly in al-Ṭabarī (iii, 2519 ff.), in the Kūtāb al-ʿUṣūn (fragm. hist. arab., i, 297 ff.), in Ibn Kathīrīn and in al-Suyūṭī (7, 6 ff., 12 ff., 41, 46).
From this, it is evident that the brief biographical notes in Ibn Kutayba (d. 276/889 [q.v.]) and the somewhat more full ones in the Fihrist (compiled in 377/987) are based on Ibn Sa'd's. The article on Malik in al-Tabarī's (d. 310/922 [q.v.]) Ḥaqīqat al-Mudhayyal is essentially dependent on the same source, while a few other short references there and in his history are based on other authorities. Al-Samānī (wrote ca. 530/1156 [q.v.]) with the minimum of bare facts gives only the legendary version of an otherwise quite well established incident, while in Ibn Khallikān (d. 681/1282 [q.v.]), and particularly in al-Nawawī (d. 677/1281), the legendary features are more pronounced, although isolated facts of importance are also preserved by them. Al-Suyūṭī (d. 911/1505 [q.v.]) gives a detailed compilation drawn from Ibn Sa'd and other works, most of which are now no longer accessible but are for the most part of later date and unreliable, like the Muʿmad Ḥadīṯ al-Muwātāḍa of al-Ghāfikī, the Ḥilya of Abū Nuʿaym, the Khisāṣ al-Muṣafak wa l-makhtulaf of al-Khāṭib al-Ḥāǧdāḏī, the Kitāb Tūrīb al-madārik of al-Kādī ʿIyāḍ and the Fadāʾil Mālik of Abū ʿI-Ḥasan Fīrḥ. The bulk of the later Manāṣık [q.v.], for example that of al-Zawāwī, are of no independent value.


Mālik's full name was Abū ʿAbd Allāh Malik b. Anas. Malik b. Abī ʿAmir b. Abī ʿAmr b.-al-Ḥaǧībī b. Ṣulaymān b.-Abī al-ʿĀṣbāḥī; he belonged to the Ḥumāyir, who are included in the Banū Taym b. Murra (Taym Kūrāyḥ). The date of his birth is not known; the dates given, varying between 90 and 977/708-16, are hypotheses, which are presumably approximately correct. As early as Ibn Sa'd we find the statement that he spent three years in his mother's womb (over two, according to Ibn Kutayba, 290), a legend, the origin of which is a wrong interpretation of an alleged statement by Malik in the possible duration of pregnancy, is still evident in the text of Ibn Sa'd. According to a tradition preserved by al-Tirmīzhī, Muhammad himself is said to have foretold his coming as well as that of Abū Ḥanīfa and al-Shāfiʿī. His grandfather and his uncle on the father's side are mentioned by al-Samānī as traditionists, so that there is nothing remarkable in his also being a student. According to the Kitāb al-Aḥqāfī, he is said to have first wanted to become a singer, and only exchanged his career for the study of fīkā on his mother's advice on account of his ugliness (cf. Goldzihër, Muh. Studien, ii, 79, n. 2); but such anecdotes are little more than evidence that someone did not particularly admire him. Very little reliable information is known about his studies, but the story that he studied fīkā with the celebrated Rabīʿa b. Farrukh (d. 132 or 143/749-60), who cultivated raʿy in Medina, whence he is called Rabīʿat al-Raʿay, can hardly be an invention, although it is only found in somewhat later sources (cf. Goldzihër, op. cit., ii, 80). Later legends increase the number of his teachers to incredible figures: 900, including 300 tābīʿīs are mentioned. He is said to have learned kraʿa from Nāḥīyāt [q.v.]. Abū Nuʿaym. He transmitted traditions from al-Zuhrī, Nāḥīyāt; the maʿāla of Ibn ʿUmar, Abu ʿI-Zinād, Ḥāḡīm b. ʿUrwa, Yāḥyā b. Saʿīd, ʿAbd Allāh b. Dīnār, Muhammad b. al-Munkadīr, Abu ʿl-Zubayr and others, but the ināds of course are not sufficient evidence that he studied the authorities with questions; a list of 95 shaykhs is given by al-Suyūṭī, 48 ff.

A fixed chronological point in his life, most of which has not been treated here, is the rising of the ʿAlīd pretender Muhammad b. ʿAbd Allāh in 145/762 (on the other hand, the story of Malik's alleg-
view that was held of the relation between the two Imams.


A. Malik's great work is the Kitāb al-Muwatta, which, if we except the Corpus juris of Zayd b. 'Ali, is the earliest surviving Muslim law-book. Its object is to give a survey of law and justice; ritual and practice of religion according to the idgāma of Islam in Medina, according to the sunna usual in Medina; and to create a theoretical standard for matters which were not settled from the point of view of idgāma and sunna. In a period of recognition and appreciation of the canon law under the early Abbāsids, there was a practical interest in pointing out a "smoothed path" (this is practically what al-muwatta means) through the far-reaching differences of opinion even on the most elementary questions. Malik wished to help this interest on the basis of the practice in the Ḥijāz, and to codify and systematise the customary law of Medina. Tradition, which he interprets from the point of view of practice, is with him not an end but a mean; the older jurists are therefore hardly ever quoted except as authorities for Malik himself. As he was only concerned with the documentation of the sunna and not with criticism of its form, he is exceedingly careless as far as order is concerned in his treatment of traditions. The Muwatta thus represents the transition from the simple style of the earliest period to the pure science of hadith.

Malik was not alone among his contemporaries in the composition of the Muwatta; al-Mādżásţīn (d. 164/781) is said to have dealt with the consensus of the scholars of Medina without quoting the pertinent traditions, and works quite in the style of the Muwatta are recorded by several Medina scholars of the same time (cf. Goldzihér, op. cit., ii, 221) but nothing of them has survived for us. The success of the Muwatta is due to the fact that it always takes an average view on disputed points (see below, section 4).

In transmitting the Muwatta, Malik did not make a definitive text, either oral or by munāwala, to be disseminated; on the contrary, the different riwayā (recensions) of his work differ in places very much (cf. Goldzihér, op. cit., ii, 222). The reason for this, besides the fact that in those days every little stress was laid on accurate literal repetition of such texts and riwayas, is due to the fact that it always takes an average view on disputed points (see below, section 4).

Fifteen recensions in all of the Muwatta are known, only two of which were to survive in their entirety, while some five were studied in the 3rd-4th/9th-10th centuries in Spain (Goldzihér, op. cit., ii, 222, nn. 2 and 4) and twelve were still available to al-Rudānī (d. 1094/1683) (Heifeneng, Fremderrecht, 144, n. 1):

a. the vulgate of the work transmitted by Yahyā b. Yahyā al-Masmūdī (d. 234/846-9), often printed e.g. Brussels, 1216, 1296 (without ṭadāl and with Hindustāni transliterations), and Lahore 1279-80 (with the commentary of Muḥammad b. ʿAbd al-Bākī al-Zurkānī, d. 1122/1710), Lahore 1889, Tunis 1280; numerous commentaries, editions and synopses; cf. Brockelmann, i, 176, S 1, 297-9; Alhwárdt, Katalog Berlin, 1145; Muḥammad ʿAbd al-Hāfiẓ al-Murādi (transcription to the edition of the regression), Lucknow 1297, 21 ff.; al-Suyūtī, 3 passim (work of al-Ghāfikī), 57 (on Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr) and 58 (chief passage); Goldzihér, op. cit., ii, 230, n. 2; Schacht, in Abbas. Presse. Ak. (1928), no. 2 c, and al-Suyūtī, Isāʾi al-muwaṭṭā bi-niqaṭ al-muwaṭṭa, Delhi 1320, and Muḥammad b. Ṭāhir al-Patnī, Mağmūʿ biḥār al-anwār, Lucknow 1283.

b. the recension of Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan al-Shaybānī (d. 1189/1870) which certainly goes back to Malik himself, besides the fact that in those days every little stress was laid on accurate literal repetition of such texts and riwayas. The other recensions of the Muwatta are given by al-Lakhnawī, op. cit., 18 ff.; further lists of transmitters of the Muwatta are given in al-Suyūtī, 48, 51, and in al-Nawawī.

B. Whether Malik composed other works besides the Muwatta is doubtful (the statements in the Fihrist, 199, 29, which speak of a number of works by Malik are quite vague and uncertain). The books ascribed to him fall into two groups: legal and otherwise. Among the legal ones we read of a Kitāb al-Sunna or al-Sunna (Fihrist, 199, ii, 9, 16) transmitted by Ibn Wahb or by ʿAbd Allāh b. Wahb (d. 197/813) which are preserved by the fragments of al-Ṭabarī's Kitāb Iḥdālī al-fuḥākā (ed. Kern, Cairo 1902, and Schacht, op. cit., no. 22) are fairly comprehensive; this riwaqā follows that of Yahyā b. Yahyā quite closely.

The other recensions of the Muwatta are given by al-Lakhnawī, op. cit., 18 ff.; further lists of transmitters of the Muwatta are given in al-Suyūtī, 48, 51, and in al-Nawawī.

C. There are two other main sources for Malik's view that was held of the relation between the two Imams.

1. Malik's writings. Further sources for his teachings.

A. Malik's great work is the Kitāb al-Muwatta, which, if we except the Corpus juris of Zayd b. 'Ali, is the earliest surviving Muslim law-book. Its object is to give a survey of law and justice; ritual and practice of religion according to the idgāma of Islam in Medina, according to the sunna usual in Medina; and to create a theoretical standard for matters which were not settled from the point of view of idgāma and sunna. In a period of recognition and appreciation of the canon law under the early Abbāsids, there was a practical interest in pointing out a "smoothed path" (this is practically what al-muwatta means) through the far-reaching differences of opinion even on the most elementary questions. Malik wished to help this interest on the basis of the practice in the Ḥijāz, and to codify and systematise the customary law of Medina. Tradition, which he interprets from the point of view of practice, is with him not an end but a mean; the older jurists are therefore hardly ever quoted except as authorities for Malik himself. As he was only concerned with the documentation of the sunna and not with criticism of its form, he is exceedingly careless as far as order is concerned in his treatment of traditions. The Muwatta thus represents the transition from the simple style of the earliest period to the pure science of hadith.

Malik was not alone among his contemporaries in the composition of the Muwatta; al-Mādżásţīn (d. 164/781) is said to have dealt with the consensus of the scholars of Medina without quoting the pertinent traditions, and works quite in the style of the Muwatta are recorded by several Medina scholars of the same time (cf. Goldzihér, op. cit., ii, 221) but nothing of them has survived for us. The success of the Muwatta is due to the fact that it always takes an average view on disputed points (see below, section 4).

In transmitting the Muwatta, Malik did not make a definitive text, either oral or by munāwala, to be disseminated; on the contrary, the different riwayā (recensions) of his work differ in places very much (cf. Goldzihér, op. cit., ii, 222). The reason for this, besides the fact that in those days every little stress was laid on accurate literal repetition of such texts and great liberty was taken by the transmitters (cf. Goldzihér, op. cit., ii, 221), lies probably in the fact that Malik did not always give exactly the same form to his orally-delivered teachings. But the name Muwatta, which certainly goes back to Malik himself, and is found in all recensions, is a guarantee that Malik wanted to create a "work" in the later sense of the term, although of course the stories which make Malik talk of his writings reflect the conditions of a later period. In later times, the Muwatta was regarded by many as canonical (cf. Goldzihér, op. cit., ii, 213, 265 ff.; al-Suyūtī, 47) and numerous legends deal with its origin (al-Suyūtī, 42 ff.).

Fifteen recensions in all of the Muwatta are known, only two of which were to survive in their entirety, while some five were studied in the 3rd-4th/9th-10th centuries in Spain (Goldzihér, op. cit., ii, 222, nn. 2 and 4) and twelve were still available to al-Rudānī (d. 1094/1683) (Heifeneng, Fremderrecht, 144, n. 1):

a. the vulgate of the work transmitted by Yahyā b. Yahyā al-Masmūdī (d. 234/846-9), often printed e.g. Brussels, 1216, 1296 (without ṭadāl and with Hindustāni transliterations), and Lahore 1279-80 (with the commentary of Muḥammad b. ʿAbd al-Bākī al-Zurkānī, d. 1122/1710), Lahore 1889, Tunis 1280; numerous commentaries, editions and synopses; cf. Brockelmann, i, 176, S 1, 297-9; Alhwárdt, Katalog Berlin, 1145; Muḥammad ʿAbd al-Hāfiẓ al-Murādi (transcription to the edition of the regression), Lucknow 1297, 21 ff.; al-Suyūtī, 3 passim (work of al-Ghāfikī), 57 (on Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr) and 58 (chief passage); Goldzihér, op. cit., ii, 230, n. 2; Schacht, in Abbas. Presse. Ak. (1928), no. 2 c, and al-Suyūtī, Isāʾi al-muwaṭṭā bi-niqaṭ al-muwaṭṭa, Delhi 1320, and Muḥammad b. Ṭāhir al-Patnī, Mağmūʿ biḥār al-anwār, Lucknow 1283.

b. the recension of Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan al-Shaybānī (d. 1189/1870) which certainly goes back to Malik himself, besides the fact that in those days every little stress was laid on accurate literal repetition of such texts and riwayas. The other recensions of the Muwatta are given by al-Lakhnawī, op. cit., 18 ff.; further lists of transmitters of the Muwatta are given in al-Suyūtī, 48, 51, and in al-Nawawī.

C. There are two other main sources for Malik's
teaching (setting aside the later accounts of the doctrine of the Malikī madhab):
The more important is the al-Mudawwana al-Mu’ta of Sahnūn (d. 240/854 [q.v.]) which contains replies by Ibn Kāsim (d. 191/807) according to the school of Malik, or according to his own rā’, to questions of Sahnūn as well as traditions and opinions of Ibn Wāh (d. 197/813) (cf. Brockelmann, op. cit., 177; Heffening, op. cit., 144; Krenkow, in EI 14 art. Sahnūn).

Al-Taβarī, who in his Kitāb Ikhtilāf al-fuqahā? has preserved fragments of the Muwatta’ recension of Ibn Wāh (cf. above), also quotes frequently traditions and opinions of Malik in his commentary on the Qur’ān on the “legal” verses.

4. Malik’s position in the history of fiqh.
Malik represents, in time, a stage in the development of fiqh in which the reasoning is not yet thorough and fundamental but only occasional and for a special purpose, in which the legal thought of Islam has not yet become jurisprudence; and, in place, the customs of the town of Medina where the decisive foundations of Muslim law were laid down. One of the main objects in the juristic thought that appears in the Muwatta’ is the permeation of the whole legal life by religious and moral ideas. This characteristic of the formation of legal ideas in early Islam is very clear, not only in the method of putting questions but in the structures of the legal material itself. The legal material, having in itself no connection with religion, that has to be permeated by religious and moral points of view, is the customary law of Medina, by no means primitive but adapted to the demands of a highly developed trading community, which for us is the principal representative of old Arabian customary law: it appears in Malik sometimes as sunna ‘use and wont’, sometimes it is concealed under the Medina idgma?, which he ascertains with great care.

Broadly speaking, this only means that objections on religious grounds have not been raised by anyone against a principle, etc., of customary law. The older jurisprudence had another main object: the formation of a system which sets out from principles of a more general character, which aims at the formation of legal concepts in contrast to the prevailing casuistry and is to some extent rounded off in a codification, if still a loose one, of the whole legal material.

While the Islamisation of the law had been already concluded in its essential principles before Malik, many generations had still to work at its systematisation; therefore, Malik’s own legal achievement can only have consisted in the development of the formation of a system. How great his share in this cannot be ascertained with certainty from the lack of material for comparison. The surprising success achieved by the Muwatta’, out of a number of similar works, would in any case be completely explained by the fact that it recorded the usual consensus of opinion in Medina without any considerable work of the author’s own and came to be regarded as authoritative as the expression of compromise (just as the works on Tradition came to be regarded as canonical). The Muwatta’ would in this case have to be regarded less as evidence of Malik’s individual activity than as evidence of the stage reached in the general development of law in his time. It may be said that this average character was just what Malik aimed at (cf. above, section 3, A).

The high estimation in which Malik is held in the older sources is justified by his strict criticism of hadiths and not by his activity in the interests of fiqh (al-Taβarī, iii, 2484, 2492; al-Sam‘ānī; al-Nawawī; Goldzhīer, op. cit., ii, 147, 168; idem, Zāhirīm, 230); even this only means that with his hadiths he kept within the later consensus. That al-Shāfi‘ī devoted special attention to him out of all the Medinan scholars (cf. his Kitāb Ikhtilāf Malik wā ‘l-Shāfi‘ī) is explained by the fact that he was a disciple of him.

As to the style of legal reasoning found in the Muwatta’, hadith is not by any means the highest or the only court of appeal for Malik; on the one hand, he gives the ‘amal, the actual undoubted practice in Medina, the preference over traditions, when these differ (cf. al-Taβarī, iii, 2505 ff.), and on the other hand, in cases where neither Medinan tradition nor Medinan idgma? existed, he laid down the law independently. In other words, he exercises rā’, and to such an extent that he is occasionally reproached with ta’arruk, agreement with the Irākīs (cf. Goldzhīer, Muh. Studien, ii, 217, idem, Zāhirīm, 4 ff., 20, n. 1). According to a later anti-rā’ legend, he is said to have repented of it on his deathbed (Ibn Khallikān). It is scarcely to be supposed that he had diverged seriously from his Medinan contemporaries in the results of his rā’.

5. Malik’s pupils.

In the strict sense, Malik no more formed a school than did Abū Hanīfa; evidence of this is found in the oldest names Abi al-Hadīṣ and Abi al-Irāk, etc. compared for example with Abi al-Shāfi‘ī’s. These names at once indicate the probable origin of the Malikī madhab; after a regular Shāfi‘ī school had been formed, which in view of al-Shāfi‘ī’s personal achievement, is quite intelligible in the development of fiqh (cf. Bergstrāßer, op. cit., 76, 80 ff.), it became necessary for the two older schools of fiqh, whose difference was probably originally the result of geographical conditions in the main, also to combine to form a regular school, when a typical representative of the average views like Malik or Abū Hanīfa was regarded as head.

In the case of Malik, the high personal esteem, which he must have enjoyed even in his lifetime (see above, section 2) no doubt contributed to this also. But it is to his pupils that his elevation to the head of a school is mainly due. Traces of this process are still to be found in the varying classification of old jurists as of the Ḥadīth school or as independent mudarris (cf. also Fihrist, 199, 1.22).

On the Malikī law school, see Malikiyā.

On Malik’s writings: Brockelmann, I, 175, S I, 297-9; Sezgin, GÄS, i, 457-84; Goldzhīer, Muhammedische Studien, ii, 215 ff. (Fr. tr. L. Berger, 269 ff.; Eng. tr. S. M. Stern and C. M. Barber, ii, 198 ff.); al-Lakhnavī, op. cit.

On Malik’s position in the history of fiqh: Bergsträßer, in Isl., xiv, 76 ff.; Goldzhīer, op. cit. (J. Schacht)

MALIK b. ‘AWF b. SA‘D b. RABI‘A AL-NAṢIRI Bedouin chief and contemporary of Muhammad, who belonged to the clan of the Banu Nāṣir b. Mu‘awiyah of the powerful Kaysī tribe of the
Hawazîn, whom he commanded at the battle of Hunayn [q.v.] against the Muslims; it is mainly through this rôle that he has achieved a place in history.

We know little about his early history, but one may assume that the battle of Hunayn (Aqabâ'î, xix, 81) when he commanded a detachment of the Hawazîn in the Fidjar [q.v.] war.

This distinction he perhaps also owed to the consideration which his clan, the Banû Nasr b. Mu'awiyâ, enjoyed among the Banû Hawazîn. Allies of the tribe of Thakaff (Aghdami, viii, 160), the Banû Nasr b. Mu'awiyâ seems to have been above all a most eloquent preacher and moralist of Basra, who copied the Holy Book for a living and who was interested, it seems, in the question of the Kur'ânic readings ( Ibn al-Djazari, Tabakät al-kurdi, i, 36).

He was the mu'alla of a woman of the Banû Sama b. Lu'âyâ, whom he had married, and when he was given to an enclosure commanded by an 'utm or tower. Mâlik's had probably only brick walls like the little stronghold in Yemen described by al-Muqaddasi (Ahsan al-takdün, 84). A century ago, the traveller Maurice Taminier (Voyage en Arabie, Paris 1840, ii, 6) passing through Liyâya saw there "une forteresse flanquée de tours" intended as in earlier times, to guard the road. Muhammad easily destroyed Mâlik's fort, and when the latter learned of the approach of the Muslims, he fought it prudent to seek refuge behind the ramparts of Tâ'if.

In the interval, all the booty taken by the Muslims at Hunayn had been collected in the camp at Djîrâna, including Mâlik's family and flocks. To the Hawazîn deputies sent to negotiate the ransom of the prisoners, Muhammad said: "If Mâlik comes to em-brace Islam, I shall return him his family and property with the addition of a gift of a hundred camels". Whatever the decision adopted by Mâlik, this declaration could not fail to compromise him with the Thakaff. He had to recognize that his position in Tâ'if had become untenable. He succeeded in escapes from the town and presented his submission to Muhammad, who fulfilled his promise to the letter.

Mâlik then pronounced the Muslim confession of faith and, to use the traditional formula, "his Islam was of good quality".

The new proselyte had extensive connections and was remarkably well acquainted with the Thakaff region. The Prophet was glad to use him against Tâ'if, which he had been unable to take by force. He put Mâlik at the head of the Kayâi tribes who had adopted Islam. Mâlik therefore organised a guerilla war against his old allies in Thakaff. No caravan could leave Tâ'if without being intercepted by Mâlik's men. Exhausted by this unceasing struggle, the Thakaffis decided to sue for terms. Mâlik then became the representative of the Prophet among the Banû Hawazîn, and the caliph Abu Bakr later confirmed him in the office. He took part in the wars of conquest, and was at the taking of Damascus and the victory of al-Kâdisiyya in 'Irâk.

**Bibliography:** Ibn Hîgâm, Sinâ, ed. Wüstenfeld, 840, 852, 854, 867, 872, 879; Ibn Kûtayba, Mu'ârîf, 315; Ibn al-Kalbi-Caskel, Dîmawara, Tab. 115; Nâsi'dî Qarîr wa l-Parasatî, ed. Bevan 495; Yûkûr, s.v. Liyîa; Ibn Sa'd, Tabakät, ed. Sachau, vii, 17; Nawâwî, Tahdhîh al-asmâ', ed. Wüstenfeld, 539; Aqabâ'i, vii, 160, 141, 190, 357-89, 359, 382, 386, that he was strongly influenced by the Christian scriptures. His moralistic tendency is seen in a fairly numerous collection of pieces of advice for behaviour, as well as in the reproaches which he

**Mâlik b. Thakaff, dârîn al-Sâmi, Abu 'yâhî, preacher and moralist of Basra, who copied the Holy Book for a living and who was interested, it seems, in the question of the Kur'ânic readings (Ibn al-Djazari, Tabakat al-kurdi, i, 36).**
launched at Bashshar b. Burd [q. v.], who was accused of bringing dishonour on the Bāṣrans and inciting the population to debauchery (Akbārī, iii, 41, vi, 49). He died just before the epidemic of plague which caused considerable ruination in Baṣra in 131/748-9; the Ḥiḥrist, ed. Cairo 10, places his death in 130/747-8, and Ibn al-Imād, Ṣafḍṭāḥī, i, 173, places it in 127/744-5.

Bibliography: In addition to sources given in the article, see Dāhīz, Bayyin, index; Ibn Kutaiba, Muṣṣaf, 470, 577; Ibn Saʿd, Tabākūt, vii/2, 11; Tabātib, iii, 281; Abu ʿI-ʿArab, Tabābāt al-ʿulāmaʾ, Fī ḵudūd, ed. and tr. M. Benamy, Cairo 1915-20, 17; Ḥakī, Kāt al-ḥulūl, iv, 187; Nawawī, Ṣadākā, 537; Pellat, Milien, 99-100, 257.

MALIK B. DISMA' [see MASAMI A].

MALIK B. NUWAYRA B. DIAMARA B. SHADDAB B. ʿUbayd b. Thilalaba b. Yarbū, Abu ʿI-Mughwār, brother of the poet Muṭtamīm [q. v.], and a poet in his own right, considered as the chief of the B. Yarbū during Muhammad's lifetime. The B. Yarbū was one of the most powerful tribes of the Tamīm confederation, and was involved in many of the battles [ayyām al-ʿarāb] [q. v.] in the Dāhīliyya. The office of ṣayfī—a kind of viceroyship in the court of al-Ḥira—was traditionally held by members of Yarbū, among whom was Malik b. Nuwayra (there is, however, an account according to which he was offered the ṣayfī, but rejected it. See Dārīr, Dīwān, 261-2). Malik's clan, the B. Thilalaba b. Yarbū, was incorporated into the body-politic of Mecca in the Dāhīliyya, through the organisation of the ḥums (see M. J. Kister, Mecca and Tamīm, in JESHO, iii/2 [1965], 139, 146).

Malik is usually portrayed as a noble, ambitious and brave warrior, a hero of whom the Yarbū poet Dārīr boasts, according to him as “the knight (fāris) of Dhu ʿl-Khāmīr” (heroes often being called after their horses). The saying “a man but not like Malik” (fata wā-lā ka-Mālik) is taken to reflect his bravery. Not withstanding all these descriptions, concrete details of his heroic exploits are sparse if not altogether lacking, and in the abundant and detailed material concerning the ayyām of Yarbū he is hardly mentioned at all. The few verses attributed to him concerning certain battles do not necessarily indicate that he participated in them (see e.g. Ḥakī, Balūdān, s.v. Muḥgāṭa). There is, however, an incident in which it is implied that Malik held a senior position in his clan: during a conflict between groups of Tamīm, peace was proposed to the B. Ḥanzadā (the larger tribal group which includes the B. Yarbū), and all its leaders accepted except for Malik. Nevertheless, he had to comply with the decision of the others (Nakāʾīd, ed. Bevan, i, 258-9, al-Maṣṣārī, Muṣṭafā al-amqīlī, Beirut 1962, ii, 525, al-Alūsī, Badrī al-arāf, ii, 75). It seems, then, that Malik's fame as a chief and warrior in the Dāhīliyya has no solid basis in actual accounts of his glorious exploits. Indeed, even the saying “a man but not like Malik” seems originally to refer to his reliability rather than his valour (see Abu Ḥārum al-Sūjrānī, al-Muʾammārīn wa l-ʿuṣūṣīn, ed. ʿAbd al-Muṭṭām ʿAmīr, 1961, 15). It is rather his brother's descriptions of him which have earned him his fame. Muṭtamīm, who lamented bitterly Malik's death, glorified him in elegies which have come to be counted among the most famous of their kind in Arabic literature.

Not much is known about Malik's attitude towards Islam during the lifetime of the Prophet. There is a dubious tradition which records that when the sage Akhārn b. Sayf [q. v.] recommended to them that they should adopt Islam, Malik objected. However, he is said to have been appointed by Muhammad as tax-collector (in the year 9 or 11 A.H.). His responsibilities are said to have included the tribe of Yarbū or the larger group of ʿAlī b. Ṭabara, who were to be exaggerated by the careless way in which tradition uses tribal names. It is safer to accept Abū Rayyāḥ's statement, that Malik was appointed over his own clan only, namely, the B. Thilalaba b. Yarbū (see Abu Ṭammām, Ḥanāsa, ed. Freytag, i, 370, al-Baghdādi, Khizāna, ed. ʿAbd al-Salām Ḥārūn, ii, 24).

In contrast to the sparsity of information about Malik's life, there is an abundance of details concerning the circumstances of his death. This is due to the fact that his execution during the reda wars, apparently by order of Khālid b. al-Walīd, aroused a fierce dispute among the Muslims. Some claimed that Malik was an apostate (mattaṣud) and therefore deserved his fate, while others maintained that he was a Muslim, and that Khālid had him murdered because he coveted his wife. The affair was used in political conflicts, as Khālid's enemies, both from among the Quraysh and the Ansār, used it against him, while the Shi'a accused Abū Bakr of having ordered Malik's execution for his alleged support of ʿAll (see the Maqṣūlīs, Birhār al-anwār, [Tehran 1301-15], viii, 267; Ibn Abī ʿl-Hādīd, Bahrah al-baṣāṣab, Cairo 1963, xvii, 202). Also reflected in this affair is the juridical and theological debate concerning the conditions required from a man in order to be considered a Muslim (see e.g. al-Haythāmi, Maṣāma al-zawāʾid wa maḥbūb ʿal-fawāʾid, Cairo 1352-3, vii, 293-4). All details of the traditions about Malik's execution should be examined in the light of these debates.

The sources are in agreement that Malik was killed by the Muslims in the year 11 A.H. There are, generally speaking, three different accounts of the events.

Account (a), the most prevalent of the three, runs as follows: Malik was the tax-collector of his people. Upon Muhammad's death he did not hand over to Medina the camels which he had collected as sadāka, but instead gave them back to his fellow-tribesmen; hence his nickname al-Djaful (it should however be noted that djaful also means ‘one who has abundant hair’), a trait for which Malik was known. See e.g. Ibn Nubātā, Sarh al-aṣwān, Cairo 1931, 54). When Abū Bakr learned of Malik's deed he was furious, and had Khālid b. al-Walīd promise before God that he would kill Malik if he could lay hands on him. As Khālid was advancing through Najd, having conquered some rebellious tribes, one of his detachments came upon a group of twelve Yarbūs, among whom was Malik b. Nuwayra. The Yarbūs offered no resistance, declared that they were Muslims, and were taken to Khālid's camp at al-Butūb (or Baṣūda) where they were executed as rebels. Some of the captors, chiefly the Ansārī Abū Katāda, tried to prevent the execution by arguing that the captives were inviolable, since they had declared themselves to be Muslims and performed the ritual prayer. Khālid, however, disregarded these arguments, ordered the execution, and married Malik's widow. When ʿUmar learned of Khālid's conduct, he pressed Abū Bakr in vain to punish him, or at least to dismiss him. Eventually, Abū Bakr openly forgave Khālid, after having heard his version of the story.

Account (b), the unique tradition of Sayf b. ʿUmar (preserved in the annals of al-Ṭabārī, Ibn al-ʿAthrī and Ibn Khaṭḥār, and in the Ḥaʾīna). This tradition connects Malik with the so-called false prophetess Sajāḥ [q. v.]. It relates that Muhammad's death found the confederacy of Tamīm in a state of internal
conflict, with groups of it preparing for war against one another. At this point, Sadjah and her army reached Tamimterritory. Malik persuaded her to abandon her original plan, which was to attack Medina, and to join him against his (Tamim) enemies. A battle took place, in which the combined forces of Sadjah, Malik and another chief of Hanza were defeated. Sadjah’s army was defeated in yet another battle, whereupon she headed for al-Yamama, while Malik stayed behind, realising that his policy had failed. He ordered his men to disperse and cautioned them not to offer any resistance to the Muslims, who would reach their territory, but to submit and adopt Islam. He himself retreated to his dwelling-place, where he was captured by the Muslims. The details of his capture and execution closely resemble those given above in account (a). Into these two accounts are sometimes woven traditions justifying the conduct of Khalid b. al-Walid. For instance, it is recorded that in a conversation held between Khalid and Malik, the latter referred to Muhammad as “your man” (or “your master”) instead of “our man” (or “our master”), thus excluding himself from the Muslim community. In a variant of this tradition, Malik further insisted on withholding the sadaka payment, and therefore Khalid put him to death (needless to say, this additional detail spoils the original argument). The reason why Malik withheld the sadaka was the causus belli of the ridda, it was immaterial how he referred to Muhammad in a conversation). Another tradition claims that the captives were killed by mistake, as Khalid’s soldiers misinterpreted his words, and Malik, the latter referred to Muhammad as “your man” (or “our master”), thus excluding himself from the Muslim community. As we have seen, this tradition is practically identical. It thus appears that the truth behind Malik’s career and death will remain buried under a heap of conflicting traditions.

**Account (c)**, the unique tradition quoted from Abu Rayya Ash (Ahmad b. Abi Hāghīm) (preserved in al-Baghḍī’s **Khāzīna** and al-Tabrīzī’s commentary to the **Hamasa**). This tradition records that upon his return from the battle of Medina, Khalid b. al-Walid, with his famous place, where he was captured by the Muslims. The details of his capture and execution closely resemble those given above in account (a). Into these two accounts are sometimes woven traditions justifying the conduct of Khalid b. al-Walid. For instance, it is recorded that in a conversation held between Khalid and Malik, the latter referred to Muhammad as “your man” (or “your master”) instead of “our man” (or “our master”), thus excluding himself from the Muslim community. In a variant of this tradition, Malik further insisted on withholding the sadaka payment, and therefore Khalid put him to death (needless to say, this additional detail spoils the original argument). The reason why Malik withheld the sadaka was the causus belli of the ridda, it was immaterial how he referred to Muhammad in a conversation). Another tradition claims that the captives were killed by mistake, as Khalid’s soldiers misinterpreted his words, and Malik, the latter referred to Muhammad as “your man” (or “our master”), thus excluding himself from the Muslim community. As we have seen, this tradition is practically identical. It thus appears that the truth behind Malik’s career and death will remain buried under a heap of conflicting traditions.


For modern studies and resumes of Malik’s career, see Nöldeke, Beiträge zur Kenntnis der Poetik der aller alten Arabier, Hanover 1864, 87-95, 134; Cauzès de Perceval, Essai, iii, 360-7; Ahlwardt, in Sammlungen alter Arabischer Dichter, (Elafma), ii, 7-8; and Ar. text, 25-6; Lyall, Translations of ancient Arabian poetry, London 1930, 35-6; idem, tr. and notes to Muhammad b. ʿAbī Ḥabīb, ed. E. ʿAmīlī, al-Ridda and the Muslim conquest of Arabia, Toronto 1972, index; Wellhausen, Skizzen, vi, 12-15; Caetani, An-
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nali, ii, 650-8 (anno 11, §§ 175-84); W. M. Watt, Muḥammad at Medīna, 138-9; Ibtisam Mūḥā Paran al-Saffār, Malik wa-Muhammam ibn Nuwayra, Baghdād 1969. A follow-up Muhammad Mūḥā Paran al-Saffār is mentioned in the Hadīṣ (797, n.). This study was published in al-Muktatf, August 1945, and al-Hādi al-nabawi, Shāhān 1364.

Verses attributed to Malik have been collected by Nūldeke, op. cit., and al-Saffār, op. cit. To these may be added the following references: Mustafā dīlayī, 25, 77, 565-70; Id, v, 234-5; Nakātī, 258, 412; Ibn Hīṣām, iii, 260; Zamakhscharī, al-Mustaṣfi ft amījī al-sanāʾ, al Karb, 1989/1990. 

Malik Ahmad Bahrī, later styled Ahmad Nizām Shāh Bahrī and regarded as the first independent ruler of the Nizām Shāhī [q.v.], was born in 875/1469. His father, Malik Bahrī, the converted Hindu who eventually became a ważīr of the Bahmānī sultanate after the murder of Malik Bahādur Mūgān [q.v.], in 886/1471. There is no reliable evidence concerning his date of birth or his early years, but he is known to have accompanied his father when the latter was appointed governor of Tehgānā in 875/1471. Here his ability and promise were so conspicuous that Mughār Nizām al-Mulk Bahrī, the converted Hindu who eventually became a ważīr of the Bahmānī sultanate after the murder of Malik Bahādur Mūgān [q.v.], in 886/1471.

Lawrence D. Farrar, a Habashī slave, born in Georgia, who fell into the hands of the Turks and thus Ayyūbīd monarchs with names of this type, the second element of the name, i.e. AL-... [q.v.]

Malik Ahmad Bahrī, later styled Ahmad Nizām Shāh Bahrī and regarded as the first independent ruler of the Nizām Shāhī [q.v.], was born in 875/1469. His father, Malik Bahrī, the converted Hindu who eventually became a ważīr of the Bahmānī sultanate after the murder of Malik Bahādur Mūgān [q.v.], in 886/1471. There is no reliable evidence concerning his date of birth or his early years, but he is known to have accompanied his father when the latter was appointed governor of Tehgānā in 875/1471. Here his ability and promise were so conspicuous that Mughār Nizām al-Mulk Bahrī, the converted Hindu who eventually became a ważīr of the Bahmānī sultanate after the murder of Malik Bahādur Mūgān [q.v.], in 886/1471.
found his way to Istanbul, where he was sold to a trader having business connections with India. Endowed by nature with valour and wisdom, he proved to be the “jewel of a great price” in the estimate of his master who, finding in one of his business trips to Gujrat, made a gift of him to the reigning Sultan Mahmoud I, popularly known in history as Sultan Begadá. A legend has it that he attained instant fame when he brought down, with a well-aimed arrow, a hawk which defecated on the head of the Sultan during an expedition against Málwá; the delighted Sultan granted him freedom on the spot and conferred on him the title of Malik. By showing gallantry on the battle-field and prudence in council, Ayáz rose steadily in the confidence of the king, who ultimately made him governor of Div [see Dú], an island situated off the coast of India in the extreme south of the Kathiawar peninsula.

In 1484, Malik Ayáz played a vital part in securing form Mahmoud I the great and impregnable Rádiput hill-fortress of Pátá Pavá in Çámpanér, following its investment over a period of 20 months. Its fall signalled the end of the centuries-old sovereignty of the Rádiput dynasty of Pátá Pavá over Çámpanér, which for the next 50 years remained the political capital of Gujrat under the Muslims. In 1511, Malik Ayáz was called upon by Sultan Muzaffar II to salvage the prestige of Gujrat, severely mauled by the inroads of Rana Sangha of Çítb. Placed in supreme command of what is described as 100,000 cavalry and assisted by generals like Malik Sáráng and Múbáriz Al-Mulk, Ayáz proved his mettle in capturing enemy strongholds like Dungarpur and Mandasor, and also through his diplomatic skill concluded peace with Rana Sangha.

But it is round the administration of the historic island city of Div that the career of Malik Ayáz is most clearly centred. In view of its strategic situation and commercial importance, the island during the late 15th century had become a bone of contention between the maritime powers of Europe and the Gujrat Sultans. The most determined challenge came from the Portuguese, who had already made their appearance on the western shores of India. They made persistent demands from the Muslim rulers for the use of Div as a naval base which for the next 50 years remained the political capital of Gujrat under the Muslims.

The Portuguese now tried diplomacy, and won support from local courts such as those of the Mazyadids at Mawsil Hilla and the Ukaylids at Mawsil [q. v.]. The last Buwayhids, a position second in power only to the Sultan himself.


**AL-MALIK AL-‘AZĪZ, ĀBŪ MĀNSÚR KHUSRAW-FĪRŪZ,** eldest son of Djalal Al-Dawla Shírizí, Búyíd prince (407-41/1016 or 1017-1049). In the lifetime of his father Djalal Al-Dawla [q. v.], ruler of Baghdad, he was governor of Baṣra and Wásit and latterly heir to the throne, but when his father died in Shábán 435/March 1044, Khusraw-Firuz was forced to wander between local courts such as those of the Mazyadids at Hilla and the ‘Ukaylids at Ma‘wíl [q. v.], making abortive military attempts to secure his father’s throne, and died at Māyyāfārīn in Rabi‘ I 441/August 1049 whilst staying with the Marwánid of Divárāb [q. v.].


**MALIK DĀNISHMAND** [see Dānīshmand].

**MALIK KĀFÜR, military commander of the Dúl dynasties.**

Originally a Hindu eunuch, nicknamed Hazár-
MALIK KAFUR — MALIK MUGHITH

He left Kazwin, according to Azād Bilgrāmi, in 987/1579 and, reaching Aḥmadnagar, took up residence at Aḥmadnagar, enjoying the favours of Murtuẓā Nizām Shāh I (1565-98) and, upon the latter's death, of Bābur Nizām Shāh II (1594-1605) [see KĀLĀWŪN]. It is mentioned in the Maʿādhir-i Rāhimi that after the fall of Aḥmadnagar to Aḥkār's forces, he served temporarily under 'Abd al-Raḥim Kān-i Khānān, whom he praises in several of his ḵaṣāṣ. Finally, he settled down in Bīḍājāpur, attaching himself to the ruler of that state, Ibrāhīm 'Adil Shāh II (1580-1627) [see 'ADIL-ŠAHS]. There he reached the highest point of his career, with his appointment as poet laureate in the Bīḍājāpur court. In Aḥmadnagar, and later in Bīḍājāpur, he developed close relations with Zuhūrī (ca. 1537-1616), to whom he gave his daughter in marriage.

He was the author of many works, written either independently or in collaboration with Zuhūrī. In his personal life he was inclined towards mysticism, and has been praised for his pious habits and purity of character.


MALIK AL-KĀMĪL II [see 'AMĪN]

MALIK KUMMĪ, Indo-Muslim poet, was born at Kūnī in about 934/1528. The author of the Maykhdāna states that his full name was Malik Muhammad. He went at an early age to Kashān, where he stayed nearly twenty years, and then spent approximately four years in Kazwin, frequenting the company of writers and scholars in both places. Already during his youth he seems to have won distinction for himself in poetical competitions with his contemporaries, and was regarded highly by such literary figures as Muḥtārām Khānān (d. 996/1587-8) and Dāmīrī of Iṣfahān (d. ca. 1578) for his innovative tendencies. He was respected in important circles, and was sought after by Ṣafawī nobles and other Persian dignitaries.

MALIK KAFUR, military commander under the rulers of Māhwā [q.v.].

...
The son of a Turkish noble named 'Ali Shir Khurd, he played a conspicuously important role in the history of medieval Malwa. He came into prominence during the reign of Sultan to bring Shah Ghūrī (809-38/1406-35), who appointed him minister in recognition of his meritorious service and conferred on him the titles of Aḥraḥ al-Malik and Khān-i-Dījahān. He was instrumental in bringing about the accession of his son Mahbud Khādījī I (839-73/1436-69), whom he helped to achieve signal victories against rival chieftains of central India, to extend the limit of frontiers to its widest extent and to bring unprecedented glory to Malwa. The galaxy of honorific denominations which Malik Mughith received, such as Amīr al-Umārī, Zodbat al-Mulk, Khuldsat al-Mulwa, Ḥāzim-i Humayūn and Masnad-i 'Āli, amply reflect the influence and prestige which he enjoyed throughout his life. His death in 846/1443, following a brief illness, left the Sultan so distracted with grief that he "tore his hair and raved like one bereft of his senses" (Firishta, ii, 488). He lies buried in the Khādījī family mausoleum at Māndū (q. v.) where he has also left an architectural legacy in the shape of an elegant mosque called the Masjīd-i Malik Mughith, which he built in 835/1432.

Bibliography: Ghalam Yazdani, Manda, City of Joy, Oxford 1929; Upendra Nath Dey, Medieval Malwa (1401-1562), Delhi 1965. (ABDUS-SUHABAN)

MALIK MUHAMMAD DJAYASÍ (DJAYA$) (990/1493 to 7949/1542), Indian Sūfī and poet, was born at Dījas (Dhayas) in Awadh (q. v.) and died at nearby Amēthī. Educated locally, he became a disciple of the Cāhib Shāykh Muhīt 'Īl-Din. He had Hindu as well as Muslim teachers, and showed a religious tolerance which some ascribe to the influence of Kabir. He wrote poetry in Awadhī, a form of Eastern Hindi, including two fairly short religious poems, one of which, Ākhtī kalām, is on the Day of Judgement. But he is famed chiefly for his Padmāvatī, a narrative and descriptive poem of over 5,000 verses probably, but not conclusively, written in Persian script, although it is best preserved in Nāgarī, and moreover probably the earliest major work in any Indian vernacular extant in an authentic form, apart from its intrinsic literary merits. It combines some elements of the earlier Hindi bardic epic, elements of the traditional mahākīvya and some metrical resemblances to the Persian mathnawī, being a story of war and love, the heroine of the title being a paragon among women. It ends with the death of Padmāvatī's husband, who is ruler of Cītūr, and her sāt, followed by the capture of Cītūr by 'Alā'ī al-Din, Sultan of Dīhilī.

Despite the apparent secular nature of the poem, K. B. Jindal (History, 45, see Bibli.) regards it as a Sūfī love poem. The poet, in his envoy (if this is authentic and not a later addition), states that it is an allegory, briefly explaining the symbolism: but A. G. Shireff (Padmāvatī, p. viii, see Bibli.) describes it as "half-fairytale and half historical romance". The first canto (again, if this is authentic) is of interest to Islamologists. The poet praises God, Muhammad the Prophet, the first four caliphs, Šer Şakib, the Sultan of Dīhilī, the poet's Čāhib teachers and predecessors and the city of Dījas. Hindu and Islamic terminology is intermingled, the Kūrān being so named and also called purāna, for example. All the essentials of Islam are referred to in Hindu terms, with a deliberately propagandist intent in accordance with Čāhib ideals, e.g. 'Uthmān is called pāndī, 'Allāh va y collaborations [see OBGHAR AL-MAHAB, II, 1938-9, pp. 192-3], Hanball cause, and the Turkish commander Arslan Basāsī [q. v.] inclining towards the Shi'ī, being

Malik Muhammad Dījasī has been revered on religious grounds by both Hindus and Muslims of the sub-continent, while his poetry gives him importance in the tradition of both Hindi and, to a lesser extent, Urdu literature.

Bibliography: Brief critical accounts of the poet will be found in F. E. Keay, A history of Hindi literature, London, etc. 1920, 31-3; K. B. Jindal, A history of Hindi literature, Allahabad 1955, 44-7; G. A. Grierson and N. A. Dvivedi, The Padmāvatī of Malik Muhammad Jaisī, Calcutta 1911, i, Introd. 1-5; A. G. Shireff, Padmāvatī, Calcutta 1944, contains his masterly authentic translation of the whole poem; the text of the collected poetry is found in Rāmchandra Shukla, Dījasī grāntkhāvī, 1st ed. Benares 1924, 5th ed., Allahabad 1951, and Mātārāsādāl Gourta, Dījasī grāntkhāvī, Allahabad 1952 (both in the Devānāgarī script). Grierson and Dvivedi's work contains the text of half the Padmāvatī in the same script, with a translation in vol. ii. L. Dhar, Padmāvatī - a linguistic study of 16th century Hindi (Avadhī), London 1949, gives the text of cantos 26-51 (out of 57) in Roman transliteration, with an indifferent or worse English translation and lexical analyses. There are five mss. of the text in Persian script, three dating from around the end of the 11th/12th century, in the India Office Library, London. Unfortunately, there is no parallel Persian or Urdu edition. Nevertheless, the Persian poets having largely concentrated on producing a reliable Devānāgarī version, since the Persian script, even when fully vowelled, is not entirely satisfactory for Hindi. They have compared Persian-script mss. with earlier ones in Devānāgarī, but the process of establishing a definitive version is not yet complete. For further bibliography, including historical and religious background, see Shireff, op. cit., pp. xi-xiii, to which should be added, as the best modern study, Vāsudev Śaran Agraival, Padmāvatī, Jhanī 2012 V.S./1955, with a critical introd., analysis, edited text based largely on Gourta's but also taking into account recently-discovered ms., translation and commentary. See also hīndī and hīndī._ (J. A. HAYWOOD)
suspected of furthering the designs of the Fātimids on Ṭrāṭ. Toghril marched on Baghdad and entered it in Ṣaḥar, 1535, with his name pronounced in the ḥudūd the Khan was soon afterwards arrested and deposited, and spent the last four years of his life in captivity, dying at Ray in 450/1058. The rule of the Būyids in Trāṭ accordingly ended, though it continued for a few years more in Fārs under Fūlād-Sūṭūn.


**MALIK SARWAR,** or Khwājā Dāhān, the founder of the sultanate of Djawnpur [q. v.] in northern India. A eunuch of common birth, Malik Sarwar rose in the service of Sultan Firūz Tughlāk to become the governor of the city of Dīhil. In the political confusion that followed the death of Sultan Firūz in 790/1388, Malik Sarwar lent powerful support to Prince Muhammad, his chief patron and a younger son of Firūz, in Muhammad’s bid for the throne. Several years later the prince eventually ascended the Dīhil throne as Sultan Muhammad Shāh and in 792/1390 elevated Malik Sarwar from governor of Dīhil to wa’āṣ of the sultanate, conferring upon him the title Khwājā Dāhān. But the sultan died the next year, and the state of political affairs in Dīhil plunged still deeper in chaos, with provincial governors and Hindu chieftains openly defying the authority of the court.

In these circumstances, Sultan Naṣir al-Dīn Muhīammad Shāh, shortly after becoming sultan in 796/1394, made Malik Sarwar governor of all the Dīhil’s sultanate’s possessions from Kanawīd to Bihār, and conferred upon him the title Malik al-Shark or “Lord of the East”. The new governor promptly repaired to these domains with twenty elephants and a large army. After a victorious campaign, in which he succeeded in subduing rebellious princes throughout the lower Djūmnā Ganges Dīhil and Bihār, Malik Sarwar established himself in the provincial capital of Djawnpur as a virtually independent monarch, a circumstance enhanced by Dīhil’s own preoccupation with Timūr’s invasion of India in 801/1398. During his brief rule, Malik Sarwar’s power increased and his administration flourished, with even the kings of Bengal paying to him the tribute formerly sent up to Dīhil. Upon his death in 802/1399, he bequeathed to his adopted son Kārānful a vast kingdom stretching from just east of Dīhil to through the heart of the Gangetic plain to Bengal. Through the patronage of Malik Sarwar’s successors, the Dhārki kings of Djawnpur, the city of Djawnpur emerged as an important regional centre of Indo-Muslim culture in the 9th/15th century.


**MALIK-SHĀH,** the name of various Saldjūk rulers.

1. **MALIK-SHĀH I b. ALP ARSLĀN, DILALĀ AL-DAWSLA MUḤĪZ AL-DĪN ABU ‘L-FATH, GREAT SALDJŪK SULTAN, born in 447/1055, reigned 465-85/1072-92. During his reign, the Great Saldjūk empire reached its zenith of territorial extent—from Syria to the west to Khurṣān in the east—and military might.

Alp Arslān [q. v.] had made Malik-Shāh his wāli ‘l-saad or heir to the throne in 458/1066, when various governorships on the eastern fringes were at this same time distributed to several members of the ruling family. Although Alp Arslān was fatally wounded during his Transoxanian campaign against the Karakhanids [see ILEK-KHANS], he lingered long enough to clear his intended arrangements for the future of the empire, leaving his son Ayāz in the upper Oxus provinces and his brother Kāwūr [q. v.] to continue in the largely autonomous principality of Kirmān which he had carved out. Through the prompt action of the experienced vizīr Nizām al-Mulk [q. v.], Malik-Shāh’s succession to the sultanate was officially notified to the caliph in Baghdad, and the key city in Khurṣān of Nīkhārāt and its treasury secured for the young prince. The revolt of the disgruntled Kāwūr, who regarded his position as superior to that of senior member of the Saldjūk family as giving him a superior claim, was quelled at Hamādān in 466/1074 and Kāwūr strangled, though the sultan subsequently (467/1074) restored his sons Sulṭān-Shāh and Tūrān-Shāh to Kirmān (see E. Merçīrl, *Kirmān Seçakları*, İstanbul 1936, 456/1074); the subsequent disputes of Shams al-Mulk with the eastern branch of his dynasty in Kāshgār kept the Kāwūr generally submissive to Malik-Shāh suzerainty over the ensuing years (see W. Barthold, *Turkestān down to the Mongol invasion*, London 1928, 314-15).

Ayāz b. Alp Arslān died just before the Transoxanian campaign of his elder brother, and Malik-Shāh now gave Balkh and Tukhār to his other brother Tekiḡ. For some years, Tekiḡ governed Kirmān effectively, but in 473/1080-1 took into his service 7,000 mercenary troops discharged by Malik-Shāh as an economy measure, even though Nizām al-Mulk had warned him of the dangers of throwing such a large group of desperadoes out of employment (cf. Sjōström, *Skj.,* ch. xli, ed. H. Darke, Tehran 1340/1962, 209-10, tr. idem, London 1960, 170-1). With these soldiers, Tekiḡ rebelled, but failed to capture Nīkhārāt and had to submit. The sultan pardoned him, but four years later, in 477/1084, Tekiḡ again renounced his allegiance whilst Malik-Shāh was in the Dīzārā at the other end of the empire; this time, Malik-Shāh showed no mercy, and after quelling the outbreak, blinded and jailed Tekiḡ. These draconian measures kept further potential trouble-makers within the Saldjūk family quiet for the rest of the reign.

Peace was also established on the eastern fringes by the achievement of a modus vivendi with the Ghaznawids [q. v.] of eastern Afghanistan and India. The succession quarrels at the outset of Malik-Shāh’s reign tempted the Ghaznawid sultan Ibrāhīm b. Mas‘ūd (451-92/1059-99) to make a bid for the recovery of the Ghaznawid territories in Khurṣān lost to the Saldjūks 30 years before. Ibrāhīm attacked the Saldjūk prince ‘Uṯmān b. ‘Uṯmān b. ‘Uṯmān b. Mas‘ūd in northern Afghanistan and captured him, but Malik-Shāh
Shāh sent an army and restored the situation there (465/1073). Thereafter, Ibrahim seems to have been established by Malik-Shah's great-uncle Toghril Beg [q.v.], as an institution deriving its legitimacy from its joint operations conducted by the Seljuk and Saffarid mighty Saffarid dynasty [q.v.] as vassals of the former western provinces, and peaceful relations between them. The later reconciliation to the permanent loss of the Ghaznavid princely Sistan, governed by scions of the once-mighty Saffārīd dynasty [q. v.] as vassals of the Seljuks, Malik-Shah's authority was reasserted, and joint operations conducted by the Seljuks and Saffarids forces against the Isma'ilis of Kuhistān [q.v.].

Seljuk-Karakhanid relations also remained pacific, as noted above, for the rest of Shams al-Mulk Nāṣir's reign and during the short reign of Khusraw Khan b. Ibrahim at the latter's son Ahmad, nephew of Malik-Shah's Karakhanid wife Tekin Khatun, whom the sultan had married when a child in 456/1064. But the discontent of the orthodox ulama in Transoxania led Malik-Shah to invade Transoxania once more in 482/1089, to depose Ahmad Khan [though he was later restored before his final deposition and execution, ostensibly because of his Isma'ilī sympathies, in 488/1095] and to penetrate as far as Semireyje, overawing the eastern Karakhanid ruler of Khāshqār and Khotan, Hārūn Khan b. Sulaymān, who now acknowledged Malik-Shah in the khauf of his dominions. Recognition of the Seljuks here represented the culmination of Seljuk prestige in the east (see Barthold, Turchistan, 316-18).

Temporarily displays of military force were sufficient to subdue ambitious Seljuk rivals, to bring into line Karakhanīd princes torn by family dissensions and to persuade the Ghaznavids that their fortunes now lay in the exploitation of India rather than in futile irredentist dreams in the west. The situation on the western borders of the Great Seljuk empire was more complex and the frontier, towards which Türkmen adventurers and ghāzis had for some time been deflected by government policy, more fluid and shifting. There was a zone of local Arab and Kurdish amirates, jealous of their independence, mingled with ambitious Turkish slave commanders and Türkmen beys; beyond them, in western Transcaucasia and western Anatolia, lay the hostile Christian powers of Georgia and Byzantium. Hence the special importance to the Seljuks of defending the northwestern provinces of Adharbaydājn, Ārān and Armenia against Georgian attacks and of preserving these regions as areas of concentration for Türkmen forces. Soon after he came to the throne, Malik-Shah took steps to strengthen his frontier by deposing the Kurdish Shaddādī [q. v.] prince of Gādgān and Dvin Fadl(un) III b. Fadl II (466-8/1073-5) and installing there the veteran Turkish slave commander of Alp Arslan's, Sawtigin, Turkish slave commander of Alp Arslan's, Sawtigin, who was already well-familiar with the situation in the Caucasus region. Malik-Shah campaigned here personally in 471/1087-8, after the Georgian king had temporarily captured Kars from the Muslims, and again in 478/1085 after the restored Shaddādī Fadl III had rebelled (see V. Minorsky, Studies in Caucasian history, London 1953, I. New light on the Shaddādīs of Ganja, 67-8). This time, the main line of the Shaddādīs in Ganja and Dvin passed放手, but a collateral branch continued in Ani till the end of the 6th/12th century (see ibid., II. The Shaddādīs of Ani, 79-106). The submission of the Shirwānī-Saljuḳ Fariburz [see Shirwān] was also received. Much of the Arabo-Kur basin, i.e. eastern Transcaucasia, was now placed under Malik-Shah's suzerainty. For the sultan's Türkmen commanders, with Malik-Shah's cousin Kūšb Ḏal'in Ismā'īl b. Yākūt as overlord.

The overturning of Anatolia and the gradual pushing-back of the Greeks continued essentially as an enterprise of individual Türkmen leaders, prominent among whom were the sons of the Seljuk Kutlugmoh b. Arslan Isfilm, Sulaymān and Manṣūr. Although the later historiography of the Rūm Seljuks makes Malik-Shah officially invest these princes with the governorship of Anatolia, the assumption of the title of sultan by these last seems to have been a unilateral act which Malik-Shah probably could only regard as one of lēse-majesté; and two others of Kutlugmoh's sons actually fought at the side of the Fatimids in Palestine against the Seljuk cause (see Cl. Cahen, Qutulmush et ses fils avant l'Asie Mineure, in Isl., xxi (1964), 267; idem, Pre-Ottoman Turkey, London 1968, 73 ff.).

In the Arab lands of Trak, the Djiyazira and Syria, Seljuk policy aimed at containing the Isma'ilī Fātimids [q. v.] in Palestine, at curbing their influence among the Shī'ī Arab amirates of the desert fringes and within the Arabian peninsula, at assuring Sunni control of major cities like Aleppo and Damascus, and at establishing some measure of control over the Türkmen bands ranging across these lands of Syria and the Djiyazira and competing with the existing Arab population for pasture-grounds. The caliphal vizier Fakhr al-Dawla Ibne Djihr [see Djihr, Banū] secured Seljuk military help in order to reduce the Kurdish principality of the Marwānids [q. v.] of Diyarbekr in 478/1085, eventually incorporating it into the Seljuk empire. Malik-Shah's authority in Syria was imposed in the face of opposition from the Armenian former general of the Byzantines, Philarétos, in the middle Taurus Mountains region, from the U'kaylids [q. v.] under their amir Muslim b. Kuraysh in the lands between Mawahl and Aleppo, and from Sulaymān b. Kutlugmoh, firstly through the agency of Malik-Shah's brother Tughūk and then in 477-8/1084-5 by an army of the capital under the sultan's personal command (see Cahen, La Syrie du Nord à l'époque des Croisades, Paris 1940, 177 ff.; idem, Pre-Ottoman Turkey, 30-2). Triumphing over his rivals, Malik-Shah's authority was now extended as far as the Mediterranean shores, and Turkish slave commanders installed as governors in Amiit, Aleppo and Edessa. Seljuk influence was even carried southwards into the Arabian peninsula, for in 469/1076-7 Malik-Shah's commander Artuk b. Eskeb (later, the founder of a dynasty of Türkmen beys in Diyarbekr [see Artuks]) marched into al-Áhsā in eastern Arabia against the Carmathians [see Karamita]; the Sharifs of Mecca were suborned from their Fātimid allegiance; and Yemen and Aden were temporarily occupied.

Relations with the 'Abbasid caliphs were necessarily important for a power like the Seljuks which claimed to be the spearhead of Sunni orthodoxy and protector of the Commander of the Faithful against Shī'ī threats. Malik-Shah did not manage personally to visit Baghdad until 479-80/1086-7, when al-Muṣṭafā [q. v.] formally granted him the saltana or secular authority. As Cahen has pointed out (op. cit., 42), Malik-Shah and Niẓām al-Mulk regarded the sultanate, which they shared over the caliph had been established by Malik-Shah's great-uncle Toghril Beg [q. v.], as an institution deriving its legitimacy from its
very self and having a full entitlement to intervene even in religious matters. The caliphs could not of course concede the validity of this constitutional interpretation of the ordering of affairs in Islam, hence the inevitability of a state decision, however of lesser degree, between the two focuses of authority (see G. Makdisi, Les reports entre califé et sultan à l'époque Saljou- qide, in IJMES, vi [1975], 228–36).

The sultans had installed in Baghdad a shíma [q. v.] or military commander, who had to keep order in the city and often in ʿIrāk in general, and an ʿamīd [q. v.] or official in charge of civil and financial matters, including the allocation to the caliph of his ʿiskās and other allowances. These personages could, and at times did, exert considerable pressure on the caliphs. Central policy in the Saljuq state was directed from the diwān of the great vizier Niẓām al-Mulk, who had been first appointed under Alp Arslan; for a detailed survey of his policy, see Niẓām al-Mulk. Part of this policy lay in facilitating the revival of Sunni Islam, as the alternation of Shīʿa powers like the Buwayhids or Buwayhids [q. v.] and Fāṭimidis disappeared or waned, by financial and other support to the orthodox religious institution, including the encouragement of the founding of madrasas [q. v.], and this in theory meant harmonious co-operation with the ʿAbbāsīd caliphs, the moral heads of Sunni Islam. In practice, strains arose between Niẓām al-Mulk and the Banū ʿDāhir, viziers to the caliphs from Khūṭab to al-Muqtafī, with a nodding of heads in relation to 471/1079 when Niẓām al-Mulk secured Fākhr al-Dāwla Ibn ʿDāhir’s dismissal. The arranging of the betrothal of one of Malik-Shāh’s daughters to al-Muktādī in 474/1081-2 (another daughter was later to marry the next caliph al-Muṣṭaḥfir) only brought about détente when the sultan came personally to Baghdad and the marriage was celebrated in 480/1087. Even then, relations speedily deteriorated, and on his second visit to Baghdad, shortly before his death, the caliph was largely ignored by Malik-Shāh, who set in motion extensive building operations, including a great mosque, the Dżāmiʿ al-Sultān, and palaces for the great men of state, intending to make Baghdad his winter capital (see Makdisi, The topography of eleventh-century Baghdad, in JESHO, iii [1959], 292, 298-9). It seems that the sultan planned to set up his infant grandson Ḏafar, the “Little Commander of the Faithful” and fruit of the alliance between the caliph and the Saljuq princess, as caliph; but in the middle of Șawwāl 485/November 1092, not very long after Niẓām al-Mulk’s assassination, of complicity in which some people thought him guilty, Malik-Shāh died of fever at the age of 58, suspectedly poisoned (see M. T. Houtsma, The death of Niẓām al-Mulk and its consequences, in Inl. of Indian history, iii [1924], 147 ff.). The caliph was thereby assured of a reprieve. Terken ʿKhāṭūn and her protégé the mustawfī ʿṬaqī al-Mulk Abu ʿl-Ghānaʿīm endeavoured to place Terken ʿKhāṭūn’s four-year-old son Mahmūd on the throne, but the Niẓāmīyya, the relatives and partisans of the dead vizier, succeeded in killing ʿṬaqī al-Mulk and eventually securing the succession of the thirteen-year-old Berk-yaruk, Malik-Shāh’s eldest son by another wife, Zubaydah ʿKhāṭūn. The Great Saljuq sultanate now entered a period of internal dissenension under Malik-Shāh’s sons [see BARK-YARUK; MUHAMMAD B. MALIK-SHAH; SMĀʾAR], so that the political authority of the caliphate could revive in the 9th/12th century as that of the sultans declined. Malik-Shāh’s body was carried back to Isfahān and buried in a madrasa there.

Although probably no more cultured than the rest of the early Saljuq sultans, he acquired, in the conventional pattern of Islamic rulers, the reputation of being a patron of learning and literature. The great Persian poet and stylist al-Tughra [q. v.] served in his chancery, and amongst Persian poets, Muʿīzẓ [q. v.] in fact derived his takhallus from Malik-Shāh’s honorific of Muʿīzẓ al-Dīn. Umar Khayyām [q. v.] seems to have been attracted into the Saljuq service at the time of Malik-Shāh’s Transoxanian campaign against Shams al-Mulk Nār, and to have played a leading role in the reform of the calendar, involving the introduction of the new Malikī or Djalalī era (after the sultan’s iskab of Djalāl al-Dawla [see QALUL]), and in the construction of an observatory at Isfahān. A collection of legal responsa, the Masāʾil al-Malikšāhīyya fi ʿl-kawādīm al-sharīʿa, perhaps composed for the sultan, is mentioned in certain sources, e.g. in Muhammad b. Muhammad al-Ḥusaynī’s abridgement of Rawandūl al-ʿUrda fi ʿl-hikdya al-saljūkīyya, ed. K. Süssheim, Leiden 1909, 69-71.

Bibliography: In addition to works mentioned in the article): Of primary sources, see the standard Arabic and Persian ones for the period, such as Zahir al-Dīn Nīshāpūrī, Rawandūl; Bundārī, Sadr al-Dīn al-Husaynī, Ibn al-ʿAthīr, Ibn al-Djawi, Sibṭ b. al-Djawi, and the Syriac one of Barhebraeus. Ibn Khāhilīn, ed. Ḥasan ʿAbbās, v, 283-9, tr. de Slane, iii, 440-6, has a biography of Malik Shāh, deriving his material from the construction of Miskawayh by Muhammad b. ʿAbd al-Malik al-Hamadānī (d. 521/1127).

Of secondary sources, see H. Kafeṣoglu, Sultan Melikşah denizinde Büyük Selçuklu imperatorluğu, Istanbul 1953; C. E. Bosworth, in Cambridge history of Iran, v, 66-102, for political and dynastic history, and A. K. S. Lambton in ibid., 203 ff. for administrative history; O. Turan, Selçuklar tarhi ve Türk-Islam medeniyeti, Istanbul 1969, 152-75.

2. Mālik-Sḥāh II b. Berk-yaruk, infant son of sultan Berk-yaruk, who, after the latter’s death in 498/1105, was briefly proclaimed sultan in Baghdad, with Ayāz as his Atabeg and Sa’d al-Mulk Abu ʿl-Mahāsin as vizier, but who soon had to yield to Muhammad b. Malik-Shāh I [q. v.].

Bibliography: Bosworth, in Camb. hist. of Iran, v, 111.

3. Malik-Shāh III b. Mohamūd b. Muḥammad Muṣīn al-Dīn (547-8/1152-3), son of sultan Mahmūd [q. v.], who, with the support of the amīr ʿKhāṣṣ Bag Arslan and of Ildigiz [q. v.], Atabeg of ʿAr- rān and most of ʿĀḏḡarbayjān, briefly became sultan in western Persia after the death of his uncle Maḥṣūd b. Muhammad [q. v.] without direct heir. His incapability as a ruler—the caliph al-Muktafī was now able to get rid of all Saljuq authority from Baghdad and ʿIrāk—speedily led to his deposition in favour of his brother Muhammad. He was imprisoned, escaped and then was granted the governorship of Fars by Muhammad, but died at Isfahān in 555/1160.

Bibliography: Bosworth, in Camb. hist. of Iran, vi, 169, 175-7.

4. Malik-Shāh was also the name of two members of the Saljuqs of Rūm in the 6th/12th century: (a) Malik-Shāh b. Kılıkg Arslan I b. Sulaymān b. Kutlumuş (for a brief spell after his father’s death in 500/1107); and (b) Malik-Shāh b. Kılıkg Arslan II b. Maṣūd, Kūṭ al-Dīn, who during the division of territories during the latter part of his father’s reign (i.e. 551/1156-92), received Siwās and Alašrāy, and who then kept his father in semi-captivity in Konya [see Kılıkg Arslan II].
The title of the poet laureate was a privilege, given occasionally to court poets, of choosing a pen name based on the name or one of the lashabs of their patron.

Certain responsibilities went with the title, at least during the Middle Ages. The poet laureate was a supervisor of the poets assembled at the court and passed judgment on poems before they were presented to the patron. He also decided about the admission of applicants to the position of a court poet, but it is evident from some of the anecdotes related by Nizaml-yi Arudi that such introductions could equally be sought through the intermediacy of other dignitaries. Being the guardian of the ruler’s reputation as a benefactor of letters, he occupied a position of trust; it is frequently mentioned that the poet laureate was a prominent boon companion (nadîm) of his patron. E. E. Bertels ascribed an important role in the development of Persian poetry before the Mongol period to the institution; the influences exerted by a poet laureate on the poets under his control fostered the rise of local traditions marked by common stylistic features.

The scarce information about literary life at the Sâsânid court available to us suggests that the rank of favourite artist was known in Iran prior to Islam. The story about the rivalry between Sârash and Bârßrâb over the first place among the minstrels of Khusraw Parviz can be taken as an indication (cf. A. Christensen, *L’Iran sous les Sassanides*, Copenhagen 1944, 484). The founding of a dîrsân al-ghir for the distribution of rewards to poets by the Barmâka (q. v.) and the appointment of Abân al-Lâhîkî (died about 200/18516-17) as an official critic of the poems presented to these Iranian vizards of the Abbâsids, point into the same direction (see also D. Sourdul, *Le vizirat Abbasside de 749 à 936*, Damascus 1959-60, i, 143 f.).

Dawlaâsh (fl. at the end of the 9th/15th century) recorded the formal appointment of ‘Unsurî as a poet laureate by Muḥammad of Ghazna through a mîjâhîl-i malik al-shu’ârâ’î, in the early 5th/11th century. The duties of this office were similar to those incumbent on the holder of the office instituted by the Barmâka (Tadhkira al-shu’ârâ’, London-Leiden 1901, 44 f.). Although the actual title is not mentioned in sources from his own time, there is little reason to doubt that ‘Unsurî did occupy the leading position at the Ghazânawid court ascribed to him. This need not mean, however, that he was the first Persian poet who was honoured in this manner. The chapter on the poets in the Câhâr makâla, the anecdotes of which illustrate the most important aspects of early court poetry, refers to the special position held by Rûdûkî under the Sâmânsids in the 4th/10th century. Particularly informative is the story on Nizâmî-yi Arûdî’s visit to Amîr Mu‘izzî’s grandfather. The incident is recorded in an anonymous text which in 510/1116-17 in order to get a reward for a lament presented to this poet-laureate of the Sâlûqân, it contains a detailed account of Mu‘izzî’s succession to the post of amîr al-shu’ârâ’î which was held already by his father Burhânî. The remunerations attached to this function consisted of a dânmas and an iţfâd, the kinds of salary regularly assigned to officials (see Dâmârîyya). Another anecdote tells about a conflict at the court of the Khâkânîyân (i.e. the ilek-Khâns [q. e.]) of Transoxana between rival poets. Râshîdî defies successfully the authority of the amîr al-shu’ârâ’î Amâk and wins for himself the title of sayyid al-shu’ârâ’î. It should be noted that the title of malîk al-shu’ârâ’î, which later appears to be in general use, does not occur in the Câhâr makâla.

The institution remained a part of the organisation of courts wherever poetry was practised according to the Persian tradition. We find it under the Sâlûqîs of Anatolia as well as under the Muslim rulers of the Indian subcontinent. For the later periods, it is difficult to decide to what extent its significance exceeded that of a merely honorary office. A remarkable revival of mediaeval customs came about in 19th-century Iran under the Kâdîjîr dynasty. Fath ‘Ali Shah tried to imitate the literary splendour of the ancient court of Ghazna by attracting a great number of court poets who were united in a society called anîmsan-i Khâkân. He gave the title of malîk al-shu’ârâ’î to Sâbâ, the author of the Shadhînshadh-ndma, which in the style of the Shâh-nâmâ glorified the exploits of Fath ‘Ali Shah. Many honorifics of this kind were handed out by Sâbâ, viziers and provincial governors to their favourite poets throughout this period. Among the last who received the title of malîk al-shu’ârâ’î was Muhammad Taki Bahâr [q. e.]. In 1904, when he was only eighteen, Muzaffar al-Dîn Shah allowed him to adopt this title which was previously held by his father Sabûrî. In spite of his subsequent renouncing of feudal poetry, the title remained attached to Bahâr’s name till the end of his days.

Malik al-Tudjudjar (A. "king of the big merchants"), an office and a title which existed in Iran from Safawid times (J. Chardin, *Journal de voyages du Chevalier Chardin*, in Perse, et autres lieux de l’Orient ..., ed. L. Langles, v, Paris 1811, 262), and probably earlier, until the end of the Kâdîjîr period. It is not clear precisely what the functions of the malîk al-tudjudjar were during the Safawid and early Kâdîjîr periods, or to what extent the office existed in the various commercial centres of the country. It is, however, obvious, that not all major towns had a malîk al-tudjudjar in the first half of the 19th century. In Dju’mâdî I 1260/May-June 1844 Muhammad Shah (1834-48) issued a farnâmân which ordered that a malîk al-tudjudjar be appointed “in every place in Persia where extended commerce is carried on ...” ("Firman relating to bankruptcies ...", in L. Hertslet [ed.], *A complete collection of the treaties and conventions ... between Great Britain and foreign powers*, i, London 1856, 614). By the second half of the 19th century, big merchants (tudjudjar) acting as malîk al-tudjudjar were to be found in most major commercial centres of Iran (Mirzâ Bahâr al-Dîn Fath ’Ali Khamîr-ad-dîn-i Sânî [q. v.], Nisârî al-Buldûn-i Nisârî, Tehran...
The economic developments of the 1870s and 1880s were bound to bring to an end the co-operation which had existed between the government and the big merchants. While the central government found itself faced by growing fiscal difficulties, the big merchants became wealthier. Against this background, the government initiated new economic measures. The tobacco concession (1890) and the new customs administration and regulations (1890-1904) in particular aroused the opposition of the big merchants to the government. Big merchants holding the office of malik al-tudjjar in several major towns played a central role in the protest movements which brought about the cancellation of the tobacco concession in 1892, and the granting of a constitution (kam-i asâ) and the establishment of a national consultative assembly (mu'askat-i shirâ-yi millî) in 1906 (see further Mêlikzâda, Tarîkh-i inshâ-yi màhârî-sâyi âmân, Tehran 1328/1949, i, 128-30, 278-9; ii, 28, 168-72; Ibrâhîm Taymûrî, Tarîhî-i tan-bâkî-yi yâ auwâlî mu'makawanat-i manfî dar Iran, Tehran 1328/1949, 78-9, 112; Nâzîm lî-am Kîrmânî, Tarîh-i bâlî-yi Irânîyân, Tehran 1322/1952, 12; Mîrzâ 'Ali Khan Ahmadî Sânî, Ruznâma-yi Dawlat-i 'Abbâsa-yi Iran, ed. Hafiz Farmanfarayan, Tehran 1341/1962, 155; Yahâbî Dawlatâbâ'dî, Tarîkh-i mu'askîrî-yi bâhây-yi Yadâyeh, Tehran n.d., i, 108; A. K. S. Lam- 

The malik al-tudjjar was not a government official. He did not receive any payment for holding the office, nor was he officially a member of any government department. He had two main functions: (1) he was the merchants' representative, or better, the link between the holders of the office of a government or provincial and the authorities, and (2) he was entrusted with authority to settle disputes between the Iranian merchants and their customers, among the merchants themselves, and between local and foreign merchants and trading-firms (Polak, Persien, ii, 188-9; J. M. de Rochechouart, Souvenir d’un voyage en Perse, Paris 1867, 176; G. J. Wills, Persia as it is, London 1886, 45; G. N. Curzon, Persia and the Persian question, London 1892, i, 450; A. Houtum-Schindler, ed. Persia, I. Geography and statistics, in Encyclopaedia Britannica, 10th ed., London 1902, xxxi, 619; Greenfield, Verfassung, 143; idem, Das Handelsrecht... von Persien, Berlin 1906, 22, 27). It was the latter function, especially so far as it concerned the claims of foreign merchants in cases of the bankruptcy of Iranian merchants, that provoked the opinion of Muhammad Shah’s above-mentioned farman. Nâzîr al-Dîn Shâhad extended the functions of the malik al-tudjjar to include, in collaboration with the provincial official in charge of trade and commerce (ra’îs tudjjarat), the encouragement of commercial activity in particular and of the economy of the country in general (Greenfield, Verfassung, 143). In Tehran, the malik al-tudjjar was conferred by the government on commercial and various other communities. In the latter case, it was asked by the al-Dîn Shâh to form a council of the prominent big merchants of the capital which would hold regular meetings, in which the question of developing and encouraging trade and commerce, should be discussed, and the results of its deliberations communicated to the government (‘Imâm al-Salţana, Tarîkh, iii, 231. Cf. Houtum-Schindler, in EBB, xxxi, 619).

With the fall of the Kâdgârs and the adoption of modern forms of government and Western institutions, the office of malik al-tudjjar lapsed, its functions being taken over by the Chambers of Commerce of the major towns and by several government departments.

Bibliography: Given in the article.

(M. G. GILBAR)
In 1695, the defterdar [see DARTAR] of the time elaborated the bases of a new form of malikâne, i.e. a grant of the enjoyment of revenues for life, with care to protect the properties of the state from the dilapidation allowed by unceasing leases, heedless of the ultimate fate of properties granted to them. The fiscal revenues were, as in ordinary leases, put up for auction and sold to the highest bidder. This last paid over to the state the “price” of the lease called mawadda and contracted to hand over each year a fixed sum corresponding to the fiscal revenues taken on lease. In the case of a new sovereign coming to the throne, he paid additionally 25% of the cost of the lease, and in times of war, 10%. Given the fact that the holders of these leases for life came from the class of high officials and persons (such as civilian and military dignitaries and scholars) who usually lived in the capital, they in turn sub-let the properties they had leased. In 1715 a firman decreed the abolition of the system, but it continued in existence till ca. 1839.

The first to be mentioned are the works of Ibn Abi Zayd al-Kayrawanî (d. 160-240/776-854), with a list of authors who have passed away and that it describes mercantile practices (documentations). See G. H. Bousquet, La Mudawwana, 2nd ed., Paris 1956-63), to say nothing of partial translations. It is the work of the Kayrawanî Sahnun (160-240/776-854 [q.v.]), and is a collection of Malikî fikî which contains the corrections and responses made to Sahnun by Ibn al-Kâsim al-Urâdi (d. 191/806), a disciple of Malik, according to the opinions of Malik himself, of his contemporaries and his masters in tradition including Abu Zuhri (d. 124/740), Nâfi‘ (d. 116/734) and Rabii’ al-Râyî. The Mudawwana was also called the Mughallatî, since it completed and improved upon, through the diversity of subjects considered, the Asadiyya of Ibn al-Furat (d. 213/828), a work based on the teaching of Malik and of the Hanafîs of ‘Irâk. The practical interest of the Mudawwana consists in the fact that it illustrates the connections between religion and trade and that it describes mercantile practices (documentation, bills of exchange and all kinds of commercial transactions). See G. H. Boussquet, La Mudawwana. Index (avec la table générale des matières), in Arachica, xvii/2 (1970), 113-50.

This work gave rise to a whole literature of commentaries of which the principal examples will be indicated here, some of which have been translated. The first to be mentioned are the works of Ibn Abi Zayd al-Kayrawânî (d. 386/996): the Ikhtisâr al-Mudawwana al-kubrâ. It is thus an abridged version of Malikî law, translated by L. Bercher, Algiers 1935 (see H. R. Idris, Note sur l’identification du dédicataire de la Risâla d’Ibn Abi Zayd al-Qarâwînî, in CT, 1 [1953], 63-8). Another work which enjoyed great success in North Africa is the Tahâdib al-Mudawwana, Tunis ms. Zaytûna, of Abî Sa‘id al-Barbâ‘î (d. 400/1009). In imitation of Sahnûn, the Andalusian Ibn Habîb (d. 338/945) composed al-Wadîhâ after a visit to Egypt as the guest of Ibn al-Kâsim. One of his pupils, al-Uthâbi (d. 355/969), made an abridged version of it entitled al-Uthîyâ. The Mudawwana also inspired Ibn Râghi (d. 646/1248) who restated the precepts of the Malikî school in his Mukhtasar fi ’r-fura‘. Khalîl b. Ishâk (d. 776/1374 [q.v.]) is the author of a Mukhtasar of this work. It has been translated into French by Perron (Précis de jurisprudence musulmane, 2nd éd., Paris 1877); into Italian by Guidi and Santillana in 1919, and again into French by G. H. Boussquet (Abrége de la loi musulmane de l'école de l'Imâm Malik, Algiers-Paris 1956-63), to say nothing of partial translations.
This Mukhtasar of Khalil, a basic text of Maliki law, is in its turn barely usable without the aid of commentaries, of which the best known are:

—al-Sharh ‘allî Mukhtasar Khalîl of al-Zurkânî (d. 1099/1687), published in Cairo in 1307 with a commentary by al-Bannâni (a version highly valued in the Orient);
—al-Sharh al-saghrî of Dârdîr (d. 1201/1786), Bûlâk 1289, and, of the same author;
—al-Sharh al-kabîr, Bûlâk 1295, with glosses by al-Darâsîk;
—Mukhtasar Kharîl of al-Kharîsî, with glosses by al-‘Adawî, Bûlâk 1316, vols. i and iv;

Transmission of the doctrine. According to Ibn Khâldûn (Mukhtâdîma, Cairo n.d.), until the 5th/11th century the Mâlikî school was divided into three tendencies (turâk): Kayrâwâni, Andalusian and eastern, the last-named including the ‘Irâkî, Egyptian and Alexandrian transmissions. The following are the lines of transmission from Mâlik onwards:

Kayrâwâni sanâd: Ibn al-Kâsim (d. 191/806), Sûrâ 240/854, who also inherited from Asad b. al-Furât (d. 213/828) and, by this indirect means, from the disciples of Abû Hanîfî. After Sahnûn, there are the commentaries of Abû Zâyad al-Kayrâwânî (d. 386/996), of al-Bardhâ’î (d. 400/1009), of Ibn Yûnûs (d. 451/1059), of Ibn Mûhrîz (d. 450/1058), of al-Tûnîsî (d. 443/1051) and of al-‘Aqîmî (d. 478/1085). This line of transmission established the reputation of the Mâdâwâsan and of its commentaries for the Maghrîb.

Andalusian sanâd: Yahyâ b. Yahyâ al-Layhî (d. 234/848), al-‘Ashâbî (d. 224/838), Ibn al-Mâdîshûn (d. 214/829), al-Mu’tarrifî (d. 220/835), Ibn al-Kâsim (d. 191/806) who transmitted to Ibn al-Hâshîb (d. 238/845) and in his turn to al-Utbi (d. 255/869). The Andalusian transmission for its part accorded the greatest respect to the ‘Irâkî transmission in the Orient; of which the best known commentary is the Bayân of Ibn Ruhâd (d. 520/1126 [q.v.]).

‘Irâkî sanâd: Kâdî Ismâ’îl (d. 246/860), Ibn Khwawizmînâd, Ibn al-Labbân and al-‘Abharî (d. 375/985) who transmitted to ‘Abî al-Wâhâbî (d. 421/1030). The last-named, who settled in Egypt, was to influence directly and profoundly the Egyptian sanâd.

Egyptian sanâd: Ibn ‘Abî al-Hâkâm (d. 214/829), Ibn al-Kâsim (d. 191/806) and Aqâbî (d. 204/819); al-Hârîb b. Miskîn (d. 250/864) inherited from both these last two. The following may be regarded as the most significant links in this chain of transmission: Ibn al-Rashîk (d. 632/1234) and Ibn al-Hâdîqî (d. 646/1248), the latter inheriting via the Alexandrian sanâd from Ibn ‘Inânî (d. 541/1146), Ibn ‘Atîr Allâh (d. 612/1215) and Ibn ‘A‘fî (d. 581/1185), and transmitting to al-Kârîfî (d. 684/1285). The connection between eastern and Andalusian transmission was established in the 6th/12th century with Abû Bâkî al-Turâshî (d. 520/1126), who travelled to Egypt and secured employment as a teacher in Alexandria (see V. Lagardère, L’unificateur du malikisme oriental et ocidental à Alexandrie: Abû Bâkî al-Turâshî, in ROMM, i [1981]). This connection with the Egyptian school, already manifest in the transmittance of the ‘Irâkî transmission in the person of the kâdî ‘Abî al-Wâhâbî, was to have as its consequence the abandonment, in the 7th/13th century, of the Mâdâwâsan and of the ‘Ubîyîya in favour of the Mukhtasar fi ‘l-fura’ of Ibn al-Hâdîqî (d. 646/1248). These two basic works of Mâlikî doctrine, which had led to the production of a significant output of judicial writing, continued to be influential for some time after the disappearance of Cordova and Kayrâwân as centres of learning, but lost their effective role at the end of the 8th/14th century.

Principles and judicial theory. Like other schools of Sunni Islam, Mâlikism bases its doctrine on the Kur‘ân, the Sunna and ‘îdâma [q.v.]; nevertheless, divergencies of greater or lesser significance exist in regard to the other rites. While there is unanimity surrounding the Holy Book, a primary difference appears concerning the Sunna. The tradition of the Prophet Muhammad and that of the Companions constitute the Sunna according to Mâlik, who excludes from it the tradition of ‘Ali, which other schools incorporate (in fact, in refusing to choose between ‘Ali and ‘Uthmân, Mâlik would have recognised the legitimacy of their caliphate, but, according to another trend of opinion, he would have agreed as to the superiority of ‘Uthmân, which would seem more likely in view of the fact that his school also flourished at Baghîr in an ‘Uthmânî milieu).

To ‘îdâma, universal consensus of the Musulmans, there is added the Medînîn ‘îdâma which proceeds from the distribution of the Sunna by the Prophet. By this indirect means, it can even result that this consensus prevails over hadîth. Medînîn opinion being considered to testify to the acts of the Prophet. For Mâlik, hadîth is thus not the most important source, and personal judgment, ‘a’îd, is to be used in parallel, when ‘îdâma cannot provide the answer to a question and only if this procedure does not injure the public good (masâila). Mâlik is sometimes reproached for making too much use of this method. Kijjî [q.v.], reasoning by analogy, which had many opponents among the Sunnis, is applied by the Mâlikis in cases of ‘îdâma al-‘umma.

Mâlikism and schismatics. It was the intolerance of Mâlik towards schismatics which made his school so successful. The hostility of his teaching towards the Kadaariyya [q.v.] and the Khârîjîs is based on the fact that these are considered to be outside the pale of public order and agents of corruption (fâsiqî). Khârîjîs must make an act of repentance (tawbâ); if they refuse, they are condemned to capital punishment. For the zindik [q.v.], even repentance is not allowed; he is immediately condemned to death for the crime of apostasy. In the temporal authorities, notably the ‘Abâsîd caliphate, often had recourse to a Mâlikî kâdî to judge heretics, public agitators or those considered as such. Thus it was the Mâlikî Grand Kâdî of Baghîr, Abu ‘Umar Ibn Yusuf, who tried and condemned to death al-Hâlîqî [q.v.] in 319/922. Two Shi‘î extremists of the Middle Ages are known to have perished in similar circumstances: Hasan b. Muhammâd al-Sâkânî, executed at Damascus in 744/1342, and ‘Ali b. al-Hâsân al-Halâbi, executed in 755/1354.

Mâlikism and mysticism. There is a priori no place for mysticism in the school of Mâlik. A hadîth of the Prophet forbids monasticism, which is even regarded as bid‘a. Nevertheless, under the impulse of piety an ascetic movement was established, and until the 2nd/8th century it attracted little attention. But, stimulated by the intense intellectual activity which developed in the Orient from the end of this century, mysticism spread widely and attained proportions which were disturbing for the prevailing orthodoxy. In the heartland of the Islamic State, the police of the state, in the name of the nation and the faith, condemned and the works of al-Ghazâlî (d. 505/1111), Sûfism gained ground with the Almoravids and even
flourished under the Almohads. In al-Andalus, where the milieu was particularly intolerant, the mystical movement enjoyed a brief period of ascendency with Ibn Mavara (d. 319/931) (q.v.) and his disciples (see V. Lagardère, La Tarîqa et la révolte des Murîdîn en 539H/1144 en Andalús, in ROMM, i [1983]).

The following may be named among the Mālikī mystics: Abu 'l-Kāsim al-Shirbî (d. Baghdad, 334/945), the Irīfīkīny Abū 'Uthmān Ibn Sallāmī al-Maghribī (d. Nisābūr, 373/983). After al-Ghazzâlî, mysticism triumphed with the Ḥanbâlī Abū al-Kādir al-Dīlî (d. 561/1165), whose school spread widely both in the East and the West. Abu Madyān al-Andalûsî diffused his doctrine in the Maghrib, and one of his pupils was Abû al-Salām b. Makrî (d. 624/1227), the teacher of al-Shâhîdî (d. 656/1258), who was educated in Irīfīkîya and in Egypt and had numerous disciples in Syria and the Hijāz. From this time onwards, there were many Shi‘îs among the Mālikîs. In Syria, around Ibn al-'Arabî (d. 638/1240), the greatest mystic of Muslim Spain, a complete organisation was established and zāwiyas were built for his followers. Among known Mālikī Shi‘îs, also worthy of mention are Muhammad b. Ahmad al-Bisâtî (d. 842/1438), Mālikī kādî and shaykh of the Shi‘îs of Cairo, and 'Abî b. Mūhammad al-Kurṣâî (d. Alexandria, 808/1405). Another who should be mentioned is a famous Egyptian Shi‘î who introduced gnosis (ma‘rifa) into his doctrine, Abû l-Nun al-Miṣrî; a Mālikî, he is the author of a version of the Musawwa.[1983].

Works of Ṭabākāt, other sources for the knowledge of Mālikism and of its disciples. Although the first text of Mālikī tabākāt is owed to the pen of Ibn Abî Dalîm (d. 351/962), under the title of Kitâb al-Ṭabākāt fi man yar-ṣî an Mâlik wa-ṣabīhā him mën aḥî al-amārîn, it is not this that is regarded by posterity as a fundamental work, both of tabākāt and of history of the doctrine, but the second of the genre in chronological order, that of the kādî 'Iyād (d. 544/1149 [q.v.]), which bore the title Tarît al-madârik wa-takrib al-masâlik. This source is particularly important for the reason that, in addition to the biographies of Eastern and Western Mālikîs, it contains a lengthy study of the life of Malik, his work, the expansion before dealing with the expansion itself. The next text, which contains the biographies of Mālikîs who lived after the time of 'Iyād until the end of the 8th/14th century, is the work of the Andalusian Ibn Farhûn (d. 799/1396) and is intitled al-Dhâhî al-mudhadh bî fi ma‘ṣîrat dâ‘în 'ulamâ‘ al-madhâhîb.

The Šâhîfî al-Sakkâwî (d. 780/1378) is the author of Tabākît mâlikîyya which is composed on the basis of some twenty sources mentioned in the conclusion. Two further works of Ṭabākāt directly inspired by the Dhâhî of Ibn Farhûn should be noted: Nayî al-ṣibhādî bi-tatîris al-Dhâhî of Ahmad Bâhâ (d. 1032/1622 [q.v.]), printed in the margins of the Dhâhî, and the Tawîl al-Dhâhî of al-Kâfî (d. 1008/1600). The last text of Mālikī tabākât is that of the Tunisian Mūhammad Mâlikî who lived at the beginning of the 20th century; it is intitled Ša‘ādîsîr al-nâr al-zâktîyya fi tabâkât al-Mâlikîyya and was published in Cairo in 1931. It is the most complete source, since it relates the biographies of the Prophet, of the Companions, of the tabî‘în, then those of the eminent fukahî (q.v.) of the Hijāz, of 'Irāq, of Egypt, of the Maghrib and of Andalusia, concluding with those of the masters who instructed the author in 1922.

2. THE EXPANSION OF MĀLIKISM

The Orient. In general, in the East as in the West, it was the disciples of Malik who took upon themselves the task of spreading his doctrine in his lifetime. In the Tarîh al-madârik, the kādî 'Iyād informs us that it was in Egypt, at Alexandria, that the second centre of Mālikism after Medina was established, through the efforts of 'Uthmān b. 'Abî al-Hâkam al-Dhâjâhîmi (d. 163/779), Sa‘îd b. 'Abî Allâh al-Ma‘ṣûrî who introduced Mālikism to Alexandria, and Ibn al-Kāsim al-'Utrî who lived for a long time at Medina as an intimate of Malik and was the intermediary through whom the doctrine gained sway in the Maghrib and in Muslim Spain. On his death in 479/1086, 'Abî Allâh b. Wahh (d. 197/982) succeeded him as leader of the Mālikîs of Egypt. These eminent fukahî were successful in definitively implanting Mālikism in this country in spite of the difficulties caused by living in proximity with Şâ‘îism which was ultimately to supplant it; today, this school is dominant in Egypt, but Mālikism remains active in the Şâ‘îidî.
However, the intransigent doctrine which became the norm in the Maghrib had the effect of suppressing intellectual effort and religious feeling. In fact, the study of the Qur'an and of hadith, as well as fiqh (personal effort at interpretation) were abandoned in favour of the manuals of applied f ith (furū'). The Almoravids sovereigns gave their support to these methods and encouraged the fukahā to accord supreme importance to the study of manuals of furū'. This abandonment of recourse to the Qur'an and the Sunna is denounced by al-Ghazālī in the Iḥyāʾūlīman (d. 804/1401), who considers that the Almoravids as practised by its disciples no longer had any connection with the religion as it had developed. He also condemns the important role played by the fukahā in political life. Ibn Tūmār (q.v.) went even further than al-Ghazālī. Inspired by his principles, he declared war on the Almoravids, appointed himself judge of morals, appropriated the title of Mahdī, and, by violent means, restored the orthodoxy. He banned the works of furū', and established as the basis of his doctrine elements of the pure orthodoxy, sc. Qur'an, Sunna and consensus of the umma. The doctrine of Ibn Tūmār was to be the impetus for an important mystical movement throughout the whole of the Maghrib, and in spite of the collapse of the Almohad empire, and thus of its political support, it was to imprint upon victorious Malikism an indelible mark of austerity (segregation of the sexes, fasting, dietary prohibitions, among other elements characteristic of Maghribi austerity).

It is, on the one hand, with the Hafṣīd civilisation in Ifrīqiya, under the influence of the judicial schools of Tunis, Bougie and Kairouān, and of scholars of the calibre of Ibn ʿArāfa (d. 804/1401), and on the other, with the Marinid civilisation in the Western Maghrib, and the famous madrāsas of Fās and Tlemcen, that the Renaissance of Malikism in North Africa is observed. If, today, Maghribī Islam seems particularly rigorous, this is due to Malikism. In fact, practice and doctrine have remained totally unchanged since the middle of the 7th/13th century, immediately after the fall of the Almohads. The success of Malikism in North Africa may be explained by reference to the theory Ibn Khaldūn (d. 880/1476) according to whom Bedouin culture accounts for the predominance of this school in the Muslim West. Effectively, Malikism is loyal to the Tradition and hostile to rational explanations; it is perfectly suited to the Berber mentality of the Maghribīs who refuse to accept any idea unless it can be traced back to a tradition. It is for this reason that Maghribī Malikism seems rigid in comparison to that of the East, which does not reject effort at interpretation (t i g h ā dā). In contemporary North Africa, Malikism is predominant in Morocco, Algeria, Tunisia and Libya; it coexists with some Ibadī and Ḥanāfī centres in the three last-named countries. It is exclusive in Mauritania where it has been the object, over the centuries, of an interesting adaptation (see Ould Bah, Littérature juridique). 

Muslim Spain. It was at the end of the 2nd/8th century that Malikism was introduced into Muslim Spain where it superseded the Syrian doctrine of al-Awāzī. Those who brought to the country the principles of the I mām of Medina were Andalusian scholars, initiated by Mālik himself or by his pupils. The best known among them are Ziyād b. ʿAbd al-Hakam, Yāḥyā b. Yāḥyā al-Layṭḥī, Yāḥyā b. Muḥād and Qaḥīb b. Dāmas. The latter was the nucleus of a clerical aristocracy which, throughout the duration of the Umayyad dynasty, exercised real power in the state and made Malikism the sole official rite of al-Andalus. This state of affairs, which lasted for nearly two centuries, coincided with the period of the transmitters of Malik and of the Medinan tradition, of the compilation and codification of the legal corpus, and of the composition of restatements. Andalusian Malikism was characterised then by an intransigent austerity, exclusively attached to the study of manuals of jurisprudence (f urū'), forsaking, in the manner of its Maghribī neighbour, the study of hadiths and prescribing all effort at personal reflection (i q t i g h ŏ dā).

The fall of the Umayyad caliphate, then the emergence of regional principalities (m u l k ā t al-jawārī) in the 5th/11th century, and later, the domination of the Almohads, put an end to the supremacy of jurisprudence. Political decentralisation, stimulated, at an early stage, a socio-cultural renewal with individuals including Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr (d. 1063/1653), Ibn Ḥādī (d. 547/1151) and Ibn Ḥazm (d. 1065/1653); with the last-named, a Zāhirī jurist who opposed the Mālikī doctrine, hadith, the oral fākā and polemics of judicial methodology (ṣ i l a) became the order of the day (see in this context, the edition of al-Miḥrābī ḍī l- ḍ ārīʾī ḍī l-ḥaḍārī of ḍārīʾī ḍī l-ḥaḍārī, edited by A. M. Turki, Paris 1978, and Turki, P o l é m i q u e i n t e r i m B i n Ḥ a z m e t ḍ a s i i s u r les p r i n c i p e s d e la l o i m u s l i m a n e, Algiers 1976).

This opening towards the exterior, towards other systems of thought, is given formal expression in the work of Ibn Rushān (d. 502/1108), especially with the B i l a d a r j a n, i n t r o d u c t o r y work of Ibn al-Malikīn, muluk tā r (ed. C. Corso 1329). Nevertheless, the class of the f ukahā retained a dominant position until the last days of the Andalusian principalities and in particular that of Granada, by means of individuals like Ibn Lubb and Muḥām mād al-Sarākūṣī in the 8th/14th and 9th/15th centuries, and through them, Malikism, as the compilations of treatises testify.

Africa, Bilād al-Sūdān. Islam was propagated at an early stage in the Sudan, among the Nūba of the Nile Valley. But it was not until the 10th/16th century that it was introduced to Dār ʿFūr by Arab tribes. The progress of Islam became most definitive towards the end of the 13th/19th century under the influence of the M a h d ī Muḥammad Ahmad. At the present time, the majority of the Muslims of the Sudan are of the Mālikī rite and use the M u k h t ā s ā r of Khalīl. Islam spread to Kanem in the 5th/11th century and was firmly established around Lake Chad from the 9th/15th century onwards.

In West Africa, Malikism was introduced by the Almoravid conquest of the T akūr (Fūta Tōrō) among tribes which were to a greater or lesser extent vassals of Ghāna. At the end of the 5th/11th century, Islamisation gained sway in the Gold Coast. Tim- buktu became the Islamic metropolis of the western Sudan in the 8th/14th century, and its influence lasted until the conquest of Songhay by Morocco in 1000/1591. It was especially among political functionaries and senior officials that the Muslim faith was spread. It was not until the 12th/18th and 13th/19th centuries that theocratic monarchies were established in Fūta Djalon and Fūta Tōrō, following the victories of the Toucouleur Muslims over the Peuls who were forcibly converted. The Toucouleur Usmānī Fōdį preached ḍ ī l-ḥaḍād and founded the empire of Sokoto in 1207/1802. Muslim law was introduced to Masina by the Peul Sēku Hamadu Bari in 1225/1810 and, in 1256/1820, the Toucouleur al-Ḥādī ʿUmar had himself appointed khālīfā t i g h ā n āt for the Sudan. A vast empire was established in which the Muslim faith was dominant. But, at the present time, there are Malikī Muslims in the Black African states of Senegal, Mali, Niger, Togo, Chad and Nigeria.

Bibliography: I. For the general study of
MALIKIYYA — MALIYYE


MALINDI, a town on the Kenya coast in lat 4°N. It is first mentioned in literature by al-Idrīsī (ca. 1150); the Ma-in mentioned by Ou-yang Hsiu, Hsin T'ang-shu, ca. 1600, is more likely to have been situated in Somalia. Al-Idrīsī says that it was a town of hunters and fishermen, whose inhabitants owned and exploited iron mines. Iron was their greatest source of profit. The iron, however, as A. O. Thompson has shown, was not mined, but recoverable from seashore deposits. Al-Idrīsī also mentions Malindi as a centre of witchcraft, a view also confirmed by Abu l-Fida (1273-1331), who adds that it was the capital of the King of the Zandī; he is likewise aware of the exploitation of iron. Malindi was visited by the Chinese admiral Chen Hō in the course of his fifth diplomatic and commercial voyage in the Indian Ocean. Otherwise, little is known of the town in the Middle Ages.

It was from Malindi that Vasco da Gama set off for India in 1498 under the guidance of the pilot Ahmad b. Mādīj al-Nadjāfī [see nāmān]. Da Gama had been cold-shouldered at Mombasa, but was well received at Malindi, where the ruler had an ancient enmity against Mombasa. The town of Malindi, which in Swahili means ‘deep-water anchorage’, lay in a bay and extended along the shore. A more detailed description is given by Duarte Barbosa in ca. 1517-18. The place was well laid out, with many storeyed houses with flat roofs. The people traded gold, ivory and wax, importing rice, millet and wheat from Cambodia. It was visited briefly by St Francis Xavier in 1542, when he had a conversation with a kādī, who would seem to have been a Shī'ī. He reported that the practice of Islam had greatly declined in recent years, and that, out of seventeen mosques, only three were in use. A later missionary, Fr João dos Santos O. P., reported in 1609 that the whole coast from Mozambique to Lamu was Shī'ī.

The royal family of Malindi was of Shi'ī descent, and possibly related to that of Kilwa [p. 40]. When the royal line of Mombasa failed in ca. 1570, the Portuguese who were virtual sovereign powers over them which even the Sultan of Kilwa could not overrule. After the move of the royal house to Mombasa, the town lost its importance. Captain Owen found it deserted in 1827. The modern seaside resort contains few Islamic antiquities: two ruined mosques, a cemetery, and a piller tomb which is possibly near the site of the former royal palace.

Ten miles from Malindi to the south, and two miles inland, is the very remarkable Islamic site of Gedi, which was occupied from the 11th until the 17th century, when it was abandoned to nature. The outer wall encloses an area of about 45 acres, and may have contained a population of some 10,000. Within the inner wall are a palace, a Friday mosque and several other small mosques, numerous houses and what may have been a commercial centre. The place is not mentioned either in Arabic or Portuguese literature. Its proximity to Malindi, and the fact that it lies some two miles from the sea, suggests that, unlike other eastern African coastal sites, which were primarily trading centres, Gedi was, as it were, a country residence of the sultans of Malindi, around which a small town had grown up. Three architectural features of the houses are of especial interest: the houses are divided into two distinct compartments, presumably for a wife each; of these compartments one has a store especially designed for cowrie shells, the local currency; and the palace and houses have elaborately constructed water conduits, leading to internal ablations and latrines.


MALIYYE. In the Ottoman Empire and successor states. In the 19th and 20th centuries, this term has been used in Arabic and Turkish to refer to financial affairs and financial administration. In the Ottoman Empire, and in various of its successor states, the term has also acquired a more specific reference to the Ministry of Finance (Maliyye Nezāreti under the empire; Maliyye Wekālet or bakānlığı under the Turkish Republic; Wizārat al-Maliyye in the Arab states). The history of financial institutions in the Ottoman Empire and its successor states still awaits thorough research. In part, this fact is attributable to problems of the original sources, which remain largely inaccessible even for the empire (e.g., Çetin, 28-35, 42, 83, 128, 153-4, 155-60; Serroğlu, 62-7, 72, tughue donated Mombasa to the Malindi dynasty, which then reigned from Mombasa until 1632 [see MOMBASA]. In the 18th century the Malindi traders at Kilwa had as their chief an officer known as the Malindi governor, a powerful figure of whom even the Sultan of Kilwa could not overrule. After the move of the royal house to Mombasa, the town lost its importance. Captain Owen found it deserted in 1827. The modern seaside resort contains few Islamic antiquities: two ruined mosques, a cemetery, and a pillar tomb which is possibly near the site of the former royal palace.

Ten miles from Malindi to the south, and two miles inland, is the very remarkable Islamic site of Gedi, which was occupied from the 11th until the 17th century, when it was abandoned to nature. The outer wall encloses an area of about 45 acres, and may have contained a population of some 10,000. Within the inner wall are a palace, a Friday mosque and several other small mosques, numerous houses and what may have been a commercial centre. The place is not mentioned either in Arabic or Portuguese literature. Its proximity to Malindi, and the fact that it lies some two miles from the sea, suggests that, unlike other eastern African coastal sites, which were primarily trading centres, Gedi was, as it were, a country residence of the sultans of Malindi, around which a small town had grown up. Three architectural features of the houses are of especial interest: the houses are divided into two distinct compartments, presumably for a wife each; of these compartments one has a store especially designed for cowrie shells, the local currency; and the palace and houses have elaborately constructed water conduits, leading to internal ablations and latrines.

74, 78-9, 85). In part, the challenge of studying the history of the financial institutions, or financial problems more generally, derives from the fact that the economic and financial topics of the first, second, and third "divisions" (defterdar-ı şhîkî-ı nüseb, ûnûrî, iltîzâm) have concentrated on problems of particular interest to people outside the Islamic world, this discussion will concentrate on maliyye in the sense of institutions for financial administration. Even within that limit, it will focus on the Ministry of Finance of the Ottoman Empire and the Republic of Turkey. A concluding section will offer comments aimed at setting Ottoman and republican Turkish developments in a comparative perspective that encompasses other Islamic states.

1. The late Ottoman Empire. During the last quarter of the 18th century, the Ottoman financial agencies were still concentrated in a large building situated between Top Kapî Palace and the Sublime Porte and referred to by terms such as Bâb-ı Defteri. These agencies were presided over by three officials known respectively as the defterdar [q.v.] of the first, second, and third "divisions" (defterdar-ı şhîkî-ı nüseb, ûnûrî, iltîzâm). In the 18th century, the first defterdar functioned as the real head of the financial departments, and the other two as assistants to him. Different sources from the period show the Bâb-ı Defteri as including a slightly varying list of bureaux, numbering close to 30. In addition to records on the revenues and disbursements of the empire, these bureaux kept the muster rolls and pay records of various categories of military personnel and palace functionaries, as well as the records on the provisioning of the capital city and major fortresses. Other responsibilities of the offices of the Bâb-ı Defteri included processing the papers for appointments of Muslim religious functionaries, maintaining records on relations between the imperial government and the non-Muslim religious authorities of the empire, and disposing of the estates (mükkeflât) of important officials, when these estates reverted to the sultan by death or expropriation. As was characteristic of Ottoman government agencies of the period, these responsibilities were parcelled out among the various bureaux in a way that reflected the effects of accretion over time, more than any effort at systematisation. At the head of each bureaux stood an official holding the rank of the scribal elite (khâkin-i deyân). The potential for gradual change among the financial agencies, even before the beginning of serious efforts at innovative reform, was illustrated by the introduction, at the beginning of the reign of Selim III, of a type of internal debt securities (eshâm) and the creation of a new bureau to maintain the records on them (Eshâm Müktef-ı Kâlêm). According to a source of ca. 1770-90 (Top Kapu Sarayı Arşivi D3208), the number of officials employed in the offices discussed here was about 650. This fact made the Bâb-ı Defterî the largest, though not the most influential, of the scribal agencies.

Eighteenth-century Ottoman financial practice displayed several traits of particular significance for later periods. One was the custom of assigning specific revenues to specific expenses and limiting the extent to which transfers could be made. This practice goes back to the beginnings of Islamic fiscal practice and is still found in many parts of the world, but is in contrast to the preferred modern practice, at least in the West, of pooling revenues in a unified budget (Heidbreder, ii, 12-14). A second characteristic, particularly prominent among the Ottomans in the era of imperial decline: revenue collection by means of tax farms, either on an annual basis (iltûzûm) or for life (mâlikânî [q.v.]; Issawi, Turkey, 343-7). A third practice, which helps to explain the reliance on tax farming, was that some of the most important revenues continued to be collected in kind.

The chief business of the offices of the Bâb-ı Defterî was to keep records of transactions organised on these bases. In furtherance of this, the staff included, in addition to the bureaux discussed above, an auctioneer (mürtî dellâtî bagîşîtî) to conduct auctions of tax farms, an 'âlim appointed with the title mürtî kâthîbî to hear cases arising between the financial department and revenue farmers or other individuals; and stafis of quasi-police officers (bâsh bâsh kâtû, kâthîb bâsh bâsh kâtû) whose responsibility was to collect overdue revenues (d'Ossios, iii, 375-9; Hammer, Staats., ii, 145-69; Uzuçarşılı, 319-73).

In the late 18th century, the treasury was still located in Top Kapî Palace. In fact, there were two treasuries. One was known as the outer treasury (khażîne-ye bûrûn, āfûrîa khażîne-i) or state treasury (khażîne-i umûmî). The other was known as the inner treasury (khażîne-ye endûrûn, iî khażîne-i). The latter was supposed to be a reserve treasury, filled at least in part out of the surplus of the former and bound to aid the former in event of shortage. In addition, there were a number of so-called khażînes, including a "privy purse" (qeyb-î humâyûne) at the palace and a number of others located in specific government agencies [see khażînez]. These were little more than special funds or cashiers' offices for specific needs or departments (Deny, 119-20).

Substantial efforts at reform of Ottoman financial institutions began under Selim III (1789-1807 [q.v.]) in conjunction with his programme of military reform. To finance his new military force, he created a "new receipts treasury" (rûdî-î qâtîd khażîne-i), under the control of the former defterdar of the "second division" (şhîkî-ı ûnûrî), and assigned a number of revenues to him. The new treasury survived until the end of Selim's reign, when, like other reforms of his "new order" (nizâm-i qâtîd [q.v.]), it was eliminated. Those of its revenues sources that were still productive were reassigned to the "treasury of the Mint (darbkhânâ-î umûmî khażînên), which was a branch of the inner or private treasury (Mûstafâ Nûri, iv, 113-14; Pakaln, OTD, ii, 79-80; Shaw, Old and New, 128-34). Selim's reforms also included some efforts to limit fiscal exactions and to reorganise the state treasury (ibid., 170, 174).

Under Mahmud II (1808-29 [q.v.]), financial reform resumed in the 1820s, at first, it appears, as a concomitant of efforts in other fields. For example, Mahmûd assigned a number of Anatolian sandûqs to a kind of collection agents (mütezelîm), rather than the normal type of provincial administrators (wâli, mutasarrîf). Such assignment of mütezelîms was not new, but this time the revenues that would otherwise have gone to the wâli or mutasarrîf were diverted to Istanbul [see khażînez, iv, 1185]. Another of Mahmûd's policies affected the timar [q.v.] system and the provincial cavalry (sipahi [q.v.]) who had traditionally benefited from it. In 1241/1825-6, Mahmûd began re-assigning timars and sipahis to other types of military forces (Drewdet, Ta'shîx xii, 143-4). In 1831,
he attempted to abolish what remained of the timar-system and to carry out a land survey and census (Lewis, 90-2).

While the exact course of events is still not entirely clear, Maḥmūd's reforms had clearly extended by then into a direct reorganisation of financial offices. With the abolition of the Janissaries in 1826, the one of the offices of the Bāb-ı Defteri that had been responsible for maintaining records of that corps, that of the yeḥi-leri kābiṣ, went through a series of changes of name and function, emerging as a "military supervisory" (vakfne-i nežāreti; Lufti, i, 132, 143; Pakalın, Maliye, i, 22-3). By 1831, further change had produced at least two financial "supervisorships", a maṣāřfīnāt nežāreti, responsible for military expenditure, and a muḳāṭātāt nežāreti, responsible for other aspects of government finance. This nomenclature is somewhat confusing, since presumably the revenues assigned to both agencies were farmed out, although the term muṣābāta might be taken to indicate that this was true only of the second (Heidborn, ii, 37; Pakalın, Maliye, i, 10; idem, OTD, ii, 578). Over the next several years, there were a number of further reorganisations, a persistent feature, at least until 1838, being maintenance of one agency for military finance and another for government finance more generally (Hammer, Histoire, xvii, 102; Lufti, iv, 111; idem, OTD, ii, 578-5). In 1829-30, for example, we find a state treasury (khazīne-yi ʿamīre) and a financial agency for the army, referred to as the mansūrī defterdārātī (Heidborn, ii, 37; Pakalın, OTD, ii, 406-7). In 1251/1835-6, the state treasury (khazīne-yi ʿamīre) was combined with that of the mint (darb-khāne), the new agency being placed under the headship of a darb-khāne defterdārā (Lufti, v, 17). Then on 3 Dhu 'l-Hijja 1253/28 February 1839, the mansūrī defterdārālī was added to the organisation, the mint was again separated out, and the result became known as the Ministry of Financial Affairs (Umūr-i Miṣāliyye Neżāret). The second half of the 1830s was when Maḥmūd organised the larger departments of the Ottoman government into European-style ministries, for which he adopted the generic term neżāret. From that point onwards, that term continued, as in the past, to refer both to small-scale agencies, where it is more appropriately translated as "supervisory", and to the new ministries. The financial agency created in 1838 was clearly of the latter type (Lufti, v, 105-116; idem, OTD, ii, 578). Following the death of Maḥmūd II, the development of the Ottoman system of financial administration reflected both the goals of reformers like Muṣṭafā Reğ fid [q.v.], and the intensity of the political struggle that surrounded them. At the death of Maḥmūd, Khosrow Paşha [q.v.] seized the grand vizierate and set to work undoing many of the reforms of the late sultan and his civilian bureaucratic advisers, who were Khosrow's enemies. Among other things, Khosrow abolished the Ministry of Financial Affairs (Qumāda-i ʿÜlû 1255/July-August 1839), replacing it with a dual system of state treasury (khazīne-yi ʿamīre) and a defterdātī for farmed revenues (muḳāṭātā; Pakalın, Maliye, iii, 96). When Muṣṭafā Reğ fid and his friends managed to topple Khosrow in 1840, they also launched an ambitious attempt to replace tax-farming with direct collection of revenues, at least in selected localities. About the same time, it appears that they converted the defterdātī for farmed revenues into a Ministry of Finance (Miṣāliyye Neżāret) responsible for supervision of the system of direct collection, delegating responsibility for revenues that continued to be administered in the "old way" to the state treasury (khazīne-yi ʿamīre; Lufti, vi, 68-9, 106). At the beginning of 1257/1841, the treasury was again combined with the mint to form a Ministry of Financial Affairs (Umūr-i Miṣāliyye Neżāret; Pakalın, Maliye, i, 26). Muṣṭafā Reğ fid and his friends did not consolidate their hold on high office until ca. 1845; however, the history of the Ministry of Finance was continuous from 1841 onwards. By the early 1840s, the bureaux formerly attached to the Bāb-ı Defteri had also undergone considerable modification; and the ministry had acquired a number of new functionaries and agencies. The resulting organisation remained essentially unchanged from that point until 1297/1880 (Lufti, v, 105, 116; vi, 125-6; Pakalın, Maliye, i, 26-7; iii, 29-31, 34).

Had Muṣṭafā Reğ fid and his colleagues succeeded in realising the policy goals that lay behind these changes of organisation, the results might have done a lot to provide the Tanzimat [q.v.] reforms with the sound economic foundation that they never acquired. What the reformers intended was a fundamental reorganisation of the system of taxation: eliminating many of the old taxes, especially the arbitrary exactions (takâlif-i ʿarfjī), substituting direct collection for revenue farming, centralising receipts and disbursements in the state treasury, and assigning generally to all officials to replace the prebendal forms (μοναπόστολοι) of connected officials, and the bureaux, which most of them had previously depended. In 1838, the tax reforms were inaugurated on an experimental basis in selected provinces, and the salary system was supposed to go into effect. The Gûlûkhanâ Decree of 1839 proclaimed the general principles underlying the changes. Subsequent acts generalised the fiscal reforms to a larger number of provinces. The chief agents of the new system of revenue-collection were to be collectors (muḥājīlîs) appointed to assess and collect revenues in collaboration with locally appointed administrative councils (mēdīlis-i idārē), which were to include both ex officio members and representatives of the local populace (ʿAbd al-Raḥmān Wefik, i, 346-7; ii, 6-50; Inalcik, Tanzimat ve uygulamaları, 623 ff.; idem, Application de la Tanzimat, 97 ff.; Shaw, Tax reform, 420). These reforms failed, and the Ottomans never succeeded in overcoming the consequences. In part, the failure resulted from the fact that the Ottoman system of financial administration was not ready for the demands that fiscal centralisation made on it. In part, the problem resulted from the opposition of former tax farmers or ṣarāfs [q.v.], who had vested interests in the old system (Pakalın, Maliye, iii, 52-4; Shaw, Tax reform, 422). In any case, revenue receipts fell off. In 1258/1842, tax farming (ilīṭāzām, but not the life farms, mālkhān) had to be restored (Pakalın, OTD, ii, 397). Direct collection was later revived for some taxes. But for the time on agricultural produce (ašāf), the most important single revenue, tax farming continued at least into the Young Turk period (Heidborn, ii, 117-30; Lewis, 385-6, 438; Shaw, Tax reform, 420-9; Issawi, Turkey, 351-60). The failure of the effort at centralisation of revenue collection crippled the new system of official salaries from the start. And that was not all.

The extent to which the Ottoman Empire had been integrated, prior to the 19th century, into the worldwide system of European economic dominance is clear from the evolution of the capitulations (imṭāyāzāt [q.v.]) and the abuses that developed out of them. One of the saddest ironies of the Tanzimat is that the economic subordination of the empire underwent a critical tightening in 1838, just as the new period was about to open. This occurred with the adoption of
the Anglo-Ottoman Commercial Convention of Balta Liman. This, and comparable treaties concluded later with other states, marked the substitution of negotiated bilateral treaties for the capitulations. More important, it forced Ottoman statesmen, who were desperate at that point for European help against the Egyptian challenge, to accept what amounted to free trade (Bailey, Kütükoğlu). The effects on an unindustrialised economy, in which customs revenues had traditionally been one of the most important cash revenues, were very serious. Not only were Ottoman markets now open wide to European industrial goods, but the ability of the Ottoman government to raise new revenue, either by taxation or by setting up monopolies or other government enterprises, was limited by the terms of the treaties (du Velay, 338).

The deteriorating economic situation, and the political and military crisis with Egypt, led to the issue in 1846 of the first Ottoman paper money (kağıt para). This remained in circulation until 1862, and gave rise to serious problems of counterfeiting and depreciation. Paper money was again issued in the wake of the Russo-Turkish War and during World War I (Toprak, 205 ff.). The coinage, too, was in disarray (Schaeler, 25 ff.; Issawi, Turkey, 326-31).

The monetary problems were aggravated by the lack, prior to the second half of the century, of modern banking facilities; when created, these were essentially foreign enterprises (du Velay, 132 ff.; Biliotti; Issawi, Turkey, 339-42).

To make matters worse, the Ottoman government began during the Crimean War to contract foreign loans (Djewdet, Tefâikir, 1-12, 20-3; du Velay, 134 ff.). In a little over twenty years, the empire acquired a foreign debt of 200 million pounds sterling (Blaisdell, 74) and expected a complete collapse of its credit. The crisis over the public debt resulted in Muharram 1299/1881 in the creation of an international Council of the Public Debt (düvân-i umûmmiyê [q.v.]), to which the Ottoman government was forced to cede control of a number of revenues (du Velay, 463 ff.; Young, v, 55 ff.; Blaisdell, 90 ff.; Issawi, Turkey, 361-5). The Russo-Turkish War also left the empire saddled with an indemnity of 35 million Turkish pounds to pay to Russia (Blaisdell, 85; Heidborn, ii, 45-9; du Velay, 174-88, 317-24).

The late 19th century nonetheless witnessed some efforts to improve the organisation and efficiency of financial institutions. There was an attempt in 1277/1861 to organise a hierarchy of fiscal officials to serve in the local administrative system then being created (Dâistâr, ii, 4-25). Under ʻAbd al-Hamîd, there were further acts on this subject and on the related issue of tax collection (Young, v, 18-21). The Constitution of 1876 contained a special section on financial affairs, including articles on taxation, budgeting, and the creation of an independent Board of Audit (Düvân-ı Muhasâbat; Dâistâr, iv, 16-17, arts. 96-107). The law of 1877 on provincial municipalities authorised them to have their own budgets (Young, i, 69-84; Dâistâr, iv, 538-53). After the Russo-Turkish War, there was a flurry of effort at reorganisation on a number of fronts, the purpose being to convince the major powers of the empire's capacity for reform. Among the measures then enacted were one of 1296/1879 setting up the Board of Audit (Düvân-ı Muhasâbat; Dâistâr, iv, 602-13) and another of 1297/1880 reorganising the Ministry of Finance (ibid., iv, 674-84; Pakalîn, Mâliyye, i, 28-30, 32-7). The latter measure reorganised the ministry and its personnel into two components, the central organisation (heyyî-i merkezîyye) and the attached agencies (heyyî-i muhâfaza) located either in the provinces or in other ministries at the centre. The central organisation was to include a corps of inspectors (heyvî-i teşfîhiyye) empowered to investigate the accounts of all central and provincial departments. Under the Hamîdîn régime, control measures such as the inspectorate and the Board of Audit produced little real effect. The practice of filling the post of undersecretary of finance (Mâliyye muhtesîbi) with a foreign expert did at least preserve a continuing source of critical perspective on fiscal affairs (Young, v, 16).
There was also another extensive reorganisation of the ministry in ca. 1305/1888. The ministry in this form appears to have been distinguished by the complexity of its internal organisation and records-keeping procedures (Pasha, Ministry of Finance, ii, 137-42). Like most governmental agencies under 'Abd al-Hamid, it also became grossly overstaffed. The number of officials in its central offices stood at 650 in 1879, 750 in 1888, and perhaps 1,400 at the time of the Young Turk Revolution (ibid., i, 36, 32).

The 1908 Revolution opened the way for efforts at fundamental reform in finance, as in other fields. The most important reforms of the period appear to have been three in number. First, as part of a program affecting the bureaucracy in general, there was a purge (tengibât) of superfluous and unreliable officials and a reduction of salaries for all others (Findley, 296-8). The purge was carried out in several waves and reduced the number of officials in the central offices of the ministry for a time to about 800. Second, as a natural extension of the purge, there was a reorganisation of the ministry. Thenceforth, its central agencies consisted of the minister, his undersecretary, a directorate general for accounts, eight specialised departments, and two consultative bodies. One of these, the Financial Reform Commission (İslâhât-i Maliyye Komisyonu), included foreign as well as Ottoman members and served to study reform proposals and draft legislation on them; the other, the Consultative Committee (Endşâm-i Mülkâbene), was to advise on implementation of a new accounting system. Even more important, the inspectorate of finance and the Board of Audit (Düvân-i Mühâsbêt) were at last made into active institutions. The ongoing practice of training financial inspectors by a period of apprenticeship abroad dates from this period (Ayni, 25). The third major reform of the Young Turk years was a new system of accountability, embodied in a law (usul-i mühâşebet-i sümâmiyye kânûnî) that went into effect in 1911. The new system centralised control of revenue and expenditure in the Ministry of Finance, established in principle the universality of the state budget, defined the system for budget preparation, and provided for a directorate of accounts, controlled by the minister of finance, in every ministry. These major reforms of the Young Turk period were the most important innovations attempted in government finance since the beginning of the Tanzimat (Heidborn, ii, 42-65; Pakahn, Maliyye, i, 30-1, 50-5).

In addition, the Young Turk years also included many other financial innovations. Publication of budgets and other acts of fiscal relevance began for the first time on a prompt and regular basis, and the budgets were much more realistic than any published before (see Bibb.). Some taxes were abolished, and the assessment and collection of many others revised. The law of 1913 on provincial administration allowed each province to have a budget consisting of revenue and expenditure items controlled at the provincial level (Dişisin', v, 144, 186-216, arts. 79-83; vi, 505-8). The Land Registry Office (Dişfet-i Kâhidâni [p. v.]), was attached to the Ministry of Finance. A special school for financial officials (Maliyye Mektebi) was founded in 1910. The privileges that foreigners enjoyed under the capitulations were unilaterally repudiated in 1914. In response to wartime needs, a Ministry of Supply (Jâde Nezâri) was eventually created. Many of these reforms occurred during the four periods between 1909 and 1918 when Djâwâd Bey [p. v.] was minister of finance (Pakahn, Maliyye, iv, 238-9, 243, 246-7).

2. The Turkish Republic. Following the collapse of the empire, the Turkish Republic managed to extricate itself from the problems that had done most to breach Ottoman economic sovereignty. The position of Ottoman debt among the various successor states, states, and the shrinkage during the armistice period of the territory under control of the Ottoman government (Blaisdell, 179 ff.). The Treaty of Lausanne (1923) recognised the end of the capitulatory régime in Turkey and apportioned the Ottoman debt among the various successor states, setting the share of the Turkish Republic at 67%. The Turkish government accepted the debt obligations assigned to it, but later unilaterally suspended payment, and in 1943 made a final offer to redeem outstanding bonds at a reduced rate (Robinson, 98-9).

Meanwhile, the development of the Ministry of Finance, as of other agencies of the new government, was "evolutionary, rather than revolutionary" (Dodd, 47). Although the matter appears not to have been studied, there must have been substantial initial carry-over of personnel and organisation from the imperial government. Serious efforts at financial reorganisation came only with the abolition of the tithes (a'zân) in 1925 and subsequent tax reforms (Ayni, 29), then in 1929 with a reorganisation of the Ministry of Finance under a law on unification and equalisation of government payrolls (deslet memurlarının maaşlarının tevhid ve taadul hakkındaki kanun; Ulker, 91). These provisions were superseded by a law of 1936 on the organisation and duties of the Ministry of Finance (maliye bakaniyla teşkilât ve vazifeleri hakkındaki kanun; Gorvine and Barber, 78-89). With numerous amendments, this remained in effect in the mid-1970s (Ulker, 91-2; Teşkilât ve Vazifevi 1976). Under the Republic, the mission of the Ministry of Finance has been defined as "to carry out the financial administration of the State in harmony with the efforts directed toward the economic development of the country" (Organization and functions, 164). In keeping with this extension of the old concept of financial administration into the newer one of economic development, the internal organisation and the size of the ministry have become considerably greater than in the Ottoman period, while a number of other organisations with related missions have also come into existence.

In contrast to the bipartite organisation of central and attached officials prescribed for the ministry in 1880, the Republican Ministry of Finance comprises four categories of agencies: central, provincial, international, and attached (bağlı) or related (iletilidâ). During the mid-1970s, the central organisation had at its top the minister, with his undersecretary, assistant undersecretaries, and private secretariat. There were five advisory and staff units, including the Financial Inspectorate (teşhis kurulu), the Board of Accounting Experts, and the Board of Certified Bank Examiners (bankalar yönetim merkezleri kurulu). The ministry had six principal organisational units, including a department for legal counsel and general directorates for budget and financial control, accounts (muhasebet), revenues (gelirler), and the treasury, the last also serving as a general secretariat for international economic co-operation. There were also support agencies in charge of personnel (izlêk ifleri), the mint and printing plant, the accounts of the ministry itself, etc. The provincial agencies of the Ministry of Finance were found at the two highest jurisdictional levels of the local administrative hierarchy, the il (province) and the ilçe.
At the province level, the chief financial officer continued to bear the old title defterdar. There were a number of agencies attached to him with functions parallel to various of the central agencies. The most important of these provincial agencies were those responsible for assessment and collection of taxes. At the next lower administrative level, the îleçı, the senior official was the mal müdürü, whose functions and staff were a reduced-scale replica of those of the provincial defterdar. The international agencies included financial representatives serving with the Turkish missions to organisations like the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (Brussels) or the United Nations (New York), as well as financial counsellors attached to embassies and consulates. The category of agencies attached or related to the Ministry of Finance included the Central Bank, the State Investment Bank, the government retirement fund, and the national lottery (Turkish government organization manual, 138 ff.; Ulker, 92 ff.; Teşkilât tebrihi 1976, 333 ff.).

During the mid-1960s, the staff of the ministry reportedly stood on average at 2,000 in the central offices and 15,000 in all (Ulker, 92). A decade later, it was reported at 5,600 in the central offices and over 40,000 in total (Teşkilât tebrihi 1976, 342). The comparison between these two sets of figures is startling, suggesting that political forces have again been at work, as in the days of 'Abd al-Ḥamīd, to blot the bare facts of this explanation of the short-term contrast, that between either of these sets of figures and those dating from the empire is probably more significant. Whatever other factors may be at work, the presence of many times more financial officials in a state much smaller than the empire surely reflects the greater demands made on the ministry in a society committed not just to financial administration, but to economic development.

Indeed, the growth of the Ministry of Finance is only a partial illustration of this point. To appreciate it fully, one must also note the proliferation of governmental agencies with financial and economic responsibilities. The empire in its day had ministries, which appear not to have been very effective, for trade, agriculture, public works, forests and mines, as well as interior administration. Atatürk committed the Republic to eliminating the hold of foreign interests over the economy and to étatism, and the first state plan for economic development went into effect in 1934 (Robinson, 103 ff.; Hershlag, 31 ff.; Issawi, Turkey, 367-8). By then, the development of a new series of official and semi-official agencies had begun. By the mid-1960s, this series included the State Planning Organisation (Devlet Planlama Teşkilati, created 1960), Board of Audit (now known as Savunmaşyet instead of Dîwan-i Mubâhebâtî), the ministries of customs and monopolies, commerce, industry, public works, communications, agriculture, health and social assistance, reconstruction and settlement, tourism and information, plus other agencies or enterprises concerned with banking, energy, natural resources, land tenure, and various forms of industrial production (Organization and functions, 62-6, 163-4, 196-317). The obvious need for coordination among so many agencies has given rise to several interministerial bodies intended to perform this function in support of the development plans (Teşkilât tebrihi 1976, 139-43, 156-8). Where the Ministry of Finance is concerned, probably the most critical need for co-ordination arises between it and the State Planning Organisation, which not only provides general guidelines, but also prepares plans for the state but also plays a central role, together with the Ministry of Finance, in budget preparation (Dodd, 245-6; Organization and functions, 175-76).

The Ministry of Finance of the Turkish Republic, though vastly larger in size and wider-ranging in functions than its imperial prototype, has thus been surrounded with a galaxy of agencies with financial and economic responsibilities. According to recent sources, some major developmental needs of the ministry are still unmet. These include improved coordination with other agencies, especially the planning organisation; the full acceptance of "programme budgeting", as opposed to dispersion of sums needed for a given project under different headings; and an end to the age-old practice of assigning specific revenues to specific needs (Dodd, 246; Organization and functions, 170-1, 179-80). The last point, in particular, shows that the Ottoman tradition dies hard. To these problems must, of course, be added others of general economic significance, such as the monetary instability and mounting public debt that have again come to plague the republic.

3. Comparative note. In the 19th century, the financial and economic history of autonomous regions within the Empire passed through stages parallel to those observable in Istanbul. The similarities derive from a common institutional heritage, similar economic and environmental constraints, and confrontation with the same set of problems in dealing with the outside world. At many points, there is not only parallelism, but also contemporaneity, in the major economic events occurring in different localities. In the 20th century, parallels are equally noticeable, the main difference being the proliferation of sovereign states and the growth of emphasis on economic development. In both periods, similar traits can be found in Islamic states beyond the frontiers or former frontiers of the empire, as well as farther afield.

In the 19th century, there were two regions in the Islamic parts of the empire that the Ottomans acknowledged as autonomous. These were the "privileged provinces" (zâyiêt-i miyâtâtî) of Egypt and Tunisia. As early as the time of Muhammad 'Ali (1805-49), Egypt, at least, began to develop financial agencies that resembled, and for a time anticipated, those of Istanbul in their development. Both Tunisia and Egypt, in addition to their extensively organised system of ministries in the 1850s; the Istanbul government had done so in the late 1830s. Tunisia and Egypt resembled their suzerain in the form and weakness of procedures for budgeting and revenue control. They shared the same problems where the privileges of foreigners were concerned. Tunis, Cairo, and Istanbul all began to accumulate a foreign debt between 1854 and 1862. Bankruptcy occurred for Tunisia as early as 1866; for Cairo and Istanbul, it came a decade later, although Egypt had been in deep trouble ever since the collapse of the cotton boom enjoyed during the American Civil War (1861-5). Fiscal control agencies, dominated by Europeans, were established in all three places between 1870 and 1881. In Egypt, there was not only a Caisse de la dette, but also an Anglo-French dual controllership over the remainder of government finance. Even the personal fortune of the Khedive was taken under European control (Deny, 104-20, 131-43, 398-414, 519-48; Rivlin, 75-136; Landes, 278 ff.; Issawi, Egypt: an economic and social analysis, 23-5; idem, Economic history of the Middle East and North Africa, 62-70; Owen, 122-52, 216-43; Brown, 134-7, 245-50, 335-49; Ganiage, 99-112, 186-216, 298-334, 348-402). It is true that Tunisia came under French domination in 1881, and Egypt did in 1882, while the territories remaining under control of the Istanbul government did not. Yet for the Istanbul government, as for the few other
Asian and African states that retained nominal independence in this period, sovereignty became almost a fiction. With its fiscal system a weaker version of the Ottoman one, and its economy even more dominated by foreign interests, Ködör Irán is one of the clearest examples (Bakhsh, *Evolution, 139 ff.; idem, *Iran, 102-4, 110-14, 142-4, 166-7, 263-6, 270-81).
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Despite this uncertainty in matters of chronology, evidence, such as the listing of a number of villages in the näbiye of Malkara as forming part of the waqf of Sulayyûn Pasha, and the names of some of them (e.g. Sarukhanlu, Kastamolu, Tatdarlar, Karî Akki, Kara Yalbûhi; cf. Gökbilgin, op. cit., 167-8; Beldiceanu-Steinherr, op. cit., 142-3), suggests both the origin and the rapidity of Turkish colonisation in that part of Thrace. Malkara, indeed, from the earliest period of Turkish rule, seems to have been a place of particular resort for akhis and dervish elements (cf. the numerous 9th/15th and 10th/16th century foundations of minor tekkes and za'iriyes in and around Malkara, Gökbilgin, op. cit., passim). Conversely, the yârîk element in the population appears to have been scanty in comparison with districts more to the north and north-west (Gökbilgin, Tûrâkîler, 262).

In the later centuries of Ottoman rule, the history of Malkara appears to have been both obscure and uneventful. In the reign of Mehemed II, Malkara possessed 938 Muslim hearths, but there was still a Christian element in the population, not only at the end of the 9th/15th century (cf. Barkan, Belgeliler, i/1 [1964], Ek cedvel I), but also in the 19th century (150 Armenian houses and one chapel; 100 Greek houses and one church (Journals of Benjamin Barker [1823], cf. R. Clogg, in Unic. Birmingham Historical Journal, xxxii [1979], 197-205]). At the same time, a rather meagre description of the town at this time is given by Ewliyâ Celebi ([q. v.]); a rather more detailed image of the town at this time is provided by Selçuklu-nâmê, v, 325).

At the end of the 11th/17th century, it figures as a relay-station (maznî-kândâ) according to the above-mentioned yol kol, between Tekir Daghî and Kêshân (Istanbul, Bahbakanlî Arşivi, Kepeci 3006).

Bibliography: Given in the text; cf. also Sh. Sâmi Bey, Kânîm al-a'lam, vi, Istanbul 1316, 4329.

(C. J. Heywood)

MALKOM KHAN, MIRZê, NAZIM AL-DAWLA (1249-1326/1833-1908). Perso-Armenian diplomat, journalist and concession-monger, important in the history of 19th-century Iran for his early advocacy of governmental reform and thorough-going westernisation. He was also the first to expose the pernicious effects of privately-circulated treatises and then in the celebrated newspaper Namûnî.

He was born in the Isfahan suburb of Djulfa ([q. v. in Suppl.] to an Armenian family whose ancestors had been transplanted there by Shâh 'Abbâs from Karâbâgh ([q. v.] in the southern Caucasus. His father, Mirzê Ya'qûb, was converted to Islam soon after the birth of Malkom, but the profession of Islam appears to have been twofold: the propagation of ideas on behalf of Malkom Khan. Fearing that the farâmînâ-kâmâ might be the centre of a republican conspiracy, Nâṣîr-al-Dîn Shâh ordered its dissolution in October 1861, and soon after banished Malkom to Arâb-î Râsûl. After Malkom had spent a few months in Baghâdî, the Ottoman authorities, responding to Iranian pressure, had him transferred to Istanbul.

There he was able to acquire the friendship of Mirzê Hûsâyîn Khân, the Iranian ambassador, and to enter his service. With his livelihood thus assured, he resumed writing his treatises, and also began to take an interest in alphabet reform, corresponding extensively (in Persian) with the noted Karabâyînî playwright Fath 'Ali Aghchâzâdê ([q. v.]).

In 1288/1871, Mirzê Hûsuyîn Khân was recalled to Iran and appointed prime minister, and the following year he invited Malkom to join him as special adviser. Malkom accepted, and his influence is to be seen on the measures of governmental reorganisation that Mirzê Hûsuyîn Khân undertook. But a new emphasis had emerged in the thinking and aspirations of both men: the attraction of foreign capital to Iran, for the sake of personal profit as well as economic development. Thus Malkom became profitably involved in the negotiations surrounding the notorious Reuter concession, and it was partly in connection with the unfinished business of the concession that he left Iran early in 1873 to take up an appointment as Iranian envoy in London. He was now destined to spend the rest of his life in Europe, with the exception of four brief return visits to Iran, later in 1873, in 1881, in 1887 and in 1888.

His sixteen years as minister in London were spent chiefly in fruitless attempts to promote various concessions, above all for the construction of railways in Iran, and to interest Britain more closely in Iran, in the hope that she would provide a counterweight to Russia and would encourage reform in Iran. Despite his relative ineffectiveness in these areas, Malkom exerted some influence on events through correspondence with numerous princes and politicians, the most important of whom were Mirzê 'Ali Khân Amin al-Dawlâ, a confidant of Nâṣîr-al-Dîn Shâh and later prime minister; Mirzê Yusuf Khân Mustâhîr al-Dawlâ, Iranian ambassador in Paris; Mas'ûd Mirzê Zîl al-Sulûm, the governor of Isfahan; and Muzaffar al-Dîn Mirzê, the heir-apparent. He also continued to compose treatises on the problems of government and reform, and took up again the question of alphabet reform (the scheme he finally elaborated is set forth in Namûnî-yi khâtât-i adâmîyat, London 1303/1885).

The most important period of Malkom's career began after his dismissal from his diplomatic post in December 1889. The preceding year, he had obtained from Nâṣîr-al-Dîn Shânî a concession for the organisation of a national lottery and the construction of casinos in Iran. The concession was swiftly rescinded,
but Malkom deftly sold it to European investors before they had a chance to realise it was worthless. He invoked diplomatic immunity and escaped legal condemnation, but the profitable venture cost him his post of ambassador. Partly to avenge himself for his dismissal, he embarked on the publication of a newspaper, Kānān ("The Law"), in which he castigated the Iranian government—particularly Amin al-Sultan, the prime minister of the day—for its corruption, and hinted at the existence of a vast revolutionary network in Iran, owing allegiance to himself. It is unlikely that such a network did exist, although an association called Madīma-i' ādāmiyyat ("The League of Humanity") did operate under Malkom's general and remote supervision, chiefly for the purpose of distributing Kānān. Malkom also attempted to implicate the Bahā'īs in its activities, almost certainly without foundation (see the letter of ʿAbd al-Bahā'ī to E.G. Browne quoted in Browne, Materials for the study of the Bahā'ī religion, Cambridge 1918, 296). Despite these ambiguities, it is certain that the newspaper was widely-circulated and avidly-read in Iran. Its strictures on tyranny struck a responsive chord, and it is indeed the impact made by Kānān during the years preceding the constitutional revolution that is Malkom's chief claim to a place of importance in modern Iranian history. In keeping with its agitational purposes, Kānān contained detailed accounts of Malkom's proposed; noteworthy, however, is the demand, put forward in no. 35 of the newspaper, for the institution of a bicameral legislature, with the lower house to be elected by popular vote.

The contents of Kānān appear to have been written almost exclusively by Malkom himself. Nonetheless, during the years of its publication he had extensive contact with other notable opponents of the Tehran government: Sayyid Djalāl al-Dir Asadābādī ("Afghānī") [g.e.], who met Malkom in London in 1891; Mirzā Akā Khān Kirmāni, a formerly Azall freethinker resident in Istanbul, who helped in the distribution of Kānān in the Ottoman Empire; and Shāykh al-Ra'-īs Abū Ḥasan Mīrza, a Kadjar prince of unconventional views living in India. When Nāgār al-Salṭān was assassinated in 1896 and it appeared to Malkom that his political fortunes might be restored, the insurrectional tone which had marked Kānān was abruptly abandoned. Two years later, in anticipation of his appointment to the Iranian embassy in Rome, Malkom ceased publishing Kānān altogether. He retained his diplomatic post in Italy until the end of his life in July 1908, and no longer seriously involved himself in Iranian politics. Another organisation operating under this supervision, the Djamā'ī ' ādāmiyyat ("The Society of Humanity"), did, however, play a role of marginal importance in the struggles over the constitution in 1907 and 1908, and, more importantly, many of those active in promoting its cause can be shown to have belonged to the readership of Kānān.

Most of those who knew Malkom personally—even those who can be termed his collaborators—seem to have had a low opinion of his personal qualities, regarding him as venal, arrogant and inconstant, despite his obvious talents as writer and thinker. Subsequent Iranian historiography accorded him a detailed account of Malkom's struggle for the freedom of religion in Iran; among the most serious involved himself in Iranian politics. Another organisation operating under this supervision, the Djamā'ī ' ādāmiyyat ("The Society of Humanity"), did, however, play a role of marginal importance in the struggles over the constitution in 1907 and 1908, and, more importantly, many of those active in promoting its cause can be shown to have belonged to the readership of Kānān.
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Morocco, it is the name given to the place of residence assigned to the Jewish dhimmis. At the outset, it is necessary to distinguish the urban mallāh from the rural mallāh. The former, as in several large towns, is a quarter adjacent to the Muslim city, integrated within it or shifted to the nearby periphery, yet enclosed within a separate enceinte defended by a wall and a fortified gateway. It is most often situated close to the ḥarablūs (citadel), the residence of the king or the governor, in order to guarantee the security of its inhabitants, some of whose representations in the civil administration or carry out important functions in the royal palace and must therefore remain close at hand in order to answer the summons, should their presence be required. The latter, the rural mallāh, that of the mountains and valleys of the Atlas and the Rif, the southern and eastern plains as far as the fringes of the Sahara, is an "open" village exclusively inhabited by Jews, situated some distance from the nearest Muslim kṣar or the fortress of the protector kāfīd). Also to be noted is the existence, in some towns, of an old and a new mallāh, mallāh kādim and mallāh jidīd. The reason may be a transfer of the Jewish population from one to the other, in order to move it away from an already existing site of Muslim culture or for purposes of construction (here we may note the religious scruples of the pious sultan Mawlay Slimān/Sulaymān, with reference to Tétouan and Sīdī, or it may be an extension of the former quarter on account of its overpopulation (al-Sawīrā and Meknēs/Mīknās).

Not all towns necessarily possess a mallāh, and with those that do have one, it has not always been so. The institution of the mallāh was only imposed on some communities at a relatively recent date, as their history testifies. Whereas, in Christian cultures, segregation was the rule (although originally, here too, there was a preference for living together in the same quarter for reasons of security or simply for convenience, in order to facilitate the practice of ritual and the communal observance of religious laws, customs and usages), in Islamic lands the Jews coexisted for a long time, and almost everywhere, in the towns as well as in the country, with their Muslim fellow-citizens, and this provision in the same quarters and the same streets. Very often, and this predates the Arab conquest, there is evidence of a deliberate choice on the part of ethnic, religious and professional groups, to live together in the same space, with their own streets and quarters. Jewish quarters are called ḥārā in Algiers, Tunisia and Tripoli; kās in the Yemen; mahalla in Persia, or quite simply darb al-yahud "the street of the Jews" or al-ghut "the avenue".

The etymology of the term mallāh is closely associated with the history of the Jewish community of Fās and with what might be called its "ghettoisation". At the end of the 7th/13th century, the Marinids founded, alongside Fās al-Bālī ("Old Fez"), Fās al-Jidd ("New Fez"), and close by, a little later (first half of the 8th/14th century), the town of Hīnjūs, which was initially allocated to the ḍayāt archers and the Christian militia; then, at the beginning of the 9th/15th century, in 1438 according to the Jewish chronicles (Kisse ha-melakhim "Throne of the Kings", by Raphaël Moïse Elbaz; Yah absorbs Fās "Genealogy of Fās" by Abner Hassarfalli), the Jews were compelled to leave their homes in Fās al-Bālī and to settle in Hīnjūs, which had been built on a site known as al-Mallāh "the saline area". From the root m-l-h it may be admitted (from the root m-l-h with the connotations "salt", "to salt", etc.), this term is extended in a generic sense, becoming a common name which, passing from Fās to the other towns of Morocco, ultimately designated the Jewish quarter. All the other proposed etymologies are to be rejected, in particular that which maintains that mallāh is "salted, cursed ground" and that the Jews are "those appointed to the task of salting the heads of decapitated rebels". It should be noted that originally there was nothing derogatory about this term: some documents employ the expression "mallāh of the Muslims" and conversely, the Jewish quarter contained large and beautiful dwellings which were often accompanied by the conversion to Islam of those who refused to submit to the exodus imposed by the royal edicts and to abandon their homes and their shops. This was what happened at Fās in 1438 and, much later, at Sīdī al-Mālik in 1807.

The mallāh of Fās is, in every respect, the oldest in Morocco and, for a long time, remained the only and the most important one. It is only in the second half of the 10th/16th century (ca. 1557) that the term mallāh appears in Marrakesh, with the settlement there of Jewish and Judaised populations from the Atlas and, in particular, from the city of Aghmāt where there had lived, since time immemorial, an important Jewish community. G. Kisse ha-melakhim (Histoire des Conquestes de Moulay Arba, Paris 1683): "In Fās and in Morocco (= Marrakesh), the Jews are separated from the inhabitants, having their own quarters set apart, surrounded by walls of which the gates are guarded by men appointed by the King ... In the other towns, they are intermingled with the Moors." It was not until 1682, or more than a century later, that a third mallāh was founded; it was that of the town of Mīknās, new capital of the kingdom of Mawlay Isma'il (1672-1727). At the beginning of the 19th century, ca. 1807, the "ghettoisation" of the Jews was undertaken by the pious sultan Mawlay Sulaymān in the towns of the coastal region, at Rabat and Sālē, at al-Sawīrā (Mogador) and at Tétouan. With the exception of the town of Tétouan, where the Spanish word judería is used, elsewhere it is the term mallāh which designates the new Jewish residential areas.

In Rabat, the Jews were living alongside the Muslims in the Bhīrāquarter when, in 1807, the sultan ordered the construction of a mallāh at the eastern extremity of the town, buying the land with his own money, building houses, kilns, mills and shops, all in the space of one year. In Sālē, the New Mallāh, built in 1807, is a long avenue extending from the Gate of the Mallāh to the old monumental gate dating from the Marinid period; in the alleyways which open out on this avenue there are 200 houses, 20 shops and trading booths, two kilns and two mills.

The Jewish community of Mogador deserves a special mention: the Jews were for a long time a majority in this town which was familiar with intense commercial activity and uninterrupted international relations (with the United States and Europe) from its recent foundation, in 1765, on ancient sites (the Purple Islands in the time of Juba II, the Portuguese Castello Real) until the beginning of the 20th century. When Muhammad b. ʿAbd Allāh set about building the town, there were Jews living in the village of Dyabat on the Oued Ḥosb, some 2 km. to the south of the town. To repopulate the new city, designed to replace Agadir as a centre of international commerce, the sultan appealed to the wealthiest and most
dynamic Jews of other Moroccan communities, con-
ferring upon them, along with the title ... Bombay 1960;
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On the topography of the mellah, administrative organisation, commercial and manufacturing ac-
tivities, intellectual and cultural life, see in the Bibl.
the works which the author of the present article has
devoted to these various themes.
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MALLU IKBAL KHAN, Indian military
leader of the Tughluq period.

The decade of decadence following the death of Sultan Firuz Shâh of Dihlî in 790/1388 is marked by the manoeuvrings of the princes, intrigues of the
nobles and sufferings of the people. According to Firîghta, the vast conqueror of the Tughluks fell to
pieces and the central administration lost all authority over the outlying provinces. Confusion reached such a
point that there occurred an unprecedented spect-
tacle of two sovereigns within a radius of 12 miles of
Dihlî, i.e. Nusrat Shâh at Firûzabâd and Mumhâd Shâh at Djâhanpâñâh, like two kings in the game of
chess, to use Badû’în’s words. Both the monarchs
were no more than puppets in the hands of their
ambitious but unscrupulous patron-nobles; and Mallû
Ikbal Khan was one such noble who emerged as the
strongest out of this internecine mêlée.

Mallû was one of the three sons of Darya Khan,
better known as Zafar Khan Lodi II, the influential
Afghan chief under Firûz Shâh Tughluq. Along with his
elder brother Sârang Khân, who was governor of
Dîpâlpûr, he obtained ascendency over all other amirs
of Sultan Mumhâd, who gave him the title Ikbâl
Khan and the command of the fortress of Siri, modern
Shahpur Jat, east of the Dihlî-Kutb road. He owed his
rise also to the Sultan’s ministe, Mukarrab Khân,
another myrmidon of the ruling military oligarchy of
that time. Perfidious as he was by nature, Ikbâl Khân
gradually got rid of those whom he regarded as rivals.
He first aligned himself with the other king, Sultan
Nusrat Shâh, whom he deceitfully dislodged from
Firûzabâd, which he immediately occupied in
800/1398. He followed it up by treacherously killing
his benefactor Mukarrab Khân and securing complete
control of Dihlî. Annexation of Pûnsîâ a little later made Ikbâl Khân undisputed master of the region.

His triumph proved short-lived, as Timûr’s sudden
invasion of the Dîâb country caught him unawares.
He confronted the Mongol invaders, but had to flee
in order to avoid complete annihilation. He escaped to
Dhul’urred (modern Daulâshahr), while Sultan Mumhâd
fled to Gudjâdûr.

After Timûr’s onslaught ended, Ikbâl Khân again
occupied possession of the ruined city of Dihlî. Though he
had the capital of the sultanate under his sway, his
writ did not extend beyond a part of the Dîâb and some
districts round Dihlî. In 804/1401, he invited thither the fugitive Sultan Mumhâd Shâh and accorded
him a warm reception, without however partaking
with the reality of power. Not content with a limited
sovereignty, Ikbâl Khân was bent upon extending the
boundaries of his suzerainty. But he felt frustrated by
the powerful Shârqi rulers of Dîawnpur [q. v.] in the
east and the influential governor of Multân, Khidr
Khan, in the west. Accompanied by Sultan Mumhâd, Ikbâl
Khân undertook an expedition against Dîawnpur, where Ibrahim Shâh, who had lately
descended the throne. At a time when battle lines were
being drawn, Sultan Mumhâd secretly deserted
Ikbâl’s camp and went over to the ruler of Dîawnpur
with a view to securing his assistance to extricate himself from tutelage of Ikbâl Khân. On failing there,
the Sultan went to Kanaâdû [q. v.], an appanage of the
Shârqi kingdom, where he was allowed to live with
the status of a local king as long as Ikbâl lived. Ikbâl
returned to Dihlî in 805/1402 disappointed.

Ikbâl Khân now decided to try his luck in the west,
an attempt which brought about his downfall. He first
marched to Samâna, which was ruled by Bahûrân
Khân Turkbûcch, who was in league with Khidr
Khân. Though Ikbâl managed to have Bahûrân Khân
murdered, he had to face the challenge of Khidr
Khan. Ikbâl Khân, more over-trade by the river Dahin-
da in Advodhâna (modern Pakpattan in Pakistan), Ikbâl Khân was defeated and killed by Khidr Khan’s
army in 808/1405. His severed head was presented to
Khidr Khan, who sent it to Fatpûr, the latter’s
native town, where it was fixed on the gate of the city.
According to the Tâbakât-I Abâki, the family and
dependents of Ikbâl Khan were expelled from Dihlî
and sent to Kol, but none of them was harmed in any
way.

A Persian inscription of Ikbâl Khân, fixed on
the southern bastion of an old ‘idgâh at Khârâvah
village near Dihlî, describes him as Mallû Sulûhâni,
indicating that he insisted on being called a slave or servant
of the Sultan. It must be said to his credit that in spite
of possessing what were in effect the absolute political
and administrative powers of a king, Ikbâl Khân
never assumed royal prerogatives, such as striking
coins in his name and inserting his name in the
khutba.

The epitaph referred to above also reveals his religious
zeal in having erected the place of worship with his
own money, and condemns the destruction and
desolation wrought by the Mongol marauders.
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MALTA (ancient Melita; Ar. Mal(i)ta; French Malte), the name of the main island of a Mediterranean archipelago which is situated around 100 km from Sicily and about 300 km from Tunisia and which also includes Gozo, Comino, Cominotto, Filf(o)la and some unimportant rocks, measuring 47 km. from the north-west to the south-east. The island of Malta measures 27 km in length and 14 km in breadth; its main town is Valletta (Fr. La Valette), the capital of what has been since 22 September 1964 an independent state included however in the British Commonwealth. In 1968, the total population was around 320,000. Malta is exclusively Christian, and owes its mention in theEI solely because it was occupied for more than two centuries by the Muslims and because its official language derives from an Arabic dialect.

1. History. Malta was inhabited in ancient times by a Mediterranean race, whose megalithic monuments are preserved at Hagar Kim ("standing stones"), Hal Tarxen and Hal Saflieni. It was colonised very early, certainly before the 10th century B.C., by the Phoenicians, and formed a base for their trading ships. It is not certain that the name of Malta is derived from the Phoenician, while the Phoenician origin of Gozo (Gozo), meaning "a merchant boat of round shape", seems certain.

The Carthaginians became masters of the island in the 7th-6th century B.C. and kept it for four or five centuries. The Romans conquered it in 218 B.C., and for the next ten centuries Malta remained under Roman and Greek influence, being situated near Eastern Sicily. Gozo had only Greek coins, and Greek and Roman coins in great number were minted in Malta. Very early, with St. Paul in the 1st century A.D., the island was converted to Christianity; during the Western Empire's decay the Byzantines established themselves in it; after their conquest of Northern Africa, the possession of Malta became indispensable to them.

The Muslim conquest of Malta is generally fixed in 870, but it is possible that the island was the goal of another Arab raid in 221/835-6, if one considers it probable that the island was included amongst those against which the Aghlabid Ibrahim ibn al-Athlr sent a fleet in that year. E. Rossi (in EI² s.v.) thought that it would not be too bold to adopt the view of Malta's falling under Muslim domination even before 184/800, and added that de Goeje shared his opinion (in ZDMG, lviii, 905 n 2), but there is nothing to confirm this hypothesis. What seems certain is that in 256/870 a squadron left Sicily under the command of Ahmad (called Hababi) b. Umar b. Abd Allâh b. Ibrahim ibn al-Aghlab in order to relieve Malta, which was being invested by a Byzantine fleet (Ibn al-Aghir, vi, 307, and al-Nuwayri, ed. Remiro, ii, 81, do not give the exact year). This shows that the island was already occupied by the Muslims before that date, and the year 255/869 indicated notably by Ibn Khaldûn ("Ibar, iv, 430) and al-Kalkhashendi ("Subb, vi, 121) should probably be retained. The retreat, without a fight, of the Byzantine fleet on 28 Ramadân 256/29 August 870 seems to have given the signal for ill-treatment inflicted on the Greek population of the island, the arrest of his bishop, who was then sent into captivity at Palermo, and the destruction of the church, the materials from which were re-used at the time of the construction of the Kasr Hababi at Sousse.

In Malta, the Muslim occupation was certainly more permanent and strongly established than in Sicily; the narrow island was completely subjugated by the conquerors, who made it a strategic base; this helps us to understand how the Arab-Berber Muslims of Africa succeeded in forcing upon Malta the Arabic language, from which the modern Maltese dialect is derived (see below, 2).

Besides the Arabic language and place-names, the Muslims have left in Malta a few coins and a considerable number of inscriptions on tombstones; one of them, the celebrated inscription called of Maymuna, dated 568/1173, was published more than a century ago, and repeatedly studied by orientalists (Italinski, Lanci, Amari, Nallino, etc.); another one, found in Gozo, is to be seen in the Malta Museum. About twenty more have been found in the excavations in 1922-5 at Râbato (near the place called Notabile); they are preserved in the Museum of the Villa Romana, near the place of the excavations.

The Muslims lost Malta in 483/1090, when the Normans conquered it; they were however allowed to live on the island under the Norman government until 647/1249, the date when Frederick II expelled them. From 1530 to 1798 Malta was the seat of the Order of St. John of Jerusalem, which the Turks had expelled from Rhodes in 1522. The Order organised there an important war fleet. The island was in constant relations with the East and with Barbary; thousands of Muslim slaves were taken to Malta; the Maltese ships had repeated encounters with those of the Porte and the Levantine and Barbary pirates. The Turks attempted to occupy Malta in 1565, with their well-known expedition, which ended in disaster, and again in 1614; more than once, they threatened to invade it under Sultan Mehmed IV.

A few Arabic manuscripts and nautical charts, of no great value, are preserved in the Public Library of Malta and in its Museum.


2. The Maltese language. Maltese is the language of the inhabitants of the Maltese Islands (Malta, Gozo, and Comino; ca. 330,000 speakers). It is to some extent a mixed language, for its basic structure, together with much of the vocabulary for the more basic features of life, are derived from Arabic—mainly North African Arabic—while an important Romance substratum (mainly Siculo-Italian) comprises, in particular, vocabulary linked with more advanced civilisation. The relation between the two constituent elements is comparable to that between the Anglo-Saxon and Norman French elements in English. For several centuries mainly a medium of oral communication, Maltese became a literary language chiefly during the 19th and 20th centuries; it gained official recognition in 1933, and became the national language of Malta in 1964. It is written in a modified form of the Latin alphabet (see table), being the only Semitic language thus written; the present system, officially adopted in 1934, follows
experimentation influenced by Italian and Arabic models from the 18th century onwards. The language has thus been subject to standardising influences only for a comparatively brief period, and it is still actively developing in response to modern needs. Several variants of contemporary Maltese can be distinguished. Literary Standard Maltese, used in belles lettres, tends to aim at a mainly Semitic dictum. Journ-alistic Maltese tends to differ from it slightly in spelling, phonology, morphology and syntax, but substantially in vocabulary and phraseology (many foreign loanwords and calques). Colloquial Standard Maltese is intermediate between the two, varying in composition according to socio-linguistic factors such as the social standing of individual speakers. In addition, there is dialectal Maltese, varying from town to town and from village to village, but essentially to be divided into urban and rural. Dialectal Maltese is now under threat, owing to the levelling effects of compulsory education and the news media. Any attempt to offer a description of present-day Maltese, and still face some of the past history of the language, is faced with some difficulties. Grammars and dictionaries of Maltese were indeed being made at least by the 18th century: notably early works are Agius de Soldanis’ grammar Delia lingua Punic presenimenti usata dal Maltesi (Rome 1750), and his unpublished publishing in his Dizionario Malti (pre-Hilalian) Arabic which is still the basis of Maltese. This included some Berber elements in vocabulary (cf. G. Wettinger, in Journal of Maltese Studies, vi [1971], 37 ff.), links Malta with Egypt rather than the North African dialect region, which has mta. Eastern Arabic-derived religious terms were possibly brought to Malta by Maronite clergy (J. Aquilina, Maltese linguistic surveys, Malta 1976, 25 ff.). Possible links with Eastern Arabic, like the Maltese realisation of k as a glottal stop, are less cogent, though bid, recently identified in transcription in 15th century Maltese lists as the ancestral form of present Maltese la “of” (G. Wettinger, Journal of Maltese Studies, vi [1971], 37 ff.), links Malta with Egypt rather than the North African dialect region, which has mta. Eastern Arabic-derived religious terms were possibly brought to Malta by Maronite clergy (J. Aquilina, Maltese linguistic surveys, Malta 1976, 25 ff.). The essentially Western Arabic dialect ancestry of Maltese is in fact sufficiently evident from two morphological features: the formation of the first persons singular and plural of the imperfect of verbs according to the pattern nktl/nktlu against Classical and Eastern Arabic knt/nktl, and the replacement of the verbal form derived from IX by a modified XI, with a resultative meaning (like kmar (kmar) “to redden”). See further on the whole question, Ph. Marquis, Arabiya. 3. Western dialects.

Nevertheless, classical literary Arabic was used in Malta as well, down to ca. 1200 A.D. at least, as is shown by a Justinianic prayer list compiled at the end of the 11th century, and another word list compiled by the English traveller Philip Skippon (cf. A. Cremona, A historical review of the Maltese language, Malta 1945, 14), as well as a sonnet by G. P. Bonamico (ca. 1672). From the 18th century, a few prose texts also survive, such as popular dialogues by de Soldanis, sermons and other devotional work, the Lord’s Prayer (1718) and the first catechism in Maltese (1752)—brief bibliographical notes concerning all of which can be found in Wettinger and Fsadni, op. cit., 8 ff. Broadly speaking, however, Maltese prose literature postdates the age of the early grammarians and lexicographers, though the origins of Maltese folklore (songs, ballads, tales, proverbs) are earlier. Confronted with this scarcity of data, scholars attempting to trace the development of Maltese, and to explain its character and relations to Arabic dialects, have been compelled to work back from the present state of the language, to some extent, through theoretical reconstruction. It can, however, be said that Maltese contains, according to present information, no recognisable linguistic elements going back to the pre-Phoenician prehistoric period. Though Phoenician or Punic was both spoken and written in Malta from ca. 800 B.C. to the Roman conquest of 218 B.C. and probably afterwards, the once popular opinion that Maltese is a direct descendant from Phoenician or Punic is now antiquated (cf. P. Grech, Journal of Maltese Studies, vi [1961], 130 ff.).

The influence of Phoenician substratum influences in Maltese has been suggested by J. Cantineau with reference to the realisation of as as in Maltese rural dialects (Cours de phonétique arabe, Paris 1960, 100), and other scholars have suggested morphological or lexical survivals; but all this remains hypothetical at present. The existence of Latin elements in Maltese vocabulary going back to the period of Roman rule there is also disputed (cf. J. Aquilina, Papers in Maltese linguistics, Malta 1961, 8 ff.), and Greek terms which should date from the time of Byzantine supremacy, like lapsi (from Greek analepsis “Ascension Day”) are remarkably few. The linguistic board appears in fact to have been wiped clean to an astonishing extent by the Arab conquest of A.D. 870, which brought in the North African dialectal (prefix-italic) Arabic which is still the basis of Maltese. This included some Berber elements in vocabulary (cf. G. S. Colin, in Mémorial André Basset (1895-1956), Paris 1957, 7-16; J. Aquilina, Maltese linguistic surveys, Malta 1975, 25 ff.).
least among the educated. However, the Norman conquest of A.D. 1090, followed by the expulsion of the Romans in 1530–1798, and the coming of British rule (1813-1964) and administration, literature and culture, up to the mid-20th century. The coming of British rule (1813-1964) added an English element to the language, which is noticeable now particularly in such semantic fields as sport, commerce and administration, and in professional and technical vocabularies. The English component in Maltese is still developing, owing to the importance of English as an international medium and also because it is taught in Maltese schools. On the other hand, recent interest in Malta's Arab connections has not so far found much linguistic reflection. The present condition of the language thus evolved can be summarised as follows. While the Semitic vocabulary in Maltese may be limited, it is quantitatively very strong where actual use is concerned. In particular, the Arabic textbook material amounts to over 90% of the total, according to word-list statistical investigation. In spoken Maltese the percentage is smaller, but even in newspapers with their tendency to use foreign loan words the Semitic element comes to over two-thirds, the Romance element to not quite one-third. There is also a marked mixture with political, social, and economic matters (cf. F. Krier, Le maltais au contact de l'italien, in Forum phoneticum, xv, Hamburg 1976, 110 ff.; E. Fenech, Contemporary journalistic Maltese, Leiden 1978, 216-17 and passim). The growth of this Romance component can be followed to some extent over the centuries: in Peter Caxaro's Cantilena there is one single purely Romance term, but by the mid-18th century de Soldanis' dictionary shows the Romance constituent in Maltese vocabulary was fairly substantial. English words in most contexts on the other hand amount to less than 5% of the total.

Phonetically, the Semitic stock of Maltese has undergone considerable changes. Among consonants, the emphatics, primary or secondary, have become fused with the corresponding non-emphatics: \( > t, d \)
\( > d, d \)
\( > s, r \) (etc.). However, the former presence or absence of emphasis may still be responsible for the different colouring of adjoining vowels: contrast Maltese sayf "summer" (Arabic sayf) with sayf "sword" (Arabic sayf). Interdental fricatives \( \theta, \theta \) have become stops \( d, t \). Arabic \( k \) is normally replaced in Standard Maltese pronunciation by glottal stop (occasionally by \( g \), and in some dialect pronunciations by \( k \)). \( x \) has become fused with \( h \), and \( w \) with \( b \) (but \( f \) and \( g \) and the latter by \( k \) in some rural dialects). while still written, is no longer pronounced: it has left traces of various kinds (pharyngalisation, colouring, or lengthening of neighbouring vowels); in some contexts it is replaced by \( h \).\( h \) in standard Maltese is mostly silent (in which case it may cause compensatory lengthening in neighbouring vowels); in certain conditions it may become \( h \). Many of these changes seem to have occurred after the mid-18th century. In pre-Hilalian Arabic, from which Maltese descended, and \( h \) had become \( d \) in Muslim Sicily); \( h \) and \( g \) were still fairly widely used in the 18th century. The diminishing Semitic consonantal repertoire was on the other hand augmented by the inclusion of Romance phonemic consonants \( s, z, d, t \) and Romance influence is responsible for a much wider use of \( g \). The voiced pronunciation of voiced consonants, an occasional feature in Arabic dialects, became regular in word final position or before voiceless consonants (thus bieb "door" is pronounced approximately biep, and libsa "suit" libpa). Vice versa, voiceless consonants before voiced consonants become voiced. Consonant assimilation, fairly frequent, also affects the verbal prefix \( t \) (e.g. iggib (for Arabic taghib) "you/she bring(s)" (via tīgib). As for vowels, the various realisations of phonemic vowels \( a, u, a, i, a \) inherited from Arabic are supplemented by the phonemic vowels \( e, o, t, o \) taken over from Romance. Since there is pronounced stress in Maltese, short unstressed vowels may disappear. Original Arabic \( i \) and \( u \) in open syllable before stress normally vanish, but short \( a \) is preserved near former emphatics and after \( f \) or \( g \); since in some environments it may have gone into \( e \) before disappearing, Maltese may originally have been a "differential" dialect in Cantineau's terminology (a in the feminine singular ending -a once seems to have undergone imāla—15th century transcriptions not rarely give it as \( e \), but present Standard Maltese again has -a; the reasons for this change are not clear. Imāla of -a may still occur in rural dialects). Among long vowels, as much as is now mostly represented by \( i \) in Maltese, rarely by \( i \).
except near former emphatics, velars, and pharyngals, where it may survive as ā. This ā is very typical of Maltese, it seems to have spread by the expense of ē during the last four centuries. Diphthongs mostly survive with some modification, though Arabic ay may be represented by ī, and au by ā, as in xītan (Arabic ǧīyān) "devil", or muhd (Arabic muḥād) "born". Vowel harmony, and the formation of prothetic and epenthetic vowels, are all noticeable features.

Maltese morphology remains essentially that of dialectal Arabic, somewhat modified and reduced. Foreign loan words may be fitted into this framework: thus, among nouns, spalla "shoulder" is given the dual ending -ejn (spallaż "two shoulders"), and sound or broken plurals are often given to loan words. On the other hand, foreign plural endings may be preserved: Italian -i (standing also for Italian -i), and English -s, the latter in recent loans. Incorporation often involves restructuring of loan words. In the case of Romance loan terms, this has most recently been studied by F. Krier (Le maltaius au contact de l'Italien, following J. Aquilina, The structure of Maltese, Malta 1959; Papers in Maltese linguistics. Italian vowels may undergo the impact of Sicilian: cf. Maltese munita with Italian moneta. Nouns may lose vocalic endings but receive prothetic prefixes (cf. Maltese sītis with Italian sieta). Clusters of voiced consonants, may be lost (cf. Maltese storbju with Italian disturbo, archaic variant disturbio). Early Romance loan words in particular may show a replacement of Romance by corresponding Semitic consonants (cf. Sicilian palla with Maltese balla). English loan words, recently studied by E. Fenech (Contemporary journalistic Maltese) have undergone similar restructuring: cf. e.g. Maltese kildja, plural kildji, for English kettle. Verbs of both Romance and English derivation are similarly adapted, e.g. by internal modifications, or the addition of prefixes or suffixes; cf. e.g. ikkopja "copied" jibbrajba "brides".—The Romance element has in turn affected the Semitic by the incorporation of endings—azz (from Sicilian - aga) and -un (Italian -one) cf. sakra (v. sakkun) to dju (kif dju) and kandel "big house", from Semitic sākrah and dār, respectively.

This substantial influx of foreign terms has led to many Romance-Semitic doubles, such as hu stessu/hu nnsfu, both meaning "he himself". Sometimes there are different shades of meaning. The occurrence of numerous calques derived from Italian and English expressions is a related feature. On the other hand, foreign influence in syntax is rather less marked, though e.g. the frequency of the sentence structure in which the verbal predicate follows rather than precedes the subject may owe something to European models.

Dialectal Maltese has received attention since the 18th century, when Vassalli recognised the existence of five regional dialects in the Maltese Islands and outlined their respective characteristics. H. Stimmie's Maltesische Studien (Leipziger Semitische Studien, i-v, Leipziz 1904) made an outstanding contribution of permanent value; within the last decade, study has received a renewed impetus (cf. works by P. Schabert, J. Aquilina and B. S. J. Isserlin, and A. Borg listed in the Bibli.). While urban dialects may be nearer to Standard Maltese, rural dialects show some archaic features: šh and gh are still sounded in some Gozitan villages, and the smile of Arabic ā into ē (or i— the latter in Gozo) is probably a 12th century transcription. The realisation of the ā, preserved as ā in standard Maltese, as ɵ is typical of country dialects, so is a tendency towards the diphthongisation of simple vowels, such as ā into eo or eu. The age of the former phenomenon is unclear—up to now, it has not been attested in early transcriptions—but the latter may have spread during the past few centuries. A greater tendency to use rare or archaic terms and broken plurals, and to employ Semitic rather than Romance vocabulary, are shared also by some oral folk literature. All in all, rural dialectal Maltese may represent to some extent a strain parallel to Standard Maltese, but one which is less far removed from the Western Mediterranean Arabic ancestry of the Maltese language than the latter.


3. Maltese literature

The literature of the small Maltese archipelago emanates from a culture which may still be defined today as Christian, and more specifically as Roman Catholic, in all its essential aspects. The very early Christianisation of the island of Malta (which its inhabitants trace back to a visit made there by Saint Paul—Acts, xxviii, 1-10) was able to resist a Muslim domination of almost four centuries, and Islam does not seem to have exerted a significant influence.

Until the 19th century, Italian, the official and administrative language, the language of education, was the vehicle of Maltese literature, just as it was the language of social relations among the educated classes. But alongside this learned literature, written in a foreign language, there existed, and still exists, an oral and genuinely national literature. At the festival of Imnarja, a great popular gathering in the woods of Buskett attended by peasants and artisans from all the villages of the island, among other displays there take place, on the night of 28/9 June, poetical contests and improvised songs in many forms which are approved by public acclamation.

On the other hand, since the end of the 19th cen-
Table showing the Maltese alphabet and corresponding Arabic and Romance sound values
(Rare correspondences are shown in brackets, occasional ones mostly omitted)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maltese letter</th>
<th>sound value</th>
<th>corresponding Arabic sound[s]</th>
<th>corresponding Romance (Italian and Sicilian sound[s])</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>a or a</td>
<td>a, i</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>b or b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b (p)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>č or ξ</td>
<td>sh, di (k)</td>
<td>č (k)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>d or d</td>
<td>d, di, d</td>
<td>d (i)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>e or e</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>e (i)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>f or f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>g or di</td>
<td>di</td>
<td>di, č</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>h or (h, h)</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>i or i (a, u)</td>
<td>i (e)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>j or y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y (dj)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>k or k</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>l or l</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>m or m</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>n or n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gh</td>
<td>gh (see text)</td>
<td>č, gh</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>o or u(a, i)</td>
<td>o, u</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>p or b, f</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p (b, v)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>q or khamza</td>
<td>k ('k', k)</td>
<td>k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>r or r</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>s or s, ŋ</td>
<td>s, ŋ</td>
<td>s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>t or t, th, t</td>
<td>t (d)</td>
<td>t (d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>u or u</td>
<td>u, 0</td>
<td>u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>v or w</td>
<td>v, b</td>
<td>v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>w or w</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>w (k)w, (g)w</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>x or sh</td>
<td>sh ('s)</td>
<td>sh, s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>z or z</td>
<td>z, ŋ</td>
<td>z, ŋ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>z or ts</td>
<td>t and s in disjunction</td>
<td>ts, č</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Long and short vowels are not distinguished in Maltese writings; e.g. dar stands for dār.
cellent Maltese version of the Gospels (1823-9).
Richard Taylor (1818-68) produced in 1846 a translation of
\textit{Robinson Crusoe} which is still highly regarded to
day, but all these works, although written in the
Maltese language, unjustly scorned by the
educated classes, was capable of serving literature of the
highest quality.

It is only in the last quarter of the 19th century that an
original prose is seen to emerge. The first novels,
described as “Gothic” by the Maltese, enjoyed con-
siderable popular success, in spite of their somewhat
medieval quality. \textit{Nirku u qoqita} (“Henry and
Judith”), 1872), by M. German, \textit{Gorg il-Bdot}
(“George the Pilot”), 1880 by Ninu Muscat Fenech
and \textit{Ermelinda u l-rendetta tal-Konti} (“Ermelinde
and the vengeance of the Count”), 1894) by A. Adam
are nothing more than somewhat pale imitations of
popular foreign novels. However, some works testify
even at this time to a greater degree of independence,
such as \textit{Fernanda Montagnes} (1896) by Alwig Vella,
the stories of V. Busuttil, \textit{Il-Habib tal-familji}
(“The friend of the families”), 1893-4). Here too the
phraseology is of Italian type, but the reader is no
longer aware of the awkwardness of a language of
translation. In fact, it should not be forgotten that all
these authors began their writings in Italian, a situa-
tion still applying at the beginning of the 20th cen-
tury, before Italian was displaced in favour of English,
which became an official language in 1934, at which
time Maltese achieved the same status.

Two authors succeeded particularly well in defying
the ascendency of Italian, an achievement which
earns them a special place in the history of Maltese
literature. The first, A. E. Caruana, is distinguished
by the purity of his language and the facility with
which he expresses complex notions in spite of a
vocabulary remarkably deficient in abstract terms.
These features are especially evident in his historical
novel \textit{Inet Farrag}, which appeared in 1889 and of
which the action is set in the 15th century during the
Spanish occupation, but which denounces by impli-
cation all the foreign powers who have ruled the
archipelago. The second, Guze Muscat Azzopardi
(1853-1927), was concerned above all to give to the
Maltese language a literary syntax of its own. It may
be said that he achieved his purpose with \textit{Najju Ellul}
(1909), a historical work describing the Maltese
resistance to the occupation by Napoleonien troops.

But the Maltese novelists of this period, guided by
concern for purity and nobility of expression, were
generally unable to avoid the pitfalls of an excessively
neutral language, of a frigid style dominated by the
taste for oratorical eloquence. A further four decades
were to elapse before they were able to rid themselves
of the shackles of Italian romanticism.

However, their ambitious works exerted only a
limited influence on the authors of the 20th century.
The stories composed by F. M. Galea (1861-1941),
\textit{Moghjija taż-zmien} (“Entertainments”), between 1899
and 1915, provided a model for a popular literature;
written in a simple and living language, dealing with
issues of daily and local life, they enjoyed immediate
success. But it is to Temi Zammit (1864-1935) that
there belongs the privilege of being considered the
founder of the Maltese short story, idiomatic and con-
cise. His writings were collected by Cremona in \textit{Stiejer,
hrejff u kitba ohra} (“Stories, tales and other works”) and
\textit{Stiejer u kitba ohra} (“Stories and other works”) in 1961.

The historical and patriotic vein continued predominant in the inter-war period. Among the
works produced at this time and worthy of mention
are \textit{Imhabbu u mieghda} (“Love and hate”), 1927) and
\textit{Helsien} (“Liberty”), 1940) by Gużè Bonnici (1907-40),
\textit{Zmien l-Ispanjoli} (“The time of the Spanish”), 1938) by
Gużè Galea (1901-1978) and \textit{Angli u n-nxik} (“Angels of
sadness”), 1938) by Gino Muscat Azzopardi
(1899-1982), the son of Gużè Muscat Azzopardi.

But, at the same time, new tendencies are taking
shape. There is observed the appearance of an ironic
tone, hitherto absent from Maltese literature, and
Gwann Mamo (1886-1941) is its initiator. His novel
\textit{Ulied in-nann Venut fl-Amerika} (“The children
of Grandmother Venut in America”), 1936) is described
by the author himself as a “satirico-descriptive, con-
temporary, semi-political novel”. \textit{Lela ta’ Haz-Zghir}
(“Christmas of Haz-Zghir”), 1938) by Gużè Ellul
Mercer (1989-1961) is written in the same vein.

Some clear social preoccupations also begin to be
observed, as in \textit{Tetšilhom hajjithom} (“To improve their
life”), 1937) by John Francia Marko (1894-1954) or in
\textit{Il-Sabih tal-fidda} (“The cross of silver”), 1939) by
Henry Wistin Born (b. 1910).

However, the novel which is still today considered
the masterpiece of modern prose belongs to the
historical vein. The work in question is \textit{Tahit tliet salmiet}
(“Under three dominations”), published in 1937 by
Gużè Aquilina, then only 26 years old. But
historical anecdote is here only the pretext for a more
general social critique which goes far beyond the scope
of the traditional historical novel. Furthermore, the
work contains neither melodramatic plot nor rudi-
mentary psychology. In addition, the work is distin-
guished by a great virtuosity of writing, Aquilina
possessing perfect knowledge of the language and its
popular usages.

Although under increasing competition, the
historical novel was to remain an important genre un-
til the decade of the 1970s. Examples include \textit{Mansel Gellet}
(1961) by Gużè Cardona (b. 1922), \textit{Il-Qavis li rebek}
(“The victorious priest”), 1970) by Gorg Scicluna (1923-74), or \textit{Beraq u qawslli} (“Lightning
and rainbow”), 1976) of Gorg Pisani (b. 1909).

The “ironical” novel was also to be developed by
M. C. Spiteri (b. 1917) in \textit{L-Ghafrid} (“The devil”),
1975), and Trevor Zahra (b. 1947) in \textit{Il-Surmati}

But two European movements were to give rise to a
new literary genre, the “social” genre, after the
Second World War; these were the expressionist move-
ment, which reached the archipelago at a late stage,
and the theories of existentialism. The Maltese
novel began to turn more and more towards contemporary
social reality. Numerous authors achieved renown in
this genre, notably Gužè Chetcuti (b. 1914) who was
the pioneer with \textit{Niżien ta’ mhabb} (“The fires of
love”), 1961). He was followed in particular by Victor
Apap (b. 1913) and Alfred Massa (b. 1938). The
former published \textit{F’ bieb il-hajja} (“At the doors of
life”) in 1975, the latter \textit{Il-Tfajla tal-bikini vjola} (“The
girl in the violet bikini”) in 1979.

However, this movement only really began to be
taken seriously under the pen of J. J. Camilleri (b.
1929). Thus \textit{Ahna sinjuri} (“We are rich”), 1965) is a
political diatribe against certain aspects of Maltese
life.

Finally, since the end of the decade of the 1960s, it
has been the psychological novel which has
dominated. The characters are no longer out-of-the-
orinary heroes; they are simple individuals,
confronted by daily reality. The way was opened in 1968
by Frans Sammut (b. 1945) with his stories \textit{Labrinti u
stiejer ohra} (“Labyrinth and other tales”). But it was
especially in his first novel \textit{Il-Gagga} (“The cage”),
1971) that he showed himself a writer of talent, confirming this four years later with *Samuraj* ("Samurai"). Alfred Sant (b. 1948) for his part shows more philosophical preoccupations in *L-Ewvol u seqi tal-bajjar* ("The first leaves of the fig-trees"), which appeared in 1969. Also worthy of mention are J. J. Camilleri for *Is-Seqha tal-art* ("The call of the earth", 1974), T. Zahra for *Hijja in-nisxiexa* ("Close to the source"); 1975). Anton Grasso (b. 1952) for *Ahjar jiha jokoll* ("Better continue to dream", 1975), and Oliver Friggieri (b. 1947) with *L-Istram* ("The strange one", 1980).

Unlike the novel, dramatic art had a long time to wait before attaining a position of prestige. With Italian opera exerting a strong attraction upon the educated classes, theatre was relegated to a status of simple entertainment designed for the people, who had to be content with mediocrity.

It is to Luigi Rosato (1795-1872) that Maltese literature owes its first dramatic work, *Katarina* (1856), a historical and patriotic drama written in verse. But most of the works produced in the 19th century were nothing other than farces and melodramas, without much psychology or technical originality, and served by feeble, barely natural dialogues and excessively conventional situations.

The beginning of the 20th century saw the extinction of a genre which was peculiar to the archipelago, as is attested by the study devoted jointly by the Maltese P. Grech and the Englishman A. J. Arberry. He wrote one work of great lyrical inspiration, or of social character, for example *X’ Inhuma l-fatati* ("What phantoms are"), a comedy in two acts dating from 1874. Later, his son Gino also wrote numerous dramatic works of some merit, including *Huwa* ("He").

Later still, certain authors distinguished themselves by sound knowledge of scenic technique and by vivid dialogue. Cremona set the example with a versified drama in five acts, *Il-Fidusa tal-bidna* ("The redemption of the farmers"), written in 1913, published in 1936. Subsequently added to the repertoire were some pieces by A. Born (b. 1901), whose main concern was in adapting French or Italian vaudeville, and by E. Sarracino Inglot (1904-83), in whose work the formal influence of the Classical Greek theatre is clearly perceivable. Cremona wrote also a versified comedy in three acts, *Il-Vizzju tal-vjaggi* ("The vice of journeys"), and Gorg Pisani for four comedies of social nature derived directly from the expressionist trend: *Il-Sengha tal-imhabba* ("The art of love", 1945), *Ghanja tar-rebbiegha* ("Song of spring", 1947), *Il-Kaz taz-Zija Olga* ("The knife of the sack"), and *Il-Kaiz taz-Zja Olga* ("The case of aunt Olga") and *Coqqa u dublett* ("Hood and petticcoat"), of a very different style which G. Aquilina defines as "the exploration of the mystic aspects of pathological crime".

Francis Ebejer is for his part considered the leading light of the new Maltese dramatic art. His theatre, very philosophical and symbolic, has been strongly influenced by the "Theatre of the absurd" of Ionesco, although he lacks the latter’s pessimism, since he always endows his characters with a certain willingness to change. In *Boulevard*, he denounces the absurdity of stereotyped and mechanical human language, as an image of the alienating ascendancy of society over the individual. In *Menz*, a more overtly political play, he contrasts the romantic hero, a positive and revolutionary figure, with the anti-hero, a man without qualities or illusions. These two plays were published in 1970.

Belonging to the same vein is the work of Oreste Calleja, whose four *Drammi* ("Dramas"), appearing in 1972, were favourably received by critics.

With the exception of Dwardu Cachia (1858-1907), whose poems were for the most part based on the octosyllabic metre of popular verse, a form of which M. A. Vassalli was a leading advocate, Maltese poetry, since its beginnings in the 19th century, has been much influenced by the Italian school, copying the metre, the accentual rhythms and strophic forms of classical and romantic poetry.

It was initially in the field of translations that the efforts of the first versifiers, who at this stage can hardly be called poets, were deployed. At around the middle of the 19th century, Dun Dovik Mifsud Tommasi (1796-1879) translated the hymns of the *Breviary* (1853), as well as the original compositions of a Salvatore Brumana (1810-72) or of an Indri Schembri (1805-72); Richard Taylor also provided a version of the *Psalms* (1846), then adapted a canto of the *Divine Comedy* in 1864.

Gan Anton Vassallo (1817-67) has left a corpus that is more personal, although considerably less spontaneous, in which he has experimented extensively in metrical forms. His epic *Il-Cfen Tor* ("The Turkish galley"), based on the folklore tradition of piracy, written in 1844 and published in 1853, is still widely known.

These authors had opened the way, at least in part, and all that was lacking was a poet of real quality. This was found in the person of Guzè Muscat Azzopardi. By means of pure and simple language, he was able to avoid the stiffness and monotony of his predecessors, and to adapt an original content to a borrowed form. His poetry, essentially religious, like all Maltese poetry, sought to express the preoccupations of his contemporaries. To him belongs the credit of having removed poetry from servile imitation of classical Italian forms. His influence on the following generation, of which Dun Karm is the most eminent representative, was essential.

The reputation of Dun Karm, considered the national hero, has extended far beyond the frontiers of the archipelago, as is attested by the study devoted to him jointly by the Maltese P. Grech and the Englishman A. J. Arberry. He wrote one work of great lyrical in-
spiration which has led him to be compared with Foscolo and Leopardi. In its entirety, it is a long meditation on nature (Deli u dji, "Shadow and Light"), history (Li Lil Malti, "To Malta"), the condition of Man, especially in his relationship to God (Jiara lil Gesu, "Visit to Jesus"), and on the destiny of the poet himself (Non omnis moriar). Although very romantic in its inspiration and sentiments, the versifying of Dun Karm remained classical and in conformity with the model of Azzopardi, although no constraint is perceptible since the writing is smooth and fluent. The major part of his works was published in 1940 by G. Bonnici in three volumes: X' Habb u x' kaseb il-poeta ("What the poet likes and thinks"), X' Emmen il-poeta ("What the poet believes"), and X' Chamel izied il-poeta ("What the poet does most"). O. Friggieri devoted a critical edition to him in 1980: Dun Karm, il-poetizji migbara (Dun Karm, collected poems). Among his contemporaries, Anastasju Cushieri (1876-1962) and Ninu Cremona showed the greatest audacity in prosodic and rhythmical style. Cushieri's poem Il-Milled ("Christmas") contains no less than six different metres within a very complex structure. Cremona has adopted the rhythms and the lightness of popular poetry in his recent Ghana Malti ("Maltese songs"), after going somewhat astray in attempts at complicated syntax. A collection of his poems was even published under the title Mi-Sigra ta' bajt, waraq mar-rh ("From the tree of my life, leaves in the wind").

All of this poetry is characterised chiefly by a very serious and relatively objective manner of approaching religious, patriotic or narrative subjects, which is found in such diverse works as those of Gorg Fisani, who gives the impression of being an Epicurean (Il-Ghad tas-zgbejja, "The feast of youth", 1945), Gorg Zammit (b. 1908), G. Aquilina, Mary Meylaq (1905-75), a poet of nature as is shown by her collection Flegg il-hena ("The promise of joy", 1945) and Villa Meylaq (1947), Anton Buttigieg (1912-83), or Gużè Delia (1900-80), renowned as the poet of legends following the appearance in 1958 of his collection Leggendi. Nevertheless, even among the poets of this generation there is already a perceptible change, with the deepening of poetic sentiment. "Religious fervour is tainted by pessimism and often has the object of questioning the norms of social life. Patriotic exaltation yields to philosophical or poetic satire. Lyricism becomes more personal" (David Cohen, La littérature maltaise, in Encyclopédie de la Pâtisserie). The work of a certain Karmenu Vassallo (b. 1913) takes this new tendency to the extreme. His collections, Nirien ("Flames", 1938), Kwiekba ta' gailbi ("Stars of my heart", 1944), Flamin u striep ("Doves and serpents", 1959) and Tnemm ("Flickerings", 1970) give the impression of a man disgusted with his century. Even Ruzzar Briffa (1906-63), in spite of the elegance and the musicality which characterise his work, is not immune from existential pessimism (Jem ma naf sox, "I know nothing", 1957) and from social and political indignation (Mi-lid atomika, "Atomic Christmas", 1957).

His influence, as well as that of Wallace Gula (b. 1926) who has greatly diversified his source of inspiration, has exerted a powerful influence on contemporary poetry. Indignation and lyricism, despair and hope, are intermingled in the world of young Maltese poetry, and there has been a revival of amorous poetry. Moreover, unlike their elders who were moulded by the influence of the Italian school, contemporary poets turn rather towards English poetry (of that of T. S. Eliot for example) or French, abandon-
the effort represented by the flowering of Maltese language and literature, coming from a small nation of 320,000 souls, is such as to fill us ... with astonishment and admiration'.


(Martine Vanhoova)

AL-MA'LÜF, a Lebanon family name which became renowned throughout the Arab world through the literary and other intellectual efforts of at least ten of its members, both in Lebanon and in the Mahdjar [q.v.], during the past 150 years. The best known members are Nāṣif ibn Amr b. al-Ma'lūf, who died in 316/928 and his brother Maymūn b. al-Ma'lūf mentioned is Abu 'Umar Ibn Maymūn b. 'Amr b. al-Ma'lūf, who died in 316/928 (see al-Ma'lūf family).

I. Nāṣif al-Ma'lūf (Nassif Mallouf), born in Zabbüğha (Lebanon) 20 March 1823, died near Smyrna 14 May 1865.

He received his first educational lessons at Bayt al-Din, where he went with his father, 'amūl of the amīr Bashīr II (1788-1840). He met there the poets and the scholars who were invited to Bayt al-Din by Amir Bashīr, among whom he met Nāṣif al-Yazdī. Languages attracted his prime interest. He was engaged by a merchant from Smyrna to instruct his sons in Arabic and to teach them the basic rules of French in 1843. Part of his time was reserved for the business of the merchant. In 1845 he was nominated teacher of eastern languages at the school of the Propaganda of the Lazarists at Smyrna. From then on, he used his spare time for the study of Turkish, Italian and modern Greek. He was Dragoman to Lord Raglan, the supreme commander of the English forces during the Crimean War, whom he accompanied from August 1855 to September 1856. His travels with Lord Raglan brought him to London, where he stayed until the end of the year. During this stay, he was elected a member of the Athenaean Club. He then became Dragoman to Sir Henry Bulwer, whom he accompanied from Bucharest to Istanbul. In 1858 he went back to Smyrna to become the first Dragoman of the English consul. He died in 1865 from yellow fever.

All his chroniclers make mention of the fact that Nāṣif al-Ma'lūf was a member of both the English and the French Asiatic Societies. He is listed as a member of the Société Asiatique from 1854, and the Royal Asiatic Society has his name on its lists of members from 1860 until 1867. A curriculum vitae was published in French in the Courrier d'Orient.

His most renowned works are his French-Turkish and Turkish-French dictionaries. The first was printed in Smyrna in 1849 and reprinted in 1856 by Maisonneuve in Paris and listed as Nassif Mallouf, Dictionnaire français-turc. The companion volume Turc-français was first published in 1863. Most of his polyglot and two-language conversation books had at least one reprint edition. His Grammaire élémentaire de la langue turque was published by Maisonneuve.


II. Lūwīs al-Ma'lūf, SJ (Louis Ma'luf), born in Zahla 18 October 1867, died in Beirut, 7 August 1947. He was baptised with the name Zahir, which he changed into Louis upon his entry into the Jesuit Society. He studied at the Jesuit College in Beirut, went to England to study philosophy and studied theology in France, where he stayed for ten years. He is best known for his al-Manqiqd fi l-lughah wa l-adab wa l-'ulūm, the first edition of which dates from 1908 and which has since been reprinted and expanded in many editions.

From 1906-32 he was director and editor of the Catholic weekly al-Bashir. Its annual supplement Takwīm al-Bashir, the almanac, was made by him into a useful instrument of information on matters of calendar, church and state, in that order. His Maktālī falsafyya badima bi-ba'd maṭlahī falsafī fī al-'arab, muslimīn wa-nasārā was first published in Beirut in 1911 by the Imprimerie Catholique and then allāh al-Malikī. This manuscript mentions the Āl al-Ma'lūf al-muslimīn fi Sīkhīyya wa l-'Kaysrīn wa-Sūsā. The oldest Ma'luf mentioned is Abū 'Umar Ibn Maymūn b. 'Amr b. al-Ma'lūf, who died in 316/928 (see al-Ma'lūf family)
reproduced at Frankfurt in 1911 with the French title
Traites inedits d’anciens philosophes arabes musulmans et
chretiens, publiees dans la revue al-Machqiq par L. Malouf, E.
Eddeet L. Cheikho. He edited the Turkish newspaper
wa-Lubnān min sanat 1197 ila sanat 1257 (1782-1841) of
Mikhyāl al-Dimāghki, Beirut 1912. His Risālā
ra’iyiya li l-kahana hasab jārkat al-kiddis Iğmā’iyus was published in 1937 in Beirut.

**Bibliography:** Dāhir, Masādir, ii, 727-9; Ziriklī, al-Âlam, v, 247; Riyyād al-Maślif, شاٰاراٰ - al-Maślif, Beirut 1962, 85.

3. Yūsuf Nuĺuf, born at Zahla 1870, died at New York, 18 June 1956. He emigrated to North America, settled in New York and founded the newspaper al-Ayydm, which survived for ten years from 1897 to 1907. He enlisted the help of his nephew Djamīl (no. 6), who migrated for this purpose. Through their newspaper they made propaganda for Arab independence, and thus earned the displeasure of the Ottoman government. Both were condemned to death under Dāmrāl Pāsha, the military governor of Syria from 1915 until the end of the Syrian campaign of the combined Arab-English forces. Yūsuf, however, never came within reach of the Ottoman authorities. Together with Djamīl he published Kitāb Khidnāt al-‘aṣyām fi tārīqāt al-‘isām, New York 1899, a biographical dictionary of important men, Arabs and non-Arabs. One al-‘isām is Yūsuf al-‘ārād al-‘adāsī al-tābī, New York 1900. His other publications were Lā‘iḥat Iblīl Bek, and Hikayāt Abī l-‘Hudā.

**Bibliography:** Dāhir, Masādir, iii/2, 623-5; Saydāb, Abūdunā wa-usdābunā fi ’l-Muḥādar al-‘Ajmiyya, Beirut 1917, 31, 207; al-Badawī al-Maślif, Beirut 1933, 450-1; Riyad al-Maślif, شاٰاراٰ - al-Maślif, 80.

4. Aīmīn Fāhm al-Maślif, born in al-Shwayfāt (Lebanon), 1871, died in Cairo, 21 January 1943. Aīmīn al-Maślif studied medicine at the Medical University of Beirut until 1894 and then went to Istanbul to obtain his idgāza. He served as a physician in the Egyptian army and took part in the Sudan expedition, the battle of Khartoum and the occupation of the Bahr al-Ghazāl. An account of the Bahr al-Ghazāl occupation by his hand was published in ten instalments in al-Mukāsaf in 1911 and 1912.

He was active during the Balkan war and during the battle of the Dardanelles in the First World War, and then joined the Arab forces of Shari‘ī Huṣayn. He taught biology at the Mu‘adn al-Tibbī al-‘Arabī in Damascus after the capture of that city. When the French put an end to the rule of Faysal over Syria and of the literary club Riwaq al-Ma‘ṣari, both in São Paulo. The Riwaq al-Ma‘ṣari was quite popular, having many itinerant merchants among its members. Their main activity was the recitation of newly-received poems by Ahmad Shawkī and Khālīl Mutrán, followed by comments and imitations along well-known lines of the mu‘arada (Saydāb, 151). The activities of the Riwaq came to an end during the First World War, when preference for nationalistic content to the detriment of literary value drove the better poets of Beirut to escape from it (Saydāb, iii, 316). Kayzār had meanwhile, in 1906 (Riyyād al-Maślif, شاٰاراٰ - al-Maślif, 369, 85) went to Paris and made contact with the Turks who were working for the deposition of ʿAbd Hamīd II.

The list of his publications opens with a play in verse, Riwaqāt Nirān, Zahla 1894. His dīsān, Tīgāhār al-Maḥāqīr, was published in São Paulo in 1904, as were his novels: al-Qhādā al-Surīyya fi ’l-dīyār al-‘Arabīyya, Beirut 1933, 450-1; Riyyād al-Maślif, شاٰاراٰ - al-Maślif, 43; Dāhir, Masādir, iii/2, 1256 f.; Ziriklī, al-Âlam, v, 209 f.; Saydāb, Abūdunā wa-usdābunā, 151, 316-7.


In 1895 he emigrated to São Paulo, Brazil. In 1898 he became editor of the newspaper al-Barāzī, which had been founded in Santos in 1896 and had been moved to São Paulo in 1897. He continued to work for this paper until 1903, when it was absorbed by the newspaper al-‘Akār. He was one of the founding members of an Arabic literary circle among emigrants al-Nahdā al-adābyya and of the literary club Riwaq al-Ma‘ṣari, both in São Paulo. The Riwaq al-Ma‘ṣari was quite popular, having many itinerant merchants among its members. Their main activity was the recitation of newly-received poems by Ahmad Shawkī and Khālīl Mutrán, followed by comments and imitations along well-known lines of the mu‘arada (Saydāb, 151). The activities of the Riwaq came to an end during the First World War, when preference for nationalistic content to the detriment of literary value drove the better poets of Beirut to escape from it (Saydāb, iii, 316). Kayzār had meanwhile, in 1906 (Riyyād al-Maślif, شاٰاراٰ - al-Maślif, 369, 85) went to Paris and made contact with the Turks who were working for the deposition of ʿAbd Hamīd II.


He learned Turkish in Beirut and then, in 1896, answering the call of his uncle, he migrated to the United States and helped in editing the newspaper al-Ayyām. He became a member of the literary circle al-Halāk al-Afghānīya. Part of his time he spent travelling between New York, São Paulo and Lebanon. In 1908 he went to Paris and made contact with the Turks who were working for the deposition of ʿAbd Hamīd II. The following year, after ʿAbd Hamīd’s reign had come to an end, Djamīl travelled via Istanbul to Beirut. The coming of Djamīl Pāsha as military governor of Syria turned out to be a direct threat against his life. He was condemned to death, but escaped from being hanged as his family knew how to hide him from Turkish eyes. An incurable disease put him in hospital before the First World War ended, and there he remained until his death in 1950.
book, but the catalogue of Atatürk's library does not mention the book. Damll advocated turcification of the country, the separation of church and state, unified schooling programmes, the adoption of the European dress, etc. His main publications include Wasiyyat Fuad Bâsha, Sao Paulo 1908, and Kanun al-tâtâ'â' al-sârâyya, also 1908, which he translated from the Turkish.


7. Mîschîl al-Ma'âlîf, born in Zahla, 1889, died in Beirut, 3 June 1942; younger brother of Kaysar and Damll, brother-in-law of 'îsâ Iskandar, and nephew of Yusuf Nu'mân al-Ma'âlîf, his paternal uncle.

His fame chiefly rests on the fact that he was one of the founding-members and the first chairman of al-'Usha al-Andalûsîyya from 1932 to 1938, being one of the sponsors who made the publication of the monthly al-'Usha possible. In 1938 he returned to Lebanon. His contribution to Arabic poetry was limited. Some of his poems are reprinted as an appendix to the memorial volume Fi haykal al-âshârî, containing the commemorative speeches and the elegies of the members of al-'Usha al-Andalûsîyya, as well as the "In memoriam' which had appeared in Durrâtât Zahla al-Fâtât and in the monthly al-Adîb. A play by his hand, Sadjîn al-zulm, was printed at Zahla in 1910.

**Bibliography:** Fi haykal al-dhikrî, Sao Paulo 1944; Riyâd al-Ma'âlîf, 'Shî'ara' al-Ma'âlîf, 51.

8. 'îsâ Iskandar al-Ma'âlîf, born at Kfar 'Akkâb, 23 April 1869, died 2 July 1956. He married in 1897 'Afta Ma'âlîf, the daughter of Ibrahim Bâsha al-Ma'âlîf. Out of this marriage were born Fawzî Ma'âlîf, 1908-1930, and Shafîk (1905-76), for whom see below, nos. 9 and 10.

'îsâ Iskandar received his education at the Scottish Missionary school in his home village and at the Scottish Missionary school in al-Shuwayr. Circumstances forced him to leave school and to pursue his studies privately. In 1890 he was nominated reader at the Patriarchal Orthodox school in Damascus. Almost simultaneously, he began to contribute historical articles to the periodical al-Nîma, and in December of the same year he started to work as the editor, secretary and proof-reader of the newspaper Lubnân. He exchanged Damascus for Zahla in 1898 to teach Arabic, English and Mathematics at al-Kulliya al-Sharkiyya (al-Adawi al-Mu'allimîh, 'îsâ Iskandar, 49). His articles in al-Machrig in this period have his name followed by the words madaris adâb al-lugha al-'arabiyya wa l-tâmîsâh ta al-kulliya al-Sharkiyya (al-Adawi al-Mu'allimîh, 'îsâ Iskandar, 49). His efforts in the field of learning were so much appreciated that he became a member of the learned societies in Lebanon, Syria and Egypt on the very first day of their existence. On 8 January 1918 the Shu'bat al-targumîn was formed during the reign of Faysal in Syria. It was transformed into the Miftâh ul-ma'ârif and then in 1919 into al-Mugâ'im al-'ilmî al-'arabî. He was a member of these societies from the first day, as also of al-Mugâ'im al-'ilmî al-Lubnânî, founded on 20 February, 1928. The Mugâ'im al-tâ'îlîgh al-'arabiyya Egypt counted him among its members on its foundation-day, 6 October 1933. In 1936 he was nominated corresponding member of the Royal Academy of History and Literature in Rio de Janeiro.

He was a very prolific writer. Tarrazi, Tarîkh al-Shîhâ, ii, 234-38, lists almost 40 journals and magazines to which he contributed his articles on a wide variety of subjects. Larger works were often serialised in magazines and then printed in book-form. Dâghîr lists 22 printed works and more than 50 titles of works which did not pass the manuscript-stage. During his lifetime he acquired a large library of about 1,000 manuscripts and 10,000 printed works. Some 500 manuscripts were purchased by the American University in Beirut and catalogued.

The following is a list of works published in book-form or serialised in the periodicals al-Adîb, al-Machrig and al-Muktafat:

al-Khithâr: a volume of studies on script, language and writing (84 pp.), 1895—"Lama fi t's-tawî 'ra fi t's-alâ'im (April 1902)—"al-Khithâr. Ma'âsim, 1902—al-Muktafat, 1902—al-MubâyîNA, a collection of elegies in memory of Mrs. Mahibâ bint Yusuf Abî 'All al-Ma'âlîf, the wife of Ibrahim al-Aswad, proprietor of the newspaper Lubnân, 1903—"al-Mihdîdât wa-ka'bâratîyât, about last words and epitaphs. A series of articles in al-Muktafat, xxx-xxxi (1905-6)—"al-Mugâ'im al-'ilmî wa-lusratuhu, a series of articles on the origins of the Ma'âlîf family and a short biography of Nasîf al-Ma'âlîf, in al-Machrig, vii-ix (1905-6)—"al-Khîrî dirajîs 'îsî al-Lubnânî, 2 parts, in al-Machrig, ix, (1906)—"Nûkhâ ma' âinwân 'Inân ibn Hâkim al-Hakim al-Halabî, 4 parts, in al-Machrig, x (1907)—"DAWNI al-ka'tût fi sirat Bani Ma'âlîf, al-Ma'ta'sa 'al-Ummînîyya, 1908. Apart from being a family history, the Ma'âlûf, other families are also followed. The book is a compendium of the history of Lebanon, Syria and Palestine with information about customs. Asad Rustum, in al-Machrig, liii (1963), 518-20, describes the book as the basic and encyclopaedia of the situation in Lebanon in the first half of the 19th century as it survived in the memories of the old people at the end of that century. The subtitle is a general socio-historical book, being a description of facts, morals and customs and cultural affairs. —Nûkhâ ma' amri al-kiss Hanânî al-Munir, 5 parts, in al-Machrig, xii, (1909)—"al-Shu'ara' wa l-t's-râtîk wa l-ma'âhidîh al-ghîriyya, 16 parts, in al-Muktafat, xxxvii-xxxix, dlv-xlv (1910-1915)—"Tarîkh madinat Zahla, 298 pp., Zahla 1911 and 1912—"Tarîkh Lubnân, printed during World War I, it is said. —"Mu'âradât Ya lay fî yâbâl, a collection of mu'âradât and the original poem by al-Husri al-Kayrawanî see Abu 'l-Hasan al-Husri al-Kayrawanî, ed. of M. Marzukî and D. b. al-Hadjâdj Yahyâ, Tunis 1963, 143-9 and mu'âradât, 150-201, containing Câser al-Ma'âlîf (177-9), 'îsâ Iskandar (182-4), Fawzî al-Ma'âlîf, (185-6) and a mu'âradât by 'îsâ Iskandar 1921, also published in al-Muktafat, lix, (1921)—"Tarîkh al-tîbî hâbi al-arab, 55 pp., 1924—"Tarîkh al-tîbî ind al-arab, Damascus 1924—"Kîlât wa l-hayyân fi 'arabîy, in al-Machrig, li-xiv, li-xv (1924-4)—"Sâna'at Dimashq, for the al-Kulliya al-Sharkiyya, Damascus 1924—"Tarîkh karî Al al-'Azem bi-Dimashq, Beirut 1926. This was serialised in al-Machrig, xxxv

Encyclopaedia of Islam, VI
(1926) with the title *Kasr Ascad Bdshd al-cAzm fi Dimashk—al-Ka4a? fi Lubndn bi-zaman al-umard* (60 pp.), also published in *al-Machriq* until vol. xxx (1932)—al-Usra al-arabiyya fi al-ad Bdshd al-cAzm, serialised in *djam tahlil asmd^al-ashkhds* al-Machriq, Beirut 1947. ShafTk left for Sao Paulo in 1926 to a textile factory there. With his uncle Mishal and his maternal uncle and engaged in commerce at this meeting were published in a special issue of al-Adib, part 2, Beirut 1956, 747; Shuf^fi Wa-^ayndki mihradjdn, Beirut 1973. (C. NIJLAND)

In 1922, he founded *al-Mashjar al-Djami*, which was completed in 1923 but not published till 1973 at Bkfyâla—al-Akhbar al-mansu^ya fi ta'nkh al-usar al-sharkiyya, only partly published in periodicals.

Of the principal constituent elements of his development, mention may be made of the influence of his father (see al-Did, v [1935]; Aoun, 28-9) and the dual cultural background that he acquired in the two clerical institutions of al-Sharkiya (in Zahlâ) and of the Brothers of the Christian Schools (Beirut 1914-15). The World War and the severe famine in Lebanon forced him to interrupt his studies; in 1916 he was employed by the Wheat Commission (Bikaâ, ms. Jan. 1956; Dd, viii/5, 181-2). In 1919, he was appointed bur- sar of the teachers' training college in Zahlâ, and secretary to the Dean of the School of Medicine (al-Ma'had al-tibbi, vii, 127; Dd, 4, Aoun, 33-4). It is to this period that his literary first-fruits belong (Dd, 5-6, 8-11, 39), and in 1921 his poem *Alfdawes al-ma'sada* won him a literary prize. On 17 September of the same year, apparently under compulsion (Dd, 30; Ddus, 25-26), he emigrated to Brazil and settled in São Paulo, where he joined his maternal uncle and engaged in commerce (al-Shark, iv [March 1931]; Dd, 186-8).

In 1922, he founded *al-Muntadâl al-Zaht fi al-Mashjar al-Djami*, Beirut 1930; al-Rabbâ, 10 January 1930; Dd, 4-5, 185), which led to a redoubling of both social and literary activity, and Spanish-Portuguese culture came to be grafted on to his original Arabic-French background (Dd, 37). Although well-known in emigre society from the year 1923 onward, his name only began to arouse the interest of Brazilian literary circles after the appearance, in 1926, of his poem *Alâ bistâ al-ri*.

Details concerning his short life, his generous nature, his illness (20 November 1929) and his death in the English Hospital in Rio de Janeiro (7 January 1930) have been carefully collected by his father (Dd, passim): al-Adib, xxxiii (March 1973), 53d, reprints a letter of ShafTk to *Isâ al-Nâ-gâ, saying that Fawzî had not died of appendicitis but of an inflammation of the duodenum, but that he had told his parents at the time that Fawzî was suffering from an appendicitis in order to allay their worries. The letter was written after *Isâ al-Nâ-gâ had written in al-Adib, xxii/11 (Nov. 1972), 46, that Fawzî had possibly died of a venereal disease or of tuberculosis.

The rare unedited works preserved in his father's library (fragments of poetry, the first issue of a monthly revue, *al-Adab*, intended to be distributed in the school—ms. January 1914—assorted meditations, proverbs and aphorisms translated from French, two panegyrics—ms. 1914-15) display tendency towards an elegant and elaborate prose (*al-Adab*, preface), a quasi-traditional prosody, a romantic taste and a con-
cern for the collation or insertion of items of wisdom. His first novelas, including 
Salmd and 
Ald bisdt al-rih. His position in contemporary Arabic poetry rests, however, on 'Ala 
his soul and the body. Faced by his insoluble dilemma, the divided and shattered being searches for
its lost unity. The transitory tends towards immortality and the finite towards infinity. Thanks to his ima-
naginative power, the poet, a stranger in the material world, seeks deliverance from his terrestrial imprison-
ment and project himself into space (canto x, ii, iii). The stellar journey is marked out with dialogues, notably that of the winged and planetary race. These passages nevertheless bear the melancholic accent of a broken and lonely poet facing his implacable destiny (canto x, vii, viii). The spatial distance opens up a vertical perspective on the world; seen from these spiritual altitudes, controversies deepen, life takes on the appearance of a thin flux of ephemeral beings and there is a proliferation of meditations on the passions of mankind, his vanity and the destructive materialism of a perverse and perfidious civilisation ruled by the spirit of evil (canto x to xii). The poet's expiation is achieved by purificatory inspiration, and original unity is regained by the fusion of the two unyielding elements. But this state of grace attained through the mystery of love is dissipated like "the brightness of a dream" and the flesh is seen to fail. Only the pen, the poet's beloved harp, remains as the sole instrument of consolation and deliverance (canto xiv).

His poetic style takes as its starting-point the neo-
classicism of his contemporaries, where the new pro-
fesses to be the offspring of an older tradition, a prose-
dy. Then he frees himself from this genre so as to integrate himself with the emigrant literary move-
ment. We may recall, in this connection, the elaborate themes, the nature of the imagery, the dimensions of the poetic state, the system of evocative language, which form common ground with the plein of 
Khayyam (1929). Other reminiscences seem to recall the Arabic version of the 
Djurdj Hassun, who knew him well in 
Shuwayr and then studied law at the Jesuit College in 1907 to study law and that he practis-
ed as a barrister for two years before he left Lebanon 
Sten al-tayydra, 
Cairo 1967, 465-72; T. luf, 
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LUF, born at Bikfaya 1893, died in São Paulo 1965. He visited the English school at Shuwayr and then studied law at the Jesuit College in Beirut. Ya'kub al-'Awidt, who knew him well in later years, relates that Djurdj Hassun joined the Jesuit College in 1907 to study law and that he practis-
ed as a barrister for two years before he left Lebanon for Argentine in 1911. There he worked as the secretary to the Ottoman Consulate at Buenos Aires for one year and then he went to Brazil.
one of the founding-members of al-'Uṣba al-andalusiyya. Though he had an astounding knowledge of Arabic poetry, prose held his chief interest. He translated from French, Spanish and Portuguese, and composed some stories himself, apart from numerous articles. He wrote a long introduction (32 pp.) to the Diwan of Ilyās Farḥāt in 1932. Al-Uṣba al-andalusiyya published a volume of stories, partly translated, partly original, with the title Akāsī in 1954. The first installment of a book on the literature of the Mahgār was published in al-Marāḥil. He died in 1965 in a car accident.


MAʿLULĀ, a place in Syria.

1. The locality. Maʿlulā is situated 38 miles/60 km. to the south-east of Damascus, 6 miles/10 km. to the west of the main Damascus-Hims road, on the second plateau (5,000 feet/1,500 metres altitude) of the Djabal Kalamūn, the last chain of the Anti-Lebanon. The agglomeration is constructed in the form of an amphitheatre, inside a wide and deep gap; access to it is protected, from the side of the third plateau, by two defiles which open on to its flanks. There is access by one of these defiles to the monastery of St. Sergius, whose church with a cupola supported on pendentives is of Byzantine date; at the entrance to the other defile there is built, partly on the rock, the monastery of St. Thecla. The parish church of St. Leontius has no features of interest, but a mosaic from the 4th century A.D. has been found in the church of St. Elias.

Maʿlulā is mentioned by George of Cyprus as Magloula and as forming part of Lebanese Phoenicia; Yakūt gives it as a district (ṣūra) of the environs of Damascus. It is known to have been the seat of a Melkite Orthodox bishopric in the 17th century, and in 1724 was attached to Saydnāyā. At the time of the rebellion of the amīr of Baʿlabakk, Muhammad Harbāsh in 1850, Maʿlulā was sacked by the Turkish troops of Muṣṭafā Pāsha chasing the rebels who had taken shelter in the village against the desires of the local population. In 1900 and 1925, Maʿlulā was again attacked and besieged.

The fame of this picturesque place comes from the fact that its inhabitants (about 2,000), who have remained Christians, mainly Melkite Catholics, still speak a Western Aramaic dialect, just like the people of two other nearby villages, Djjubba ‘adīn and Baḥkha, which became Muslim in the 16th century. Since the time of the first notes on the Aramaic or Maʿlulā and Djjubba is mentioned, apart from the regional prestige speech of the city of Damascus—a process already completed for Maʿlulā itself—in all outside relations. Hence it is not astonishing that there is a strong Arabic influence on their Aramaic vernacular, especially in the field of vocabulary: a random count will yield an average of about 20% and even more of words of Arabic origin in any given text. Loan translations abound. Nevertheless, the Aramaic language of Maʿlulā and Djjubba is preserved in full vigour, while at Baḥkha there seems to be a marked tendency, especially among the younger generation, to supplant it entirely by Arabic, which, of course, in due time will lead to its extinction there; in 1971 people of less than forty years’ age were, according to information by inhabitants of the village, no longer able to use the vernacular correctly, although they had no difficulties in understanding it. Understandability among the three villages is mutual, except for smaller details which on the whole will not impair the comprehension of any utterance.

The characteristics of Maʿlulā Aramaic (or, to be more exact, Western Neo-Aramaic) include:

General. MA is a descendant of the western branch of Aramaic (giktul, kallem-e, inter alia), its closest relationship being to Judaeo-Aramaic and Syro-Palestinian.

Phonology. Long vowels of Older Aramaic have been preserved under stress; ā > ə. In unstressed position, they appear shortened -ā > ā - and partially merged, e.g. hēmī < hāmī, pāṣī < pāṣī. Short vowels in a stressed syllable seem to continue the former state, while, when unstressed, they too have undergone, at least phonologically, certain mergers (e > a, o > u against a, pre-tonic even e > a > s against a). Stress is usually on the penult, and may hit even originally prothetic vowels: ēbā < brā via shēd. Voiced plosives consonants have been devoiced (b d g > p t k), voiceless plosives consonants except p palatalised (j k > ā k); Djj. ‘A. k > ā, p has become f > 3 b. Bagdadīfīt laws are no longer operating, although they have left many traces; roots containing susceptible consonants will appear either unified: irkheb < ‘irkheb “he mounted (a horse)” or rikhēb < ‘arkhēb “be put somebody on horseback” corresponding to older arkeb which, except for palatalisation and b > 3 b, should have remained unchanged (for p, see below); or there exists a so-called root-variant: irkēb as above: rikhēp “I mounted”, the p has been generalised in the causative (see above example). Initially, in general the spirant version of these consonants has been perpetuated (original context pronunciation after final vowel).

Morphology. On the whole, the older system has changed very little, much less than in eastern Neo-Aramaic. This is doubtless to be attributed to a certain preserving force exerted by the structurally very similar surrounding Arabic dialects. Salient innovative features out of Aramaic material are the development by fusion of analytical constructions of obligatory verbal forms to show the definiteness of a following direct or indirect nominal object (giktul gahrōna “they hit a man”; kaffīl gahrīna “they hit the man”, < kaffīn-eh f) and the personal inflexion of predicative adjectives by prefixes formally identical with those of the imperfect (ana n-sfer “I’m poor”), as well as the strongly extended use of old kīl and kaffīl participles as a resultative or perfect. Arabic has contributed in addition to a good many of verbal stems (III, V, VI, VII—the normal expression of the

speaking neighbouring villages, Baḥkha and Djjubba ‘Adīn-Ghuppa ‘Odh are bilingual, and use varieties of dialectal Arabic more or less rapidly assimilating to the regional prestige speech of the city of Damascus—a process already completed for Maʿlulā itself—in all outside relations. Hence it is not astonishing that there is a strong Arabic influence on their Aramaic vernacular, especially in the field of vocabulary: a random count will yield an average of about 20% and even more of words of Arabic origin in any given text. Loan translations abound. Nevertheless, the Aramaic language of Maʿlulā and Djjubba is preserved in full vigour, while at Baḥkha there seems to be a marked tendency, especially among the younger generation, to supplant it entirely by Arabic, which, of course, in due time will lead to its extinction there; in 1971 people of less than forty years’ age were, according to information by inhabitants of the village, no longer able to use the vernacular correctly, although they had no difficulties in understanding it. Understandability among the three villages is mutual, except for smaller details which on the whole will not impair the comprehension of any utterance.

The characteristics of Maʿlulā Aramaic (or, to be more exact, Western Neo-Aramaic) include:

General. MA is a descendant of the western branch of Aramaic (giktul, kallem-e, inter alia), its closest relationship being to Judaeo-Aramaic and Syro-Palestinian.

Phonology. Long vowels of Older Aramaic have been preserved under stress; ā > ə. In unstressed position, they appear shortened -ā > ā - and partially merged, e.g. hēmī < hāmī, pāṣī < pāṣī. Short vowels in a stressed syllable seem to continue the former state, while, when unstressed, they too have undergone, at least phonologically, certain mergers (e > a, o > u against a, pre-tonic even e > a > s against a). Stress is usually on the penult, and may hit even originally prothetic vowels: ēbā < brā via shēd. Voiced plosives consonants have been devoiced (b d g > p t k), voiceless plosives consonants except p palatalised (j k > ā k); Djj. ‘A. k > ā, p has become f > 3 b. Bagdadīfīt laws are no longer operating, although they have left many traces; roots containing susceptible consonants will appear either unified: irkheb < ‘irkheb “he mounted (a horse)” or rikhēb < ‘arkhēb “be put somebody on horseback” corresponding to older arkeb which, except for palatalisation and b > 3 b, should have remained unchanged (for p, see below); or there exists a so-called root-variant: irkēb as above: rikhēp “I mounted”, the p has been generalised in the causative (see above example). Initially, in general the spirant version of these consonants has been perpetuated (original context pronunciation after final vowel).

Morphology. On the whole, the older system has changed very little, much less than in eastern Neo-Aramaic. This is doubtless to be attributed to a certain preserving force exerted by the structurally very similar surrounding Arabic dialects. Salient innovative features out of Aramaic material are the development by fusion of analytical constructions of obligatory verbal forms to show the definiteness of a following direct or indirect nominal object (giktul gahrōna “they hit a man”; kaffīl gahrīna “they hit the man”, < kaffīn-eh f) and the personal inflexion of predicative adjectives by prefixes formally identical with those of the imperfect (ana n-sfer “I’m poor”), as well as the strongly extended use of old kīl and kaffīl participles as a resultative or perfect. Arabic has contributed in addition to a good many of verbal stems (III, V, VI, VII—the normal expression of the
passive voice—, VIII, X), which, with the exception of VII, of course may be regarded as a special kind of Aramaic roots on the model of Arabic (Aaron = "bigger")

Syntax: For category syntax, see the preceding section. Clause and sentence connection is realised on the one hand to a large extent by intonation alone (asynesis), while on the other hand there is, as far as clause adverbials of time are concerned, a real profusion of incessantly reappearing temporal conjunctions. Very remarkable is the introduction from Arabic of the asynetic relative clause (the which) to be used in exactly the same circumstances (indefinite clause-head) as in the tongue of origin.

The value of western Neo-Aramaic for the clarification of difficult problems raised by our not always complete understanding of the intricacies of the grammar of Older Aramaic has not yet been fathomed; there is still a grave lack of studies of this kind.


MALWA proper is an inland district of India bordered on the south by Vindhylas, and lying between lat. 24° 30' N. and long. 80° 30' E. To this tract, known in the age of the Mahābhārata as Nishadhara, and later as Avanti, from the name of its capital, now Ujjain, was afterwards added Akara, or eastern Malwa, with its capital, Bhilsa, and the country lying between the Vindhylas and the Satpūras. Primitive tribes like Ahibras and Bhils have been dwelling among the hills and jungles of Malwa since ancient times, some of whom still cling to their primitive way of life. The province formed part of the dominions of the Mauryas, the Western Satraps, the Guptas of Magadha, the white Huns, and the kingdom of Kanawd [q.v.], and then passed to the Malawas, from whom it has its name since about the 5th century A.D. These when Hinduised formed the Paramāra tribe of Rājpūts, which bore sway in Malwa from 800 to 1200, but from the middle of the 11th century onward their power was increasingly challenged by a confederacy of the Çālukyas of Anhilvada and the Kalāṭuris of Tripūri.

Malwa, at the crossroads between northern India and the Dakhan, and between the western provinces and the seaports of Gudjarat [q.v.], always occupied a position of great strategic and commercial importance. It was therefore only a matter of time for the territory to attract the attention of the Sultans of Dihlī. In 632/1234-5 Shīhu’ al-Dīn Dilāwar Ghuri of the Ghurīs [q.v.] went to Dihlī, and from the capital he invaded Ujjain, demolished the temple of Mahākāl, and sacked Bhilsa. This, however, was no more than a predatory raid and did not lead to annexation. Sultan ‘Alā’ al-Dīn Khalḍjī [see KHALDJIS]—who as governor of Kārā had led a successful raid on Bhilsa in 691/1292—sent his commander ‘Ayān al-Mulk Multānī [q.v. in Suppl.], “a master of pen and sword” (Amīr Khusraw), in 705/1305 to conquer Malwa. It now became a province of Dihlī, and, with interludes of Hindu revolt, remained so until, in 804/1401-2, on the disintegration of the Kingdom of Dihlī after Timūr’s invasion, the Afghān governor Dīlāwar Khalīl Khalīrī made it an independent kingdom. With the help of Muzaffar II of the Parama tribe of Rājputas, which bears sway in Malwa since ancient times, some of whom still cling to their primitive way of life. The province formed part of the dominions of the Mauryas, the Western Satraps, the Guptas of Magadha, the white Huns, and the kingdom of Kanawd [q.v.], and then passed to the Malawas, from whom it has its name since about the 5th century A.D. These when Hinduised formed the Paramāra tribe of Rājpūts, which bore sway in Malwa from 800 to 1200, but from the middle of the 11th century onward their power was increasingly challenged by a confederacy of the Çālukyas of Anhilvada and the Kalāṭuris of Tripūri.

Malwa, at the crossroads between northern India and the Dakhan, and between the western provinces and the seaports of Gudjarat [q.v.], always occupied a position of great strategic and commercial importance. It was therefore only a matter of time for the territory to attract the attention of the Sultans of Dihlī. In 632/1234-5 Shīhu’ al-Dīn Dilāwar Ghuri of the Ghurīs [q.v.] went to Dihlī, and from the capital he invaded Ujjain, demolished the temple of Mahākāl, and sacked Bhilsa. This, however, was no more than a predatory raid and did not lead to annexation. Sultan ‘Alā’ al-Dīn Khalḍjī [see KHALDJIS]—who as governor of Kārā had led a successful raid on Bhilsa in 691/1292—sent his commander ‘Ayān al-Mulk Multānī [q.v. in Suppl.], “a master of pen and sword” (Amīr Khusraw), in 705/1305 to conquer Malwa. It now became a province of Dihlī, and, with interludes of Hindu revolt, remained so until, in 804/1401-2, on the disintegration of the Kingdom of Dihlī after Timūr’s invasion, the Afghān governor Dīlāwar Khalīl Khalīrī made it an independent kingdom. With the help of Muzaffar II of the Parama tribe of Rājputas, which bears sway in Malwa since ancient times, some of whom still cling to their primitive way of life. The province formed part of the dominions of the Mauryas, the Western Satraps, the Guptas of Magadha, the white Huns, and the kingdom of Kanawd [q.v.], and then passed to the Malawas, from whom it has its name since about the 5th century A.D. These when Hinduised formed the Paramāra tribe of Rājpūts, which bore sway in Malwa from 800 to 1200, but from the middle of the 11th century onward their power was increasingly challenged by a confederacy of the Çālukyas of Anhilvada and the Kalāṭuris of Tripūri. 

On his death in 873/1469 he was succeeded by his son ʿAbd al-Kādīr Ghiyāth al-Dīn. Though Ghiyāth al-Din was well-versed in warfare, he had the sagacity to shift the emphasis from conquest to consolidation. He gave up his father’s aggressive foreign policy and tried to maintain friendly relations with his neighbours. His reign was a period of peace and plenty, and of cultural development. Having a large harem to look after, he increasingly associated his son Nāṣir al-Dīn in state affairs. In the event, Nāṣir al-Dīn removed all rivals from the throne, forced abdication on his father and himself ascended the throne (906/1500). His cruel reign ended with his death in 916/1510, leaving the kingdom in disarray and beset with grave problems. He was succeeded by his son Muhāmmadh al-Dīn [q.v.], who, though he tried to do a poor general. With the help of Muzaffar II of
MALWA — MALZUZA

Gujarat he rid himself of his powerful Radjput minister, Mednl Ral, but in doing so embroiled himself with Sangrâmá Rànài of Citor, who defeated him in the field and took him prisoner, but generously released him. He then became a province of Gujarât, and in 941/1535 the emperor Humâyùn [q.v.], invading that kingdom, defeated Bahâdûr Shàh at Mandasor and captured Mândù, but was recalled to Hindûstàn in the following year by the menacing attitude of Shîr Khán in Bengal; hence Mâllû Khán, an officer of Mahmûd II, established himself in Mâlâwâ and assumed the title of Kàdir Shådja [q.v.] and Hâdîji Khán, two officers of Shîr Shàh, drove him from Mâlâwâ and assumed the government of the province. Shådja-Khán died in 962/1554-5, and was succeeded by his son Malik Bâyâzîd, known as Bâz Bahâdûr, who, during the decline of the power of the Sûr emperors, became independent. A severe defeat at the hands of the queen of the Gond Kingdom of Garha Mandala engendered in him a distaste for warlike enterprise, and he devoted himself to the reading of books and to the embraces of the beautiful Rûpmàtì. In 968/1561, the Mâlâwâ were conquered by Akbar’s army under Adham Káhàn and defeated his troops, put him to flight, and captured his mistress, who took poison rather than become the conqueror’s paramour. Bâz Bahâdûr fled into Khándeh [q.v.] and Pir Muhammad Khán, second-in-command of Akbar’s army, who followed him there, was defeated by Mâhàrâk Khán of Khándeh and drowned in the Narbâdà. Bâz Bahâdûr returned and again reigned in Mândù, but in 969/1562 another Mughal army under ’Abd Allâh Khán the Uzbek invaded Mâlâwâ and compelled him to flee to Cîtor. He remained a fugitive until 978/1570, when he submitted to Akbar and entered his service. Abu ’l-Fadl mentions him among the adventurer[s] (Râghûbîr Sînh).

It seems that the majority of the Malzuza were annihilated by the Abbasids general Yazíd b. Hâtim b. Kâbiša b. al-Muhallab during the great massacre of the Berber peoples of Tripoli. According to another passage of the History of the Berber of Ibn Khalûdîn, the Malzuza were not a sister-tribe of the Maghllà, but rather a clan of this latter people. Another genealogy of the Malzuza, quite different from that of Ibn Khalûdîn, was given by Ibn al-Abmâr in his monograph on the Manîtids entitled Ra’awât al-nirzîn fi da’wát Bani Marîn. According to this author, the Malzuza belonged, together with the Maghllà, the Maghâr (sic), the Mâyûnà, the Khâshâyà (or Khashâ), the Matmàtà, and the Lamâyà, and also the people of Fâtîn, not to the descendants of Dûnà, but to the great Berber branch of the Zanàtâ.


(T. W. HAIQ - [RIAZUL ISLAM])

MALZUZA, an ancient Berber people belonging to the branch of the But, and to the family of Dârisa, who most probably lived in Tripolitania.

If we are to believe Ibn Khaldûn (9th/14th century) and his sources, the Berber genealogists, the Malzuza were descendants of Fâtîn, son of Tamzît, son of Dârî (eponym of the Dârisa) and were the sister-tribe of the important Berber tribes of the Mâhgrâra, the Lâmâyà, the Šàdînâ, the Kûmiyà, the Mâyûnà, the Mâhghîlî, the Mâtîmàtà, the Khashâyà (or Khashâ) and the Dûnà. The majority of these peoples have survived until the present day, except for three, sc. the Malzuza, Khashàna and Dûnà, who became extinct at an early date and whom the mediaeval Arab historians knew only by name. According to Ibn Khalûdûn, all the nine peoples above-mentioned occupied, before the 8th/14th century, “an exalted rank among the Berber populations and were distinguished by their great exploits”. One should add that, according to the passage of the History of the Berber of Ibn Khalûdûn, the Malzuza were not a sister-tribe of the Maghllà, but rather a clan of this latter people.

Another genealogy of the Malzuza, quite different from that of Ibn Khalûdûn, was given by Ibn al-Abmâr in his monograph on the Manîtids entitled Ra’awât al-nirzîn fi da’wát Bani Marîn. According to this author, the Malzuza belonged, together with the Maghllà, the Maghâr (sic), the Mâyûnà, the Khâshâyà (or Khashâ), the Matmàtà and the Lamâyà, and also the people of Fâtîn, not to the descendants of Dûrî, but to the great Berber branch of the Zanàtà.

It seems that the majority of the Malzuza were annihilated by the Abbasids general Yazíd b. Hâtim b. Kâbiša b. al-Muhallab during the great massacre of the Berber peoples of Tripolitania which took place after the defeat and death of the Bâdî‘ i-mand Abû Hâtim al-Malzuza [q.v.]. The Malzuza, his fellow tribesmen, were to suffer in particular after his fall. However, it is not impossible that a clan of the Malzuza survived until the 4th/10th century. Indeed, one would be tempted to link the name of Malzûza with that of Malzûrâ, a people whose clans formed the most powerful and prominent at six military stations during the great rebellion of 1857.

Bibliography: Ibn Khalûdûn, Histoire des...
ABU HATIM AL-MALZUZI, the famous Ibadi imam. He is mentioned in the Kitab al-Sira wa-akhbarr al-an'ama, an Ibadi chronicle written shortly after 504/1110-11 by Abu Zakariyya. He is also known by other names. In the chronicle, which is one of the last commentaries on biographies of the provincial governors of Berber peoples of Ibn Hawkal (4th/10th century). It should be noted that the tribe into which Abu Hātim was born, the Malzuza, was regarded by Ibn Khaldūn and the Berber genealogists on whom he depended as the sister tribe of the Maghila or, indeed, as a clan of this latter tribe.

As for the orthodox Arabic sources, only three authors tell us of Abu Hātim al-Malzuza: Ibn 'Idhāri al-Marrakūši (7th/13th century), al-Nuwayri (9th/14th century) and Ibn Khuldūn, who lived in the same century. Ibn 'Idhāri tells us of him simply Abu Hātim, except in the passage where he cites al-Tāhiri and where this imām is called Abu Hātim al-İbādī. Al-Nuwayri says that this leader bore the name Abu Hātim b. Ḥabīb and that he was also called Abu Kādim. Abu Hātim was a mawḍūʿ of the Arab tribe of Kinda. Sometimes he is named by al-Nuwayri quite simply as Abu Hātim. Ibn Khuldūn gives the Berber leader the name of Abu Hātim Ya’kūb b. Ḥabīb, according to Ibn Khuldūn, he also bore the name of Abu Kādim; this historian also makes him an amīr of the tribe of the Maghila. It should be noted that the tribe into which Abu Hātim was born, the Malzuza, was according to this author, a sister tribe of the Arab tribe of Kinda. Abu Kādim also bore the name of Abu Hatim Ya’kūb b. Ḥabīb al-Malzuza al-Nadjīsī; he was, according to this author, a mawād of the Arab tribe of Kinda. The latter author cites the Nadjīsī among the peoples of Tripolitania. Similarly, the tribe of the Malzuza seem to have belonged to the Mazāta or, indeed, as a clan of this latter tribe. The latter author also makes him an amīr of the tribe of the Maghila who professed Khāridjī, Ibādī and Suhrī doctrines, as early as the imāmāte of Abu l-Khaṭṭāb ‘Abd al-A‘lā al-Ma‘ṣīfī (110-4/757-61). In fact, if we are to believe Abu Zakariyya, he was governor of the city of Tripoli during the 9th/15th century, and was written as an autograph in an appendix to al-Shammakhl’s Kitab al-Siyar (ed. Cairo, 598-600). At the end of this life, we read that ‘one face towards the oratory opposite the tomb of Abu Hātim’. No doubt this is Abu Hātim al-Malzuza who was killed, as we shall see, in a battle with the ‘Abbāsid army in the Djabal Nafusa and buried in a place in this district. Finally, a distinguished Ibadi writer of the 9th/15th century, Abu l-Kāsim al-Bahṭārī, calls the leader in question Abu Hātim Ya’kūb b. Ḥabīb al-Malzuza al-Hawwārī. As for the orthodox Arabic sources, only three
Malzuzi moved against Tuba, at the head of the Ibadf insurgents of Tripolitania and Hirkiya, who then joined with the other Ibad and Sufr groups besieging Umar b. Hafs. The latter put up a brave defence, at the head of 15,000 soldiers. As for the besieging forces, they formed a huge army, in which Abū Kurra stood out at the head of 40,000 Sufirs. Another band of Sufirs numbering 2,000 soldiers was commanded by 'Abd al-Malik b. Sakardid. Several Ibadf forces, commanded by different leaders, were independent of one another. The sources mention among these latter troops: Abū Hātim at the head of a considerable number of warriors; Yūsuf al-Miswar b. Rustam, with 15,000; 'Aṣīm al-Sadratl at the head of 6,000 warriors and al-Miswar b. Hāni with 10,000. The army under the command of Djarir b. Mas'ūd al-Madyūni was also composed of Ibadf.

During the siege of Tuba, Abū Hātim al-Malzuzi was only one of the leaders of the Ibadf groups and not the commander-in-chief of the Ibadf armies who besieged Umar b. Hafs. The latter, threatened by the great Khāridji army, whose total strength was about four times that of his own army, bought the neutrality of Abū Kurra for 40,000 dirhams. After this, the latter's warriors left Tuba. Similarly, 'Abd al-Rahmān b. Rustam, whose troops had been routed by a detachment of the garrison of Umar b. Hafs, hastened to lead back to Tāhār, his capital, the remnants of his army. It was on this occasion that Abū Hātim and Malzuzi took charge of the besieging forces. Umar b. Hafs, seeing that the forces of the Ibadf surrounding Tuba were very much weakened, succeeded in escaping from this fortress and making haste to Kayrawān, which was also besieged by the Ibadf. The Ibadf army which was besieging this city was already commanded by Abū Hātim, who had abandoned the siege of Tuba to make an end of the affair. It consisted of 6,000 warriors and 3,000 men, besides al-Miswar b. Rustam, whose troops had been routed by a detachment of the garrison of Umar b. Hafs, hastened to lead back to Tāhār, his capital, the remnants of his army. It was on this occasion that Abū Hātim and Malzuzi took charge of the besieging forces.

Abū Hātim, whose biography he is ignorant about. This is why, on reading the final dictionary, the term indicates the widest repertory existing of arbitrators. These deficiencies led the contemporary scholar Muhammad Tāzī al-Tustarl to write a temporary scholar Muhammad Tāzī al-Tustarl to write a temporary scholar Muhammad Tāzī al-Tustarl to write a final dictionary, the term becomes merely a person forward as definitive in this particular sphere.
Qāmūs al-riqāl di Tustan: per una guida alia lettura dei testi prosopografici imamiti, in ibid., 37-49.

AL-MĀMĪ, AL-SHAYKH MUHAMMAD (d. 1282-7), traditional Mauritanian scholar of a highly individualistic nature, whose reputation is founded less upon his considerable qualities as a poet and a Mālikī jurist than upon some of his statements, which caused a sensation in their time.

Thus, for example, he claimed to know the number of grains of sand contained by the earth, by means of a calculation which he reveals in a poem in ḩusūmniyya Arabic, although he refrains from giving the precise result of his computations. He caused something of a scandal by declaring the principle of the roundness of the earth, something of which his compatriots, adhering to the letter of the Kurān: “The earth, We have stretched it out ...” (XV, 19), were still unaware in the 19th century. He is also credited with having predicted the existence of the rich mineral deposits which are exploited today in Mauritania. Legend has it that from his reading of all the books currently available (except two!) he acquired original knowledge which is revealed particularly in his poems in dialectal Arabic. He employed this same mode of expression to declare grammatical rules or to formulate prayers, but he resorted to classical Arabic for anything that could be described as didactic poetry; the latter includes in particular the kasidas entitled al-Misāṭ biyya on the art of debate, and al-Dulfīniyya which express the essence of his judicial teaching.

Concerned to adapt law in such a way as to legitimise the practices of his time, he naturally rejects takdīl, blind imitation, and reveals himself an advocate of idhāḥāt, personal effort; while not going to far as to claim for himself the status of a mujtahid, he skilfully recommends recourse to the practice of taqlīd, which consists in formulating general rules on the basis of the teaching of a particular school, in his case, Mālikism.

A practical problem which engaged the attention of al-Māmī is that of the zakāt [q. v.] of animals owned by the tributaries of a Mauritanian tribe; he considers that they should be relieved of this obligation and bases his conclusion on substantial arguments. Otherwise, in a general fashion, he makes it his business to give legal foundation, in conformity with the shāri‘a, to all the customs rooted in his social milieu and, in his principal work entitled, significantly, Kitāb al-Bādiyya, he addresses himself to the specific problems of nomadic societies: the open-air mosque, the valuation of war) or the natural one (notably: the middle of a road). But the most current denotation of the word, in this latter sense, is that of a piece of territory under the control of some authority—in the modern meaning of the term, a kingdom.

Arabic geographical literature provides some interesting developments of the word. It adopts it, on one hand, in its plural form mamlākît, as it attested by the titles of several works of the type of geography called “that concerned with roads and kingdoms” (Kitāb al-Maslīlī wa l-mamlākī [q. v.]), made popular by Ibn Khurradadhbih. But it is the singular form mamlakat which merits attention here. One of the pioneers of Arab geography, al-Djāhīz, distinguishes in his K. al-Amsār wa-sudjābīn al-buldān between the mamlakat al-‘Arab and the mamlakat al-‘Ajam, which was a classic distinction in the framework of the Shufūbiyya controversies. About 70 years later, around 316-20/928-32, another pioneer of the genre, representing administrative geography, Kudāma b. Dja’far, want beyond the controversy and reunited the two mamlakas into a single one, the mamlakat al-‘īlam or, more simply, al-mamlaka. This course of evolution ended with the geographers of the Balkh school, that of the so-called “atlas of Islam” who devoted themselves to depicting the Islamic world and that world only. The mamlakat al-‘īlam from this time onwards monopolizes geographical description in al-‘Iṣṭakhri, Ibn Ḥawākī and above all al-Muḳaddasi, who opposes, en bloc, this mamlaka to the whole of the remaining world, calling it, according to the needs of the context, mamlakat al-‘īlam, al-mamlaka or al-‘īlam. The feeling of unity, based on economic links and the sense of belonging to the same civilisation, here transcends the political cleavage inherent in the existence of two caliphates at Cordova and Cairo, the rivals of the one in Baghdiyya by the appearance of the Turks in the 5th/11th century en masse, and the decline of the caliphate were to justify this vision;
political divisions were to make this vision disappear, at a single blow, after the year 1000 (Subh al-a^shd, iv, 457, 1.9-458, 1.3). Both sellers and buyers had a very strong interest in the continuation of the slave-trade, with the exception of those under the Mamluk world, with the exception of those under the Mamluk sultanate of Egypt and Syria (see next article), see Bahli; for these last in various parts of the Islamic world, the exception of those under the Mamluk sultanate of Egypt and Syria (see next article), see Bahli. Although for many centuries the basis of several Islamic powers, the institution of military slavery can in many ways best be studied within the framework of the Mamluk sultanate of Egypt and Syria (648-922/1250-1517) since the latter is so richly documented in the historical sources, many of them contemporary to the events which they describe and containing definitions and descriptions of that sultanate's institutions. Although differences of circumstances and the need to handle the Mamlук sources with care (since many of them are partial or inaccurate or valid only for the author's own time) call for caution in making a comparative study, it is nevertheless true that an examination of Mamluk military slavery can in many ways best be studied with care (since many of them are partial or inaccurate or valid only for the author's own time) call for caution in making a comparative study, it is nevertheless true that an examination of Mamluk military slavery is bound to shed much light on other Islamic societies in which the institution played a leading rôle. Of all the slave societies which should be examined in connection with that of the Mamlûks, it is obvious that those immediately preceding and following it (in the Ayyubid period and in Ottoman Egypt) should have first priority.

1. Countries of origin and racial composition.

We know quite a lot about the racial composition of the Mamluk of the Mamluk sultanate and their countries of origin (called quite often simply al-bilâd; see e.g. Ibn al-Dawâdârî, ix, 71, 11.12-13). By contrast, though we know that the greater part of the Ayyubid's Mamlûks were Turkish, we do not know their exact lands of origin, with the certain exception of al-Malik al-Sâlih Nagâm al-Dîn Ayyûb's reign, the direct predecessor of the Mamluk period, and with the possible exception of the reigns of one or two of his Ayyubid contemporaries or immediate predecessors. The source evidence on the characteristics of the peoples supplying the Mamlûks and on the various factors which brought about those Mamlûks' sale and importation into the sultanate, clarifies the reasons for the creation of a military slave institution and explains its unparalleled success and durability as the major military force for its time in the lands of Islam.

A most important description of the Kipčâk steppe [see DÂSHT-I KÎPKÂC in Suppl.] and its people, the major source of military slaves for the Mamluk sultanate in the first part of its existence, is that of Ibn Faḍl Allah al-'Umârî, who based it on the evidence of persons who visited the Golden Horde (K. Lech, Das Mongolische Weltreich, Wiesbaden 1968, 68-71 of the Arabic text, which is an excerpt of the Mašâlik al-âbâr, al-Kalkashandî, Subh al-a^shâ; iv, 456-8). There the author stresses both the very harsh circumstances in which the inhabitants of that steppe live, their primitiveness (including that of their pagan religion), as well as their military ability, faithfulness and loyalty (see also al-Dîmâqâhî, Naqshat al-dahr, 264, 11. 4-11). Particularly children, a combination of quality which made them highly suitable raw fighting material. The sources attest a unanimous conviction that the Mamlûks of Egypt and Syria had been the decisive factor in saving Islam both from the Frankish and the Mongol threats since the battles of al-Manâqûra (647/1249) and the Later battles against the Ilkhâns of Persia and Trâk (al-'Umârî, op. cit., 70, 1-71, 1.12; Subh, iv, 458. See also D. Ayâlon, The transfer of the Abhâbân caliphate, 58-9, and n. 1; idem, The European-Asiatic steppe, 47-52; idem, The Great Yasa, part Cx1, 117-130, part Cx2, 148-56; idem, From Ayyubids to Mamlûks). This unprecedented and repeated evidence is crowned by Ibn Khaldûn's evaluation of the Mamlûk phenomenon in the lands of Islam in general and in the Mamluk sultanate in particular ('Bar, v, 369-73; Ayâlon, Mamlûkyydt, 340-3). The resultant prestige greatly helped the Mamlûks in overthrowing the Ayyubids, in firmly establishing their rule, and in thoroughly incorporating in their realm an undivided Syria, as a region with a status very inferior to that of Egypt.

The factors which led to the sale of slaves by the inhabitants of the Kipčâk steppe and their rulers were the following ones: the general destitution of the population, which forced it, in certain years, to sell its children ('Umârî, 70, 11. 2-4; Subh, iv, 458, 1.12; al-Mâkzîrî, Sulâk, i, 942, 11. 10-12); the need to sell the children in lieu of taxes to the ruler (Subh, iv, 476, 11. 11-16); the ruler's capturing and selling the children and women of his subjects (Subh, iv, 474, 11. 10-475, 1.1). It was not, however, only under duress and such pressures that those children were sold. The high sums paid for them constituted an immense incentive. In the third reign of al-Nâṣîr Muḥammad b. Kalâwîn (1309-40 [q.v.]), who was exceptionally lavish in his buying of Mamlûks, the Mongols competed so fiercely with each other in selling their boys, girls and relatives to the slave merchants, that it marred their internal relations (Sulâk, ii, 525, 11.6-10).

It is true that the Mongol attacks on the Kipčâk steppe filled the slave markets with Turks from there, thus facilitating their purchase by the later Ayyubids and particularly by al-Sâlih Nagâm al-Dîn Ayyûb, and indirectly contributing to the establishment of the Mamluk state (see e.g. Ayâlon, Le régime Bahriya, 133-4; idem, The Great Yasa, part Cx1, 117 ff.). However, prisoners of war captured by any kind of external enemy, or even by a Muslim ruler, could not guarantee the uninterrupted supply of Mamlûks, particularly children below military age, without the constant co-operation of local elements, whether the ruler, or the heads of the tribes, or above all, the parents and relatives of those children. Furthermore, that co-operation in selling their own flesh and blood was not confined to the subjugated peoples, but included as well the conquering and subjugating Mongols, and we are even informed as well that the subjugated peoples of that region used to steal the children of their Mongol conquerers and sell them to the slave-dealers ('Umârî, 72, 14.11-17).

The Islamisation of the Mongol dynasty of the Golden Horde and many of its constituent peoples must have contributed, in the long run, to the diminution of military manpower for the lands of Islam from the Kipčâk steppe and especially for the Mamlûk sultanate. In the short run, however, it is quite doubtful whether the adoption of Islam had a considerable effect on the slave-trade from that region. For many years, those who became Muslims retained many of their old pagan habits, and numerous other remained pagan ('Umârî, 72, 14.11-19; Subh, iv, 457, 1.19-458, 1.3). Both sellers and buyers had a very strong interest in the continuation of the slave-trade,
which meant that new converts to Islam were not necessarily excluded from becoming Mamluks (ibid.). For the effects of conversion to Judaism or Christiani-
yty of nomads of the Eurasian steppe at an earlier period on their readiness to sell their children, see al-
Iṣṭaḥābī, 223, 11.11-15.

One of the major drawbacks of the Mamluk system, from which almost all the Muslim states suffered, was that they had little or no control on their sources of supply (the outstanding exception being the Ottoman empire, which recruited most of its kullar from the Christian peoples living within its boundaries). The states which were not contiguous to those sources of supply had an additional major problem, that of being dependent on favourable factors concerning the routes leading to the sources in question (be they sea or land-routes) (see e.g. Ayalon, Aspects of the Mamluk phenomenon, i, 207-9). The Mamluk sultanate was, in this respect, completely dependent on foreign factors both on land and on sea; hence its attempts to diversify its routes (and very probably its sources) of supply as far as it could.

The main route was by sea through the Bosphorus and the Dardanelles, and this was under the complete command of Byzantium, and later the Ottomans, and the Franks. In the Byzantine period there is no complaint in the Mamluk sources about Byzantine interference with very few of the routes of the Mamluk sultanate, in spite of Byzantium's ambivalent policy in its relations with the Mongols of the Golden Horde, the Ilkhan of Persia and I'tâk and the Mamluks. In the correspondence between Michael Palaeologus and Kalâwûn in 680/1281 concerning the conclusion of a pact between the two states, the slave traffic figures quite prominently. The emperor promises, inter alia, safe passage of Mamluks and slave girls, on the condition that there will be no Christians among them, but demands the release of all the Christian Mamluks already in the sultanate to Byzantium. The sultan agrees, in his answer, to most of the emperor's suggestions, and stresses the importance of granting safe conduct to the merchants coming from Sûdûk and the Kîpçâk steppe, but completely ignores the emperor's demand about the Christians of Little Armenia, as well as the importance of the route, is questionable. Interference with the ordinary flow of slaves to the Byzantine realm by this Eastern Anatolian route. One of the stipulations of the Mamluk sultan in that treaty was the free purchase of Mamluks in the Ilkhanid dominions (Esclangon, 3; al-
Safrâdi, al-Wâţî fi l-fasâ'id, vi, Wiesbaden 1974, 220, 1.9-221, 1.6; Ibn al-Dawâdârî, Kâz n al-durar, ix, 312, 1.16-313, 1.10; al-Mâkûrî, Sulûk, ii, index, p. 1020b), and it is thus very probable that the flow of Mamluks through Ilkhanid territory increased as a result of the treaty. It is true that Dîmûrâd b. Dîjûbân, the Ilkhanid governor of Anatolia (Bîlîd al-Rûm), prohibited, after 1225, the dispatch of Mamluks to Egypt by sea or through the straits of the Dardanelles (al-Makrizî, Kanz al-durar, ix, 312, 1.16-313, 1.10; al-Mâkûrî, Sulûk, ii, p. 1293, 11.1-8), but the attitude of that highly controversial ruler, for which he paid with his life, should be considered as exceptional. How the slave trade from the Ilkhanid empire went on after its disintegration in 736/1336 is unknown.

In the third reign of al-Nâsîr Muḥammad b. Kalâwûn, the purchase of Mamluks reached, perhaps, its peak. He is said to have imported Mamluks and slave girls from "V. the Golden Horde (Bîlîd Uzbek), Anatolia (al-Rûm), Tabrîz and Baghâdîd and other countries" (Sulûk, ii, 524, 11.13-15); clearly, at this time all the three main routes connecting his realm with the Mamluks' countries of origin were in use.

In summing up the problem of the routes through which military manpower was supplied to the Mamluk sultanate, it can be said that interference with the flow of slaves into it, be it by Byzantines, Ottomans, rulers of Little Armenia, Ilkhanid Mongols or Christian Europeans, never seriously affected the military strength of that sultanate; only an effective embargo on this item alone might have broken that strength.

One of the major events in the history of the Mamluk sultanate, which transformed the racial composition of its military aristocracy, was the supplanting of the Kîpçâk Turks by the Circassians. The
Mamlük sources attribute that transformation solely to internal causes (Ayalon, Circassians, 135-6). There are, however, good reasons to suggest that the situation in the Mamluks' countries of origin had some share in bringing about that result. There is a considerable amount of evidence about the comparatively flourishing situation and the dense population of the Kıpçak steppe in ca. 1200-1350 (ibid., 136, and n. 2), although the process of its decline seems to have started with the Mongol occupation (al-Umarî, 71, 11.15-18). Ibn ʿArabghallah gives quite a detailed description of how it had been devastated and depopulated by internal wars and the attack of Timur (Akkhâr Timurî, 113, 1.5-115, 1.4, 122, 1.2, 126, 1.2-127, 1.4; see also A. N. Poliak, in REI [1935], 241-2; idem, in BSOS, x, 864-7). The very fact that the area had been a major source for the supply of Mamluks must have contributed considerably to its depopulation and perhaps even to the military devaluation of its human material, since the slave traffic was confined mainly to a particular section of a small age group, namely, the cream of adolescent boys and girls who still had all the reproductive years ahead of them, and this must have adversely affected the future generations in the steppe. Although the number of the Royal Mamluks (al-mamlûk al-sulânîyya) was not very great, it should be remembered that many of the commanders, both in Egypt and in Syria, had their own Mamluks, and that the owning of white slaves existed in sections of society well beyond the military aristocracy. Furthermore, the Kıpçak steppe supplied slaves to countries outside the Mamlûk sultanate as well. Finally, the rate of mortality among those Mamluks in the countries to which they had been imported was very high, especially in times of epidemics, necessitating the more or less constant need for the replenishment of their thinning ranks. The long-range effects of the islamisation of the peoples of the Kıpçak steppe have already been mentioned.

Before enumerating the races of the Mamluks, the term Türk must be discussed. It had two meanings; one very wide, the other much narrower. We shall start with the wider meaning, leaving the other to the enumeration of the races. Türk or Atrak in the wide sense embraced all the Mamlûk races, and was practically synonymous with Mamlûks. The Mamlûk sultanate was called Đaâlalât al-Turk or Đaâlalât al-Atrak or al-Daâlalât al-Turkiyya. The commonest designation of the Mamlûk sultans was Maltûl al-Turk. But whereas the sultans of the Kıpçak period had only this designation, each of the sultans of the Circassian period had a double designation; thus Sultan Qânûna was the thirty-fourth of “Maltûl al-Turk and their sons” and the tenth of the “Qânûniyya and their sons”1; and so on.

To compile a list of the various races represented in Mamlûk military society is quite easy. But to evaluate the respective weight of the various racial groups, with the exception of the two major ones (the Türk and the Đaâlalâts) is very difficult. This is because it is quite rare that the sources refer to the racial affiliation of individual Mamlûks, who were usually given Turkish names irrespective of their racial origin; moreover, the mention of racial groups taking an active part in a certain event or struggle (again with the exception of the two main races) is even more rarer (some lists of Mamlûk racial groups do however exist). This is in glaring contrast to the extremely rich and varied data furnished by those sources about the groups (zaawâli, sing. āliyya) based on slave and patron relations, like the Zâhiriyya of Baybars, Mansûríyya of Kâlûwân, Nâsirîyya of Farâdji, Aṣârifîyya of Kâyîbtây, etc. Therefore, our picture of these groups and their relations (on whom see below) is far clearer than that of the racial groups (ṣânîn, sing. ʿin). The racial struggle concerns itself mainly in connection with the Circassians and from a comparatively early date in the Turkish-Kıpçak period, reaching its peak in the closing decades of the 8th/14th century. After the almost total victory of the Circassians, it is brushed aside, with the exception of some flickers of antagonism on the part of other races, and of repeated expressions of haughtiness towards and discrimination against those races on the part of the Circassians.

In Ottoman Egypt, the racial factor is even more subdued than the Mamlûk one. Furthermore, at least as far as the chronicle of al-Djibartî [q.v.] is concerned, practically the only data we possess about the racial composition of the military aristocracy are that source’s mentioning of the racial affiliation of a certain number of individual Mamluks.

From the data in the sources of the Mamlûk period (including the lists of personnel), the following general list can be reconstructed: Türk (or Atrak), Kıpçak, Tatar, Mughul (or Mughâl), Khâqâniyya, Rûs, Rûm, Arman, Ās, Abâza, Lâz and Đaâlalâts.

By far the two dominant races were the Türk and the Đaâlalâts, if the whole Mamlûk period is considered. The Đaâlalâts seem to have constituted an important element already in the Burdíyya [q.v.] regiment created by Kâlûwân, and are the only ones mentioned as repeatedly challenging the supremacy of the Türk. The Kıpçak are rarely referred to in the above-mentioned data and lists, and are an obvious synonym of Türk. The case of the Mughul and the Tatar is more complicated. The Mughul, who are mentioned only in the Kıpçak period, seem to have been distinct from the Türk, although perhaps with a certain degree of overlapping. The Tatar, on the other hand, especially under the Circassians, were very often synonymous with Türk. This can be proved in two ways: (a) Türk and Tatar are never mentioned together in the same list, or in connection with the same event; and (b) a good number of individual Mamlûks in the Circassian period are said to have been Türk al-ʿin on one occasion and Tatar al-ʿin on another. The reason for that alternation is obvious.

The more the Tatars advanced in the steppe, the greater was the Turkish element which they subjugated and incorporated in their armies; and since the Turks were much more numerous, it was they who absorbed their conquerors. Already Ibn Faḍl Allâh al-Umarî says that the Tatars were completely assimilated by the Kıpçâks and lost their own identity (op. cit., 73, 11, 17-20).

The Rûs were third in importance. There is no sufficient information for establishing the relative importance of the other racial groups. The Rûs are never mentioned as a racial group outside the lists, and there are hardly any individual Mamlûks who are said to have belonged to that race (the best-known individual is Baybûgha Rûs, or Urus or Urûs).

The Franks (Farâdji, Fîrângî) are never mentioned in the Mamlûk sources as a racial group. There are, however, a fair number of Mamlûks who are said to have been of Frankish origin; and since the Mamlûks, as already stated, did not preserve their original infidel names—especially if they had not been Turks—and since the origin of many of them is not mentioned, the number of the Franks amongst them might well have been considerably higher. Yet the sources’ absolute silence about the Franks as a separate body does not support the claim of some mediaeval Euro-
pean writers about the very great proportion of Franks in the Mamluk army. One should, however, take into consideration the possibility that there might have been a certain degree of overlapping between 

There were some Muslim-born people, even from within the boundaries of the Mamluk sultanate, or from the neighbouring countries (particularly the areas inhabited by the Turcomans), or from regions lying further away, who managed to join the Mamluk military aristocracy either by fraudulent means (such as an arrangement with the slave dealer), or because they were taken prisoners and found the status of a Mamluk too good to give up by admitting that they were in reality Muslims. Some of these whose bluff had been called were ousted from the military aristocracy, deprived of their Mamluk names and forced to bear again their original names. These Muslim-born Mamluks constituted, however, only a very marginal element in Mamluk society. A few of the Turcomans who became Mamluks were called Rūmīs as well.

2. The arrival and early training of the Mamlūk

The crucial stage in the Mamlūk’s career, from his leaving his country of origin, through his education and upbringing, and up to his manumission, can be reconstructed fairly well in the Mamluk sultanate, despite numerous gaps which affect the sureness of the general picture; even so, this picture is far superior to what we know at present about the parallel careers of military slaves in the rest of the mediaeval Muslim world, including the Ottoman empire, up to the beginning of the 10th/16th century.

In the life story of each Mamlūk, his slave merchant, and especially the one who brought him over from his country of origin, figured most prominently. He was his first patron and protector from the hardships and dangers during the long voyage to his adopting country. He also served as the most usual link between him and his original homeland, so that Mamlūk was usually bound with strong ties of affection and veneration to that merchant. All of those merchants were Muslim civilians from outside the Mamluk sultanate, and some of them became very influential in that sultanate. They should not be confused with the “merchant of the Mamlūks” (tājīr al-mamālīk, or fully, tājīr al-mamālīk al-sulṭānīyya), who was generally a low-ranking Mamlūk amīr (amīr of ten) and whose function was to supervise the commerce of the Mamlūks; this personage usually stayed within the boundaries of the sultanate.

While we know very little about the slave-market and its functioning, we know much more about how the sultans bought their Mamlūks; they in fact usually bought them from the Bayāt al-Māl [q.v.] or treasury. Those of them who had not yet been manumitted before the death or dismissal of the reigning sultan were returned to the Bayāt al-Māl and bought from there by the new sultan.

The sultan’s Mamlūks were brought up in a military school situated in the barracks (tābaka, tābāk, sing. tabaka) of the Cairo citadel, of which there were 12. It would appear that each of those barracks had a special (probably separate and secluded) section assigned to the Mamlūk novices (kuṭūbah, or possibly kuṭūbiyya, sing. kuṭūbah or kuṭūbi), since (a) after having finished their period of training, and as long as they had not been driven out of the citadel, the Mamlūks continued to stay in those barracks and being called by their respective names; and (b) the barracks accommodated a bigger numbers of Mamlūks than the number of novices staying there at any given moment.

The education of the novice was divided into two main parts: the study of the elements of Islam and afterwards the military training (amuṣūṭ or ṣawīn al-harb or al-furūṣiyya). The first part was most essential; for, in spite of its unavoidable elementary character, it inculcated in him the conviction that he had been led in the right path from the darkness of heathendom to the light of Islam (see also Baybars al-Mansūrī, Zubātāt al-fikrā, B. L. ms. no. 23235, fol. 51b, 11.5-16). The second part of the novices’ education of the Mamlūk, even if later in his career he did not lead a very strict religious life, was at least as important as his other kinds of gratitude to the Muslim environment in general, and to his patron in particular, for raising him from poverty to richness and from anonymity to fame and high position. As al-Makrizī aptly puts it in his well-known passage on the Mamlūk’s upbringing, the combination of his identification with his new religion, and a great proficiency in the art of war (more precisely, in horsemanship) were the targets of the Mamlūk’s education. “[U]ntil the glorification of Islam and its people had been merged in his heart, and he became strong in archery, in handling the lance and in riding the horse’’ (Kitāb, ii, 214, 11.1-2).

Curtailing the religious education, or dropping it altogether, because of the need or desire to shorten the period of apprenticeship, was always a symptom of decline in the Mamlūk sultanate or elsewhere.

3. The role of the eunuchs

The overwhelming dominant element in the personnel of the military school was that of the eunuchs [see kaṣīr], who took part in the upbringing of the novices (even in the religious field, in addition to the theologians), as well as in keeping very strict discipline among them. A major reason for manning the school with eunuchs was to use them as a buffer between the young and adult Mamlūks to prevent pederasty [see liwāt]. A novice proved to have been the object of sodomy could be sentenced to death (Kitāb, ii, 214, 11.6-8).

The eunuchs in the military school formed a kind of a pyramid, as the basis of which were the simple eunuchs called khūdām (or tawāyjīs) al-tabhāk. At the head of each barracks was a eunuch called mukaddam al-tabākā, and all the barracks were commanded by a eunuch who was called mukaddam al-mamālīk al-sulṭānīyya and who had a deputy (maḥb), also a eunuch. There does not seem to have been a separation between eunuchs serving in the school and in other military or administrative capacity and those of them serving in the harem or in religious institutions. It would appear, however, that they did not usually perform those different functions simultaneously.

The eunuchs as a body were extremely strong and influential under the Mamlūk sultans. It is difficult to compare their power with that of the eunuchs in other Muslim mediaeval states, because the eunuch hierarchy of those other states cannot be reconstructed to the same degree. What is certain, however, is that individual eunuchs in the Mamlūk sultanate could not rise to the highest ranks or be as powerful as those in other Muslim states, including under the Ayyūbids and in the very early decades of the Mamlūk sultanate; neither could they be commanders in the field of battle, as happened so often in earlier Muslim states. The highest rank that a eunuch could reach under the Mamlūks was the middle one, namely, amīr of forty, and even to this rank only one single eunuch could be appointed, the Mukaddam al-Mamālīk al-
Sultaniyya. Only in the chaotic conditions prevailing in the years immediately following al-Nasir Muhammad b. Kalâwîn’s third reign, to a very great extent as a result of that reign, the eunuchs, together with the women and slave-girls of the court, accumulated unprecedented power. This kind of power could not have lasted for long, for in addition to its running counter to the basic concepts of Muslim society, it would have destroyed the very foundations of Mamlûk aristocracy. Other evils originating from that reign (usually believed to be good and great, with only partial justification) lasted much longer (see below).

The eunuchs in the Mamlûk sultanate belonged mainly to four races, the Rûm, Habash, Hind and Takhrîr, the two first-named being the predominant races. Thus only one race, the Rûm, was common to them and to the Mamlûks. Like the Mamlûks, each one of them was considered to be Ibn ‘Abd Allâh (thus shrouding his infidel past in obscurity). Unlike them, however, they bore a special kind of Muslim names, representing the pleasant and beautiful (gems, perfumes, etc.; see Lâkâb). Only a few of them bore Turkish names.

With all the differences between them and the Mamlûks, the eunuchs of the court formed a very essential part of the aristocracy, and without them, the early stage of the Mamlûk’s career, which affected so decisively his subsequent one, would have been fundamentally different.

4. Completion of training and manumission

There is no evidence indicating the average length of the period which the novice had to stay in the military school. There is, however, much proof to show that, on the whole, that period was considerably shortened in the later period, a curtailment which adversely affected the proficiency of the Mamlûk soldier. Each single Mamlûk attending the school was manumitted on finishing his period of apprenticeship. The ceremony was a communal one, carried out in the presence of the sultan in a passing-out parade called Khânqâh, in which 150 to 500 “graduates” took part. Each one of them received a manumission certificate, called ‘isâda, which attested, at the same time, his being a fully-fledged soldier.

The amirs did not have at their disposal facilities even remotely similar to those of the sultan for upbringing and training their Mamlûks, a fact which was reflected in their comparatively military inferiority. There are, however, certain indications that the Mamlûks of the great amirs were brought up according to principles resembling those which were applied in the case of the sultan’s Mamlûks (see e.g. Zuhdât at-Fikr, fols. 51b, 11.5-16, 99b, 11.13-100, 1.4).

The Mamlûks, on their manumission, were simple soldiers. Thus they were given an equal start. However, they had a real chance to rise to the highest ranks only if they had been manumitted by a sultan and not merely by an amir, and this chance was greatly improved if the Mamlûk was included in the sultan’s personal guard (al-‘hâsisâkiyya [q.v.]). There was no school for training officers; these rose from the rank of simple soldier without having to undergo a special kind of training.

In a most illuminating passage, where al-Makrînî contrasts the attitude of al-Nâsir Muhammad b. Kalâwîn to his Mamlûks with that of the sultans who preceded him, the correct principles for creating a healthy and successful Mamlûk military body, as against the wrong ones, come to the fore: The earlier sultans, besides giving the Mamlûk the proper up bringing (already described earlier), used to dress him in comparatively simple clothes, raise his salary gradually and promote him slowly in rank and position. A Mamlûk thus treated, when reaching the top, will know how valuable is his new status, acquired with such efforts, and will be able to make the right comparison between his previous wretchedness (shakâz) and his present well-being (na‘îm) (Suluk, ii, 524 1.5-525 1.15).

5. The Mamlûk and his patron

The period of the Mamlûk’s slavery, terminated by his manumission, did not only affect his career (i.e. his chances of rising in the socio-military ladder), but also determined for life his close affiliations. He was bound by loyalty, on the one hand, to his manumitting patron (mawlîk, usâdîfî), and, on the other, to his colleagues in servitude and manumission (khushshâkiyya). The intensity of the Mamlûks’ feelings of loyalty to their patron is revealed in those cases when things did not work according to plan. It happened that a patron-sultan died or was dethroned, but shortly before the date fixed for the manumission of a certain group of his Mamlûks. This group refused sometimes to be manumitted by their new patron-sultan in spite of the fact that by doing so they practically dealt a death blow to their chances of becoming part of the uppermost stratum of the military aristocracy. The patron and his freedmen developed relations very similar to those of a family. He was considered to be their father (wâdhî), and they his sons (wâdâd, sing, wâlîd), and the freedmen amongst themselves were regarded as brothers (ikhwâm, sing. âkh), with special relations between senior and junior brothers (âhâwâd, sing. âghâ, and inyyût, sing. ini).

The ties binding the patron to his own freedmen and the same freedmen to each other constituted the pivot upon which Mamlûk internal relations hinged. These ties continued to be binding after the dismissal or death of the patron. That cohesive factor, most formidable in itself, was supplemented and strengthened by a repressive one: a freedman of patron A, who had been transferred to the service of patron B, would never be accepted by him and his own freedmen on an equal footing. He would always be considered as a stranger (gharb, adjnabi). A Mamlûk “family” or group or faction (ảfûn, pl. âsâbîn) kept outsiders serving their patron at arm’s length. Such a faction, if and when separated from its patron, could either be broken by killing its members, putting them in prison, sending them into exile and transferring them to the service of other patrons, under whom they were given an inferior status, or else remain intact and carry on until the death of the last of its members. In the Mamlûk sultanate, a new sultan quite often broke up part of his immediate predecessor’s freedmen and let the other part stay on until it petered out after several decades. Under the Circassians, where the attempts to create a dynasty failed constantly, and sultans followed each other in quick succession, numerous factions, owing allegiance to different sultans, existed simultaneously. Many combinations of short-lived coalitions between those factions were constantly forming and dissolving. A very instructive case in point is Ibn Taghrîbirdî’s account of the change in sultan Khushkadam’s position from almost complete shakiness to comparative stability as a result of the varying attitudes of the Mamlûks of the sultans who preceded him, both in their relations among themselves and with the Mamlûks of the reigning sultan, al-Zâhiriyya Khushkadam. The Mamlûks of the sultans who preceded Khushkadam were, in the order of their seniority, al-Mu’ayyadîyya Shâykh, al-
The particular ties existing between the patron and his slave soldiers go back to the very beginning of military slave society in Islam and always constituted one of that society’s mainstays. However, they clashed quite often with interests wider than those of the specific ruler and his military slaves, thus constituting a source of weakness as well. Yet on balance, they had, from a Muslim point of view, a positive value. The great drawback of the whole system was that it had outlived its purpose; it could not cope properly with the progress of technology and with the unavoidable military changes which it brought about, as was so decisively demonstrated in the annihilation of the Mamluk army and empire by the Ottomans [see ǎkko. iii. The Mamlūks]. In Ottoman Egypt, the antiquated character of the art of war as practised by the Mamluks was only accentuated. At the same time, the internal disensions within Mamluk society were greatly intensified, through a strange merging of hereditary and one-generation nobilities in that society. Hence Mamluk “houses” (bâyût, sing. bayt) did not peter out as they did in the Mamluk sultanate, but went on living indefinitely as long as they were not crushed by a factor external to the specific “house”. The longer they lived, the more deep-rooted and vehement became their mutual hatreds. The incidents necessitating the taking of blood revenge (al-akhḍ bi l-ṭahr) grew in number, ultimately leading to the unflinching determination of annihilating physically (baṣ’ , izda) the rival “house”. When the Fikārīyya wiped out the Kāsimīyya in 1142/1729, the causes which brought about the inevitably uncompromising struggles within the Mamluk society were not removed; the “houses” which grew out of the Fikārīyya continued their fights according to the old pattern.

6. Mamlūk Society

Mamlūk society in the sultanate was a very exclusive one. In order to become a member of it, one had to fulfill very definite requirements. One had to be a Mamluk. Of the many thousands of people who lived in the area stretching to the north and to the north-east of the lands of Islam; to be born an infidel; to be brought into the Mamluk sultanate as a child or young boy (preferably at the age of puberty); and to be bought, brought up and manumitted by a patron who was a member of the military aristocracy (preferably a Mamluk as well, and most preferably the sultan himself). The chances of a Mamluk who had been bought and manumitted by a civilian of joining the aristocracy, and particularly of rising high within it, were very meagre indeed.

What greatly helped in making the Mamluks such an easily distinguishable, distinct and exclusive caste was a practice which started long before the creation of the Mamluk sultanate, namely, that all of them, with but a few exceptions, bore Turkish names, irrespective of their origin. This was also the case of the Circassians when they came to constitute the major factor in the military aristocracy. The fact that most of the Mamluks’ sons (wulal al-nās ) bore Muslim names greatly helped in their smooth outing from that aristocracy, thus facilitating its preservation as a one-generation aristocracy. In Ottoman Egypt, the adoption of Muslim names by the overwhelming majority of the Mamluks was an important factor in the creation of a society in which hereditary and one-generation nobilities merged into one.

Another important aspect of the exclusiveness of that society was that its members married mainly slave-girls from their own countries of origin or daughters of Mamluks. Most of their concubines were also from the same region, although black girls were by no means excluded from that category. Marriages between Mamluk amirs and local girls (mainly the daughters of high-ranking officials, great merchants or distinguished ālamāt ) were quite rare. This meant that the number of slave-girls imported from the areas which served as the source for military slaves was at least as great as the number of Mamluks. Marriages between the sons of the Mamluks and local girls were much more numerous, and this represents one facet of the assimilation of the Mamluks’ offspring in the local population.

The Mamluks were also distinguished by their dress, which was considered to be much more respectable than that of any other class. This distinction goes back to the Mamluk regiment of the ʿAbbasīd caliph al-Muʿtaṣim (al-Masāʾili, Munjīd al-dhahab, vii, 118 = § 2801).

The owning of Mamluks was the prerogative of the Mamluks (although cases of Mamluks owned by civilians were quite frequent), as was the riding of horses. Orders prohibiting civilians from buying Mamluks were rarer than those forbidding them to ride horses (some of the highest civilian officials were explicitly exempted from the riding prohibition).

The language which the Mamluks used predominately among themselves was Turkish. The knowledge of Arabic of most of them seems to have been very superficial, although a more systematic study of this question may change that impression to a certain extent. Their Islamic awareness, however, was very strong. It was expressed, inter alia, in the numerous religious institutions which they built. This activity had also its material aspect, as stated by Ibn Khaḍūn: in order to assure the future of the Mamluks’ descendants, who could not join the military upper class, they appointed them as administrators or superintendents of the waqfs assigned to those institutions for their maintenance (al-Taʾrīf bi-Ibn Khāḍūn, 279).

The main body of the Mamluk sultanate’s army, namely, all the Royal Mamluks (al-mamlūk al-sultanīyya)—who formed the backbone of the Sultanate—and most of the armies of the first-ranking amirs were stationed in Cairo. It was very difficult to make any part of the Royal Mamluks serve as a garrison anywhere outside the capital. Units of the corps which were forced to stay in Syria, for example, soon declined in power and importance, and some minor exceptions to this rule do not affect the general picture. Considering the comparatively limited number of the Mamluks, keeping their élite element together must have been the only way of preserving its military might. This, in its turn, considerably increased the already great preponderance of the capital vis-à-vis the rest of the realm. Nothing could move the Royal Mamluks, of their own choice, from Cairo, not even epidemics, which wrought havoc among them.

This concentration in the capital had its grave drawbacks. Any serious revolt of the Bedouins or Turcomans anywhere in the realm could not be quelled without the participation of the Royal Mamluks, who were often stationed far away from the scene of the revolt. Worse still, all the major wars of the Mamluk sultanate took place in its northern part or beyond it, a great distance from the main centre of military might, and this became critical in the closing decades of Mamluk rule, when the Mamluks had to cope with
the Turcomans beyond their borders, who lived con-
tiguously to the Turcomans of their own realm, and
who were supported by the ominously growing power of
the Ottoman empire.

7. Mamlûks in other Islamic states

The Mamlûk sultanate served as an example to
other Muslim states, including in the reliance on
Mamlûk soldiers, many of whom were acquired in
Egypt. For the ruler of Yânûbî, see Ibn al-Furât, ix, 43, 11-6-9; for the ruler of Mecca, see Dâwûd al-suhib, 332; Ibn Iyüs, iv, p. 496, 11-10-12; Nûgûm, ed. Pop-
pûr, vi, 117, 11. 18-23; Ibn al-Furât, ix, 208, 11. 12-15, 308, 11. 7-20; for the ruler of Yemen, see Suhib, v, 35, 11. 15-17; Nûgûm, v, 81, 11. 1-2; for the ruler of Bûdjav, see Suhib, v, 137, 1-9; and for the sultan of Tâkûrîr, see Suhib, v, 300, 11. 7-9.

In 869/1464-5 the army of the ruler of Shîrûn and the adjacent areas, whose capital was Shâmâkhi, was estimated at 20,000 combat soldiers (mukdûl), of whom 1,000 were Circassian Mamlûks (Hawzdâlît al-
duhr), 579, 1. 16-580, 1. 13). This does not necessarily
imply direct influence from the Mamlûk sultanate, but what it certainly reflects is the great competition from other Muslim states which that sultanate had to face in drawing manpower from the same sources, and especially from states situated much nearer to
those sources.

The character, structure and development of military slavery in the Mamlûk sultanate can be more
properly understood if it is studied in connection with its Ayyûbîd predecessor. The Kurdishness of the Ayyûbîd régime and its army has been greatly exag-
gerated. The Turkish, and even more so the Turkish
Mamlûk element in its armed forces was the domi-
nant one throughout its history, as was only natural for a dynasty whose founders came from the ranks
of the Zangûd army. Shîrîkûh's private army, the
Asadîyâ, who numbered 500, and who were, most
probably, the main factor which enabled Shâlûh al-Dîn
to succeed his uncle, were—contrary to what students of the Ayyûbîds have written about them—a pure Mamlûk unit (see e.g. Abû Shâmà, i, 173, 1.1-2; as-
ma'kûrîz, îflûz al-bunûfâ, iii, 308, 11. 9-10), as were the other private armies of the Ayyûbîd sultans, like the Kâmisîyâ of Muhammad, the Ashrafiyyâ of Muâsû, the Nişrîyâ of Yûsûf, etc.

The reign of al-Malik al-Salih Nadjm al-Dîn
Ayyûb, the founder of the Bahriyyâ regiment which
topped the Ayyûbîds and established the Mamlûk sultanate, strengthened the Ayyûbîd impact on that sultanate. That sultan was venerated by his Bahriyya,
who looked upon him as the example which should be
followed. It was very rare that a ruler belonging to a
deposed dynasty should leave such an impress on its
deputies; it took the Bahriyya quite a long time to
disconnect themselves from the direct heritage of their
patron, and from their general Ayyûbîd heritage they
disconnected themselves only partly.

Mamlûk military slavery certainly shows an evolu-
tion in comparison with its Ayyûbîd prototype, but
the changes were quite slow and each of them has to
be traced and identified separately.
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MAMLUKS, the Mamlūk sultanate, i.e. the régime established and maintained by (emancipated) mamluks [see preceding article] in Egypt from 648/1250 to 922/1516; and with the role of their successors, the Mamluk sultanate was an embattled
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powers fall under direct Mamluk control, although the three minor lordships of Hims, Hamāt and al-Karak retained their autonomy. With the ending of this crisis, the invertebrate rivalry of the Mamluk households reappeared. Baybars headed a group of conspirators who murdered Kutuz. He then usurped the sultanate after undertaking to help his brothers-in-arms, the Bahriyya.

(b) The embattled sultanate

Al-Zahir Baybars, rather than his predecessors, was the effective founder of the Mamluk sultanate. In his comparatively long reign (658-76/1260-77), a high degree of internal stability, contrasting with the political vicissitudes of the previous decade, allowed the establishment of the characteristic political structure and institutions of the régime. Nevertheless, during his reign and those of his immediate successors, the Mamluk sultanate was an embattled power, threatened by the Mongol Ilkhāns [q. v.] in the east, and by the remains of the Frankish states on the Syro-Palestinian coast. Of the two, the Mongols were by far the greater danger. A few months after ʿAyn Ḏalūt, a second Mongol invasion of Syria was stopped by the Ayyūbids of Hims and Hamāt at the first battle of Ayn Ḏalūt (25 Ramadan 658/19 September 1260). An other critical encounter was at the second battle of
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the caliphate assisted Baybars in his negotiations with Berke, in view of the social disparity between a mamluk and a Çingizid. In regard to the second aim, Baybars early took steps to ensure the succession of his son, Baraka (i.e. Berke) Khân, named after his maternal grandfather, a Khârâzamian warrior-chief. In Shâwâl 662/August 1263, Baraka Khân, aged about four years, was duly invested as joint-sultan with his father.

Baybars’s dynasty did not long survive, the essential cause of its downfall being the hostility between the veteran magnates of Baybars’s household, the Zâhiriyâ, and the Ashkâbâd, i.e. the court-mamlûks of his son. The leading opponent belonged to an older generation, and was Kalâwûn al-Alî, a comrade of Baybars. Having deposed Baraka Khân, the magnates installed his seven-year-old brother Salâmîsh (Sûleymîsh) as nominal sultan. A few weeks later, Kalâwûn usurped the throne (Râbi‘ II 678/August 1279), and exiled the sons of Baybars to al-Karak.

Al-Mansûr Kalâwûn was responsible for an important military innovation, viz. the establishment of a Cir- cassian mamûlîk regiment, known (from its quarters in the towers of the Citadel) as the Burdjiyyâ [q. v.]. This was the first indication of a threat to the ascendancy of the Kipchak Turkish mamûlîks. In other respects, Kalâwûn continued the policies of Baybars. Syria remained a central preoccupation. The governor of Damascus, Sunkûr al-Áshkâr, proclaimed himself sultan like Sandjar al-Halabi before him. He was defeated after some difficulty in Safar 679/June 1280, but succeeded in establishing himself in the former crusader-castle of Şâyûn, whence he controlled the fortresses in the mountainous hinterland of Latakia.

Finally, he joined Kalâwûn in operations against a Mongol force sent by the Ilkhan Abaka, which was routed at the second battle of Hims (Shabban 680/November 1281). Abaka died in the following year, and his successor, Tegûder Ašhad, a convert to Islam, sought good relations with the sultan. Kalâwûn was thus left free to pursue the djihâd against the Frankish states. Tripoli fell in Râbi‘ II 688/April 1289, and like the other coastal towns was demolished. Kalâwûn was about to lead an expedition against Acre when he died (Dhu ‘l-Ka‘a da 689/November 1290). Like Baybars, he endeavoured to establish a dynasty, but his intended successor, his son-al-Sâlih Alî, predeceased him. The throne passed to another son, al-Áshraf Khalîl [q. v.], for whom was reserved the crowning mercy of the capture of Acre (Dâumâd I 690/May 1291) and the extinction of the Latin kingdom. In the following year, Khalîl took the Armenian patriarchal see of Ka‘l-ât al-Rûm (Radjab 691/June 1292), but in Muharram 693/December 1293 he fell a victim to a conspiracy of magnates who had belonged to his father’s military household (the Manşûriyyâ), and who felt themselves threatened.

The murder of al-Áshraf Khalîl inaugurated seventeen years of political instability, during which magnates with the support of mamlûk factions dominated the sultanate. Twice in this period, in 693/1293-4 and 698-708/1299-1309, another son of Kalâwûn, al-Nâsir Muhammad, was installed as sultan. Aged less than ten at his first accession, he was no more than a figurehead, and he was twice set aside by usurpers; between 694/1294 and 698/1299 by Kitbughâ and Lâdin (Lâdin [q. v.]), and in 708-9/1309-10 by al-Mu’azzaf Baraybars al-Dâshnikîr [q. v.]. It is significant that this last usurper was a Circassian, originally recruited into the Burdjiyya. The part played by the Burdjiyya added a further com-
plication to the factional struggles after the death of al-Ashraf Khalil. In 709/1310, however, al-Nasir Muhammad, now mature in political experience and with a mamliq household of his own, emerged from exiled in al-Karak, and, with the support of the governors of Aleppo, Hamad and Tripoli, marched on Egypt and overthrew al-Muzaffar Baybars. 

(c) The autocracy of al-Nasir Muhammad

During the long third reign of al-Nasir Muhammad (709-41/1310-41) the mamliq sultanate was no longer threatened by external enemies. The Frankish states were gone, and with them any serious danger of a crusading threat from Europe. The last Mongol invasion, commanded by the Ilkhan Oldjetyū in the winter of 712/1312-13, was abortive. Thus the Sultan did not need to divide his time between Syria and Egypt, and al-Nasir Muhammad was free to concentrate on internal problems, and to establish an autocratic government. He had learnt to secure his own position. The usurper Baybars and his colleague Salār were put to death within a few months of the restoration. The three Syrian governors who, as kingmakers, might become dangerous were the next to go. One died naturally, the second was arrested, while the third fled to Oldjetyū. Meanwhile, with consummate political skill, al-Nasir Muhammad carried out the operation which had been fatal to several earlier sultans—the substitution of his own mamliqs for veteran magnates in key positions. Outstanding among his servants was Tankiz al-Husāmī, appointed governor of Damascus in 712/1312, and in effect governor-general of Syria two years later. Another, Arghūn al-Dawdār, received similar extensive powers as viceroy in Egypt (nāṭ ib al-sultana bi rīāy al-Misriyya). Early in the reign, the sultan carried out a fiscal reorganisation (al-rakūt al-Nasirī), which greatly strengthened his own position against the magnates. Such a reform had been attempted in 697/1298 by Lāqīm, and had been a principal cause of his murder. Al-Nasir Muhammad proceeded with his habitual caution, commissioning first a cadastral survey and redistribution of assignments of landed revenue (sing. khdiss [q.v.]; in the less politically sensitive province of Damascus/1313). This was followed in 715/1315 by the cadastral survey of Egypt, after which the sultan sat in full court to distribute warrants of assignments to the beneficiaries. In consequence of the rauk, the share of revenue assigned to the sultan’s fis (al-khdiss) was raised from one-sixth to five-twelfths at the expense of the other holders of assignments. At this time also he abolished a wide range of uncanonical taxes (muṣār [see Mār], many of them abusive. This was a popular act, which probably had little effect on the sultan’s own resources but worked to the detriment of the tax-farmers. Al-Nasir Muhammad’s third reign thus was a period of autocratic and sometimes arbitrary rule. His tenure of power was so secure that on three occasions (712/1313, 719/1320, 732/1332) he was able to absent himself from Cairo for the Pilgrimage—thereby also demonstrating his suzerainty over the Holy Cities. His relations with his magnates, although apparently close and cemented by political marriages, were liable to sudden rupture. Even Tankiz al-Husāmī was disgraced and put to death, after nearly thirty years’ service in Syria. In the last months of the sultan’s life, rival court-factions were forming around two of his favourites, Kawsūn (who had married a daughter of the sultan) and Baḥṭāk, although on his deathbed he obtained the semblance of a reconciliation between them. He died in Dhu ’l-Hijja 741/June 1341, having nominated his son, Aḥū Bakr, to succeed him.

(d) The ascendency of the magnates

Although three generations of al-Nasir Muhammad’s descendants succeeded him in the sultanate, the fact that twelve sultans reigned in less than half a century indicates their weakness. They were mostly young and inexperienced, some of them mere children, who lacked the essential power base of mamliq households. Behind these figureheads, the magnates controlled the state, and struggled among themselves for the ascendancy. The period also saw a rise in Circassian recruitment after an intermission during the reign of al-Nasir Muhammad. Political instability appeared immediately after al-Nasir Muhammad’s death. Three weeks later, Kawsūn obtained Aḥū Bakr’s approval for the arrest of Baḥṭāk and the sequestration of his vast wealth and assignments. The fallen amir was sent to Alexandria, where shortly afterwards he was put to death. Then in Safar 742/August 1341, Kawsūn forestalled a plot against himself by the sultan, whom he deposed, substituting an infant son of al-Nasir Muhammad, named (or perhaps nicknamed) Kudjuḵ, i.e. Kūčūk. The new sultan was certainly not more than seven years old, and Kawsūn was the effective ruler until he was overthrown, and his puppet-sultan deposed, in Rajab 742/January 1342. It would be otiose in this article to recount in detail the political history of the later Kalāwūnids. The one sultan in this period who showed some promise of repeating the success of his father, al-Nasir Muhammad, was al-Nasir Ḥasan. Eleven years old when he was first raised to the throne after the killing of his brother and predecessor (Ramadan 748/December 1347), he was deposed in favour of another brother in Qumādā II 752/August 1351. Restored in Shawwāl 753/October 1354, he succeeded in ridding himself of the kingmaker and regent, Sarghmatūgh al-Nāṣirī, in Ramādān 759/August 1358. He then promoted his own mamliqs, chief among them being Yalbughū al-Umāri, and tried to create a power-base of a new kind by conferring high amirates and provincial governorships on awldd al-nds (q.v.), i.e. descendants of the mamliqs, a socially privileged group who nevertheless did not normally form part of the military and ruling establishment. This experiment inevitably aroused the mistrust of the mamliqs, and an opposition faction appeared, headed (against the traditions of mamliq loyalty to the founder of the household) by Yalbughū al-Umāri. The sultan was defeated, captured, and put to death (Qumādā I 762/3March 1361). Yalbughū acted as regent until his own overthrow and death in Rabī’ II 766/December 1366. Sixteen years later, Barqūk b. Anas (q.v.), a Circassian nurtured in his military household, the Yalbughūwīyya, deposed the last Kalāwūnid and usurped the sultanate.

(e) The Circassian Mamlūk sultanate

The Circassian Mamlūk sultanate, which begins with al-Zahir Barqūk’s usurpation in Ramadan 784/November 1382, follows a regular and almost invariable pattern of succession. A magnate would usurp the throne, which on his death would pass to his son. Within a few years at most, the latter would be deposed by another usurper, and the cycle of events would be repeated. But the sultanate was not a prize open to all comers: the usurpers emerged from specific circles, namely the military households of previous sultans. The two principal nurseries of sultans were the households of Barqūk and of Kān b. Bāy (q.v.), each...
of which produced five rulers. Since Ka‘it Bay was a mamluk of Barsbay [q. v.], who was himself a mamluk of Barkuk, the Circassian sultans may be regarded as consisting of a dynasty by mamluk clientage rather than blood descent (cf. Table 2).

The Circassian sultanate faced in its early years a threat comparable to that which al-Zahir Baybars had confronted in the later 7th/13th century—the danger of annihilation by the Turco-Mongol forces of Timur Leng. Barkuk responded by offering asylum in 796/1394 to Ahmad b. Uways the Djalalird [q. v.] expelled from Baghdad by Timur, by establishing a common front with the Ottomans and the Golden Horde, and by replying defiantly to Timur. The storm did not break until 803/1400-1, during the reign of Barkuk’s son, Faraj [q. v.]. He and his forces were compelled to evacuate Syria, which Timur occupied and devastated. He did not, however, attempt to invade Egypt. In Shab‘bân 803/March 1400, he began to withdraw from Damascus, having secured his rank for an advance on the Ottomans.

Although throughout the 9th/15th century the Mamluk sultanate continued to present the appearance of a great power, it was undergoing a prolonged economic and military decline. Its growing economic weakness has usually been ascribed to political factors—the factional conflicts of the magnates, resulting in enfeebled administration, and hence in the decay of agriculture. These disorders were probably rather symptomatic than causative, and the basic reason for the economic decline may lie in the heavy mortality occasioned by successive epidemics of plague. The most serious of these (the Black Death of European history) occurred in 749/1348-9, during the first reign of al-Nasir Hasan, and there were twelve severe epidemics during the last century of the sultanate. Since mortality was particularly high among the mamluks, this must have necessitated very heavy expenditure by the sultans and magnates to keep up their military households. Even so, there seems to have been a marked fall in recruitment. The Royal Mamluks dropped from about 12,000 in the third reign of al-Nasir Muhammad to less than half the number under the Circassian sultans. The plague, however, inflicted its severest damage by its inroads upon the agrarian and industrial workforce. Villages were deserted, irrigation works neglected, and cultivated land went back to waste. The landed revenue of Egypt shrank in the last century of the sultanate from over 9 million dinars to less than 2 million. Alexandria, the centre of the textile industry, suffered badly from the Black Death, and its decline continued in the Circassian period. Both in Egypt and Syria, the weakening of administration and the decline of the sedentary population were reflected in growing tribal pressure on the cultivable areas and the routes. It is in this period that a fraction of Hawwara [q. v.], settled by Barkuk in Upper Egypt, established a domination there which they retained into the Ottoman period.

As the landed revenue decreased, the magnates and sultans made growing depredations upon commerce; e.g. they compelled merchants to buy goods at an artificially-enhanced price (tarh, rimaya), an abuse for which there had been sporadic precedents. The transit-trade, especially in spices, from the Indian Ocean, which had been handled since the 6th/12th century by the group known as the Kârimis [q. v.], was brought under strict control by Barsbay (825-41/1422-30). Qidwa, under Mamluk control from 828/1425, benefited in effect the staple in trade in the Red Sea, and its revenue was shared between the sultan and the Sharif of Mecca. In 832/1428 Barsbay established a monopoly of the pepper trade, forcing up the price at Alexandria to the detriment of the Venetian merchants. His interest in the transit-trade between the Red Sea and the Mediterranean explains two other developments in his reign. Three campaigns against Cyprus, culminating in the conquest of the island (829/1426) and the reduction of its king to a vassal of the sultan, ended the danger to Muslim shipping from this Frankish outpost. The campaigns are of interest as being the only major naval operations undertaken by the Mamluks. Furthermore, Barsbay’s refusal, repeated over ten years (828-38/1424-34), to allow Shâhrûkh the formal privilege of providing a veil for the Ka‘ba indicate a determination to deny the Timurid any locus standi within the Mamluk commercial sphere of interest.

Between the reign of Barkuk at the beginning of the Circassian period, and that of Kânsâw al-Ghawri [q. v.] at its end, the Mamluk sultans were involved in only one major land-war, that fought with the Ottomans between 890/1485 and 896/1491. The underlying cause of this war in the reign of Kâ‘it Bay (872-901/1468-96) was the threat offered by the Ottomans to the marcher-principalties, particularly Elbistan, which since its foundation by the ruling dynasty (Dulkadir, see DHU ‘L-KADR) in the first half of the 8th/14th century had been a Mamluk protectorate. This localized conflict of interests was aggravated by considerations of high policy when, on the accession of Sultan Bâyazîd II [q. v.] in 886/1481, Kâ‘it Bay gave asylum to his brother and rival, Qjem [q. v.]. Although in appearance the Mamluks confronted the Ottomans on equal terms, the outcome of the war was merely to maintain the status quo on the frontiers.

Bâyazîd had been unable to commit all his forces to the war, and the next conflict between the two powers was to reveal the inherent military and political weakness of the Mamluks. As a fighting-force they were obsolescent. Unlike the Ottomans, they had failed to take advantage of the development of firearms, the conservative Mamluk cavalry showing particular reluctance to adopt the use of the arquebus (cultivated only for siege-warfare only) since the later 8th/14th century. A principal cause of the overthrow of Kâ‘it Bay’s son and successor, al-Nâṣir Muhammad (901-4/1496-8) was his recruitment of a force of black arquebusiers. Kânsâw al-Ghawrî attempted to restore the military effectiveness of his state. An arquebuse unit (al-tabaka al-khâmîsa) was set up in 916/1510, but the old prejudice remained, and it was dissolved in 920/1514. He paid attention to the casting of cannon, which had been used by the Mamluks (but for siege-warfare only) since the later 8th/14th century, and he made efforts to revive the traditional cavalry-training.

At the beginning of Kânsâw al-Ghawrî’s reign (906-22/1501-16), the Mamluk sultanate was hemmed in by three great powers. To the north was the Ottoman state, which was now confronted on the east by the new military monarchy of the Safawid Shâh Ismâ‘îl [q. v.]. To the south, dominating the Indian Ocean and threatening the Red Sea, was the naval power of the Portuguese. The Mamluks lacked the maritime traditions and experience to deal with this danger. They received supplies of material and personnel for a naval expedition from the Ottomans in 520/1514. Ottoman-Safawid hostilities, however, in-
volved the Mamluks when Sultan Selim I invaded Syria, probably to safeguard his flank, and inflicted a second defeat on the Mamluks at al-Raydaniyya (29 Dhu 'l-Hijja 922/23 January 1517). Cairo fell, and the last Mamluk sultan, al-Ashraf Tumam Bây, was subsequently captured and hanged. Egypt thus became a province of the Ottoman Empire, and was separately administered from Syria.

(i) The Neo-Mamluks of the Ottoman period

The Ottoman conquest of Egypt was not followed by the extinction of the mamlûks. Indeed, from one point of view, it may be regarded as an episode in Mamluk factional politics, since Selim's victories were facilitated by Mamluk collaborators in opposition to Kânsâw al-Chawrî and Tûmân Bây. The leaders of this faction were the governors of Aleppo and Damascus, Khâ'sîr Bay and Dînjîbîrdi al-âshârî [q.v.], who received their reward from the conqueror, Khâ'sîr Bay being appointed viceroy in Cairo (where he maintained much of the state of the sultans, his predecessors), and Dînjîbîrdi being restored to Damascus. These arrangements marked, however, a transitional phase. On Selim's death in 926/1520, Dînjîbîrdi attempted to make himself independent, but his revolt was suppressed, and he himself killed (927/1521). Khâ'sîr Bay died in 928/1522, and thereafter Ottomans were appointed to both Damascus and Cairo. A last Mamluk rising headed by the kâdsîfs Dînjîm and Înâl was suppressed shortly afterwards.

Mamlûk recruitment and the formation of mamlûk military households nevertheless continued, and provided part of the armed forces of Egypt beside, but distinct from, the seven corps of the Ottoman garrison troops, the most important of which were the Janissaries and the šâsîfs [q.v.]. The establishment of the Mamlûk, nominally 24 in number, bore the Ottoman designation of sanâdîq beyi (whence in the Arabic chronicles sanâdîqiyât, sanâdîq), used as the plural of bašîbîeg, the modern baqâwît, a neologism, but his revolt was suppressed, and he himself killed (927/1521). Khâ'sîr Bay died in 928/1522, and thereafter Ottomans were appointed to both Damascus and Cairo. A last Mamluk rising headed by the kâdsîfs Dînjîm and Înâl was suppressed shortly afterwards.

Mamlûk recruitment and the formation of mamlûk military households nevertheless continued, and provided part of the armed forces of Egypt beside, but distinct from, the seven corps of the Ottoman garrison troops, the most important of which were the Janissaries and the šâsîfs [q.v.]. The establishment of the Mamlûk, nominally 24 in number, bore the Ottoman designation of sanâdîq beyi (whence in the Arabic chronicles sanâdîqiyât, sanâdîq), used as the plural of bašîbîeg, the modern baqâwît, a neologism, but his revolt was suppressed, and he himself killed (927/1521). Khâ'sîr Bay died in 928/1522, and thereafter Ottomans were appointed to both Damascus and Cairo. A last Mamluk rising headed by the kâdsîfs Dînjîm and Înâl was suppressed shortly afterwards.

The central and essential institution of Mamlûk society under both the sultanate and the Ottomans was the military household. This consisted of the mamlûks obtained, trained and emancipated by a master (ustâd), to whom they remained attached by loyalty and more formally by legal clientage (awâlî). This link was indicated by the mamlûk's nishâ. The loyalty felt towards the ustâd was narrowly personal; during the sultanate, it extended, if at all, only in a very attenuated form to his sons or other members of his family. The second bond of loyalty created by the Mamlûk household was the comradeship (âshâshiyât) existing among the mamlûks as brothers. The ustâd, the master (ustâd), the constant propensity of each generation of magnates to recruit new households of mamlûks virtually excluded their blood-descendants (awâlîl nâsî) from military functions, and hence from political power. The second and later generations of immigrant origin thus became absorbed into the Arabic-speaking Muslim society of Egypt and Syria, to the culture of which they made notable contributions.

The principal households were those of the sultans (the Royal Mamlûks), designated from the iṣâb of the founding ustâd, e.g. the Sâlihiyya of al-Malik al-Sâlih Ayyûb, the Žâhirîyya of al-Malik al-Žâhir Baybars etc. Since the mamlûks were immigrants, recruited at any one time principally from a single ethnic group (originally the Kipcak Turks, subsequently the Circassians), they formed in effect a synthetic alien tribe. The factional struggles among the different households, which form a recurrent feature of Mamlûk history, bear some analogy to clan warfare. The mamlûks depended upon their ustâd for patronage and advancement, while the ustâd depended upon his mamlûks for the maintenance of his own power and security. This was clearly the case as regards the royal household. The initial reign of many sultans, e.g. the later Kasûluwinids and the sons of Circassian usurpers, may largely be explained by their lack of mamlûk
The distinctive characteristic of the administrative system was the over-riding control exercised by the sultan through Mamluk amirs. The amirates that had existed under the Ayyubids were organized, probably in Ayyubid’s reign, into three principal ranks. At the top was that of amir al-talâkhdndh, who had the privilege of a military band, and came to be equated with the commander of 100 horsemen and head of a company of 1,000 warriors of the hâlka. With the differentiation of the Bahriyya from the hâlka which had been its matrix, the latter sank into being the bearer of ordinary subjects, to the detriment of the amirs. In theory there were 24 amirs of the highest rank. The second rank was that of amir tkhâlkhânahu, who had the privilege of a military band, and came to be equated with the commander of 100 house troopers. The third rank, amir tkhâsh, had a military household of ten horsemen. This was a hierarchical rank; it did not imply a chain of command, nor was there any kind of subfeudation, although it usually provided a curtas honorum. The military households, including that of the sultan, were maintained by assignments of landed revenue (sing. tkhâsh [q.v.], khâsh). As mentioned above were reorganised by al-Nâṣir Muhammad in 715/1315, thereby laying the fiscal basis of his autonomy. It was the Royal Mamlûks who were promoted to amirates and appointed to the great offices at court and in the provinces. Although their tenure of office was individually precarious, and their assignments were never entirely secure, they were always the potential opponents of the sultan. Repeated attempts to establish a species of contractual relationship by obtaining an accession-compact at the installation of a sultan were never effective in practice; hence many reigns ended in factional revolt, and the deposition (or even murder) of the ruler.

A noteworthy instance of the development of offices in this period, and of the extension of Mamlûk control over the administration, is provided by the history of the vizierate. Under the Ayyûbids, as under previous régimes, the greatest office of state had been the wazzir, a civilian usually trained as a jurist, who served during the ruler’s pleasure as his omnipotent minister. The erosion of the wazzir’s powers began with the establishment of the office of vicegerent (nâ’ib al-sultan), held by a mamlûk, as a permanent post, not an ad hoc appointment during the sultan’s absence on campaign. This development may be dated to the reign of Barâka Khân (676/1277). The close relationship which had existed between the ruler and the wazzir was further weakened in 678/1280 when Khâlidwan promoted the civilian head of the chancery (sâhib diwan al-inâja) to the confidential post of secretary (kâhidh al-sir) to himself. The secretariacy was held by a succession of civilian officials down to the end of the Mamlûk sultanate. The wazzir then was restricted to being the head of the state treasury (al-daula al-sharifa, diwan al-cizârah), but on several occasions Mamlûk amirs were appointed to the office until it was abolished by al-Adil. The new office of vizier (vizier al-dawlat al-sharifa), being the head of the state treasury (diwan al-khud), was also placed under a civilian controller (târikh al-dawlat al-sharifa, khâsh), who absorbed many of the wazzir’s financial functions as the secretary had taken over his chancery functions. Although the vizierate was restored after the reign of al-Nâṣir Muhammad, it was restricted to a limited financial field. Barkûk created two new personal treasuries, diwan al-murjad and diwan al-amlik, which were managed by a Mamlûk great officer of the household force of thirty men. This high steward (wâdar al-dâlîya from wâdar al-dâr al-dâlîya). The militarisation of household offices, and the acquisition by some of state functions, were characteristic developments of the Mamlûk sultanate. In contrast to the Ayyûbids, under whom only four court offices were normally held by the military, the Mamlûks beginning with Baybars quickly developed a hierarchy of such offices. The dawlat al-dâlîya was militarised, and its holder rose from being the bearer of the royal ink-well to being the channel of communication between the sultan and the chancery. Not until the 8th/14th century, however, was this office usually given to an amir of the highest rank. Another officer who acquired public functions was the chamberlain (khâsh [q.v.]), who obtained jurisdiction in disputes between the amirs and the soldiery. Originally, he acted in conjunction with the vicegerent, hence his importance increased when al-Nâṣir Muhammad left the vicegerency vacant after 727/1326. During the first half of the 9th/15th century, the chamberlain’s jurisdiction was abusively extended to ordinary subjects, to the detriment of the Khâsh’s courts. A proliferation of offices took place, e.g. by the end of Barkûk’s reign there were six chamberlains, Faraj raised the number to eight, and by the mid-14th century their numbers had increased still more.

An important military office, which went back to
through Ayyūbid and Zangid antecedents to a Saljūkid institution, was that of the atābak [q. v.], a tenure of the shaykh al-balad, which institutionalised the primacy held by military and political leaders. The title was originally a tenure of the amir al-âsâkir, with the second reign of al-Nâşir Hasan, Shaykhâbân al-âmarâni annexed the title to his office of atābak al-âsâkir, and the two terms were thenceforth synonymous. This was, however, itself an indication that the atābakâiya was coming to imply pre-eminence in rank rather than specific functions. From about the same time also, the title of atābak al-âsâkir comes to be held by amirs in the Syrian provinces, and so loses its uniqueness.

In contrast to the loose Ayyūbid family confederacy of autonomous principalities, the provinces of the Mamlūk sultanate were under close central control, being administered by governors of mamlūk origin serving as the sultan’s delegates (sing. nâ’ib al-saltana). In Egypt, this title was originally held solely by the vicegerent (al-nâ’ib al-kâfi’î), who (as indicated above) was in some respects the functional successor to the wâṣîr. The title of nâ’ib was extended in 761/1365 to the governor of Alexandria (after the brief occupation of the city by King Peter I of Cyprus), and by Barkûk to the governors of Upper and Lower Egypt. The vicegerency was characteristically allowed to lapse by al-Nâṣir Muhammad in 727/1326. Restored after his death, it was overshadowed by the atābakâiya. The last appointment was made by Farâq in 808/1405. The Syrian nâ’ibs held the title of malik al-âmarâni, which had been used by the Sâlûqs of Rûm [see BEGLERBEGI], and which continued to be borne by Khâdir Bey as viceroys of Egypt after the Ottoman conquest. Pre-eminent among them was the governor of Damascus. Although the Syrian governors seemed like kinglets in their provinces, they were subject to various controls, both from the arbitrary will of the sultan and of an administrative nature. Grants of assignments could only pass under the sultan’s signature, or sometimes that of the vicegerent. Several of the principal provincial officials, e.g. the governor of the citadel at Damascus and the chamberlain there, were appointed by the sultan, as was the governor’s secretary, who served as a spy on him. Governors of the Egyptian provinces bore the inferior titles of kâdî or wâlî.

(b) Neo-Mamlūk institutions

The extinction of the Mamlūk sultanate ended the recruitment of Royal Mamlūks, but the formation of mamlūk households continued until the time of Muhammad ʿAli Paša. Detailed information on their structure is only available from the early 12th/18th century with the copious data provided by al-Dhâbârî. By this time the households (sing. bayt) had developed into complex patronage-systems comprising the following elements: (1) the head (watâd) of the household, who might be a bey, an Ottoman garrison-officer, or even a native civilian (e.g. Saûl al-Fâllâh, d. before 1161/1748). (2) Children of the bey (watâd). By contrast with the normal pattern in the sultanate, sons of a watâd were members of the military household, and might succeed to its headship. Daughters or widows of a watâd might marry mamlūks of the household. (3) True mamlūks. The immigration (especially of Circassians) continued as under the sultanate, but there is some evidence of the recruitment for military purposes of black slaves (šeïd). (4) Free retainers recruited in Anatolia and Rumelia. They served chiefly as mounted bodyguards (sing. šarrâd), and were subsequently, it appears, enrolled in the Ottoman garrison-corps as clients (sing. čerak, whence čâvrâk or dîvrâk) of their former employers. They were thus largely excluded from the advancement open to true mamlūks, although the Bosniaks who appear in the Kâsimnâme in the 11th/17th century, and the future Djâzaâr Ahmad Paša, may have started their careers in this way. (5) Allies among the native urban population and the tribes, where Mamlūk factionalism tended to link up with an indigenous division into the rival groupings of Saʾd and Harâm. With the disappearance of the Royal Mamlūks, the old factional polarisation between kâdrînîs and shutâbîn ceased, but factionalism reappeared (perhaps not before the later 11th/17th century) basically to obtain high office and the control of the revenues of Egypt. Although the old kâdrî’s had been abolished after the Ottoman conquest, their place was soon taken by a system of tax-farms (sing. tilâzîm [q. v.]), many of which were appropriated by the neo-Mamlūks. The şuğâr bâys (an Ottoman term which almost certainly conceals their continuity with the amirs of the highest rank under the sultanate) were at one and the same time the leading mulâzims and the chiefs of the neo-Mamlūk establishment. Although they formed a military elite, the bâys were outside the cadres of the Ottoman garrison. Their lack of specific duties enabled them to assume a wide range of functions and to develop into a self-perpetuating ruling group. Their most principal functions were: (1) the command as tender of forces levied for service inside Egypt (e.g. against nomadic incursions) or outside in the Ottoman sultan’s wars. (2) The command of the annual tribute sent by land to Istanbul, held by the amir al-khâzâna. (3) The command of the annual Pilgrimage-caravan to Mecca, held by the amir al-hâdîsh (the form amir al-hâdîsh, which might be expected, is not found in mediaeval or later sources), who accompanied the maḥmal, sent, as during the Mamlūk sultanate, in token of sovereignty. (4) The headship of the financial administration as defârdâr. The earliest defârdârs after the conquest were Ottomans, but from the later 10th/16th century the post was held by a bey. (5) Service as acting viceroy (kâ dinner-makân [q. v.]) in the interim between the withdrawal of a viceroy and the arrival of his successor. In the factional struggles, such an appointment was a means of legitimating the position of the dominant group. In addition, during the 12th/18th century, bâys served as military governors of the sub-provinces of Egypt, thus reducing the status of the former governors, the kâdîs, who were also mamlūks by origin. They became in effect subordinates of the bâys. An important new office which emerged during the 12th/18th century was that of šuğâr al-bulâd, which institutionalised the primacy (ri’bi) held by military and political leaders. The title
### TABLE 1

**THE TURKISH MAMLUK SULTANS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sultans</th>
<th>Reigns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>al-Salih Ayyub</td>
<td>637-47/1240-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadjar al-Durr</td>
<td>648/1250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Mu'izz Aybak</td>
<td>648-55/1250-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Zahir Baybars</td>
<td>658-76/1260-77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Mansur Kalawun</td>
<td>678-89/1279-90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Mu'azzam</td>
<td>647-8/1249-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Mu'izz Aybak</td>
<td>648-55/1250-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Zahir Baybars</td>
<td>658-76/1260-77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Mansur Kalawun</td>
<td>678-89/1279-90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadjar al-Durr</td>
<td>648/1250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Mu'izz Aybak</td>
<td>648-55/1250-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Zahir Baybars</td>
<td>658-76/1260-77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Mansur Kalawun</td>
<td>678-89/1279-90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Mu'azzam</td>
<td>647-8/1249-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Mu'izz Aybak</td>
<td>648-55/1250-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Zahir Baybars</td>
<td>658-76/1260-77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Mansur Kalawun</td>
<td>678-89/1279-90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Mu'azzam</td>
<td>647-8/1249-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Mu'izz Aybak</td>
<td>648-55/1250-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Zahir Baybars</td>
<td>658-76/1260-77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Mansur Kalawun</td>
<td>678-89/1279-90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Continuous line:** blood descent

**Broken line:** mamluk clientage
TABLE 2
THE CIRCASSIAN MAMLUK SULTANS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Reign</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>815-24/1412-21</td>
<td>al-Mu'ayyad Shaykh</td>
<td>815-24/1412-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>824/1421</td>
<td>al-Mansur al-OTHMAN</td>
<td>824/1421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>824/1421</td>
<td>al-Mu'ayyad al-OTHMAN</td>
<td>824/1421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>832-91/1390-9</td>
<td>al-Zahir Tanur</td>
<td>825-42/1422-38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>832-91/1390-9</td>
<td>al-Mu'ayyad al-OTHMAN</td>
<td>824/1421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>842-57/1438-53</td>
<td>al-Zahir Djakmak</td>
<td>842-57/1438-53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>857-65/1453-60</td>
<td>al-Ashraf Inal</td>
<td>857-65/1453-60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>865-72/1461-7</td>
<td>al-Zahir Khushkadam</td>
<td>865-72/1461-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>872/1467-8</td>
<td>al-Zahir Yalbay</td>
<td>872/1467-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>832-91/1390-9</td>
<td>al-Zahir Tanur</td>
<td>825-42/1422-38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>842/1348</td>
<td>al-Ashraf Kâ'it Bây</td>
<td>873-901/1468-95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>857/1453</td>
<td>al-Mansur Uthman</td>
<td>872-3/1468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>865/1460-1</td>
<td>al-Ashraf Ahmad</td>
<td>857/1453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>865/1460-1</td>
<td>al-Ashraf Ahmad</td>
<td>857/1453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>873-901/1468-95</td>
<td>al-Ashraf Kâ'it Bây</td>
<td>873-901/1468-95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>872-3/1468</td>
<td>al-Mansur Uthman</td>
<td>872-3/1468</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* al-Musta'ın, caliph and sultan: 815/1412.
seems to have been held only by members of the beylicate. With the administrative reorganisation carried out by Muhammad 'Ali Paşa as the autonomous viceroy of Egypt, the neo-Mamluk titles and offices became obsolete.
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MAMLUK B. HARUN AL-RASHID [see ABU URIYADA].

AL-MAMLUK [see AL-BA'TIHY, DAI L-SUNNAH].

AL-MAMLUK B. 'ABD ALLAH B. HARUN AL-RASHID, seventh 'Abbasid caliph. Born on 15 Rabih I 170/14 September 786, "the night of the three caliphs" (death of al-Hadi, accession of al-Ma'mun), he was the eldest of the eleven sons of al-Rashid. His mother, Maradjil, a concubine originally from Badhghis, died soon after his birth and he was brought up by Zubayda, the grand-daughter of al-Mansur, wife of al-Rashid and mother of Muhammad (al-Amin), who was born in Shawwal 170/April 787. He received a classical education in Arabic, tutored by al-Kisa'i [q.v.], in adab (as a pupil of Abu Muhammad al-Yazidi), in music and in poetry (where his tastes were classical). In religious sciences, he was trained in hadith (and became a transmitter himself) and in fiqh (taught by al-Hasan al-Lul'ui), where he excelled in Hanafi jurisprudence. He was distinguished by his love of knowledge, making him the most intellectual caliph of the 'Abbasid family, which accounts for the way in which his caliphate developed.

In 177/794, in response to the wishes of members of his family, al-Rashid named as his first successor Muhammad (al-Amin), the only caliph born to parents both of whom were 'Abbasids; proclaimed initially in Khurasan by his guardian al-Fadl b. Yahayä al-Barmaki [q.v.], he subsequently received the bay'a in Baghdad. As for 'Abd Allah (al-Ma'mun), he had to wait until the age of puberty to be declared second heir of al-Rashid, in 183/799, under the guardianship of Dja'far b. Yahayä al-Barmaki, the caliph's favourite. While reviving the Marwanid tradition of appointing two heirs to the throne in order to guarantee the stability of the regime and the future of the dynasty, al-Rashid made an innovation in accepting the appointment of a third successor, al-Käsim (al-Mu'tamim), the son of a concubine, sponsored by his 'Abbasid guardian 'Abd al-Malik b. Sâhâb [q.v.].

The protocol was solemnly proclaimed, during the pilgrimage of 186/802, in Mecca: the unity of the empire was re-affirmed by the existence of a single caliph-designate, Muhammad (al-Amin), residing in Baghdad, supported by his two heirs who were given charge of key-provinces: greater Khurasan, the heartland of the 'Abbasid régime since the success of the da'wa hâdžîmiyya (132/750), was entrusted to 'Abd Allah (al-Ma'mun) and the war-front in the struggle against the Byzantine Empire (al-Djazira and northern Syria), a major pre-occupation of al-Rashid, placed under the authority of al-Käsim (al-Mu'tamim). This interdependence between the different groupings of the empire conferred autonomy on Irîjâjîya, where the authority of the Aghlabïds was recognised in 184/800, with the purpose of containing the Kharidjîs, the 'Alids and the Umayyads who had subsequently in founding principalities in the Magrib and in al-Andalus, in the second half of the 9th/10th century.

On his return from the pilgrimage, al-Rashid rid himself of the patronage of the Barmakids, ordering the execution of Dja'far b. Yahayä on the night of 1 Safar 187/29 January 803, and arresting al-Fadl and his brothers, who were imprisoned at al-Râfikâ. Henceforward, 'Abd Allah (al-Ma'mun) had as his guardian al-Fadl b. Sahl, son of a Zoroastrian from a village near Baghdad, Cam the Zoroastrian. Cam the Zoroastrian was Barmakid and ultimately converted to Islam, in 190/806, assuming the role of kâthî-tutor, thus becoming qualified for the post of future vizier on the accession of al-Ma'mun.

At the age of eighteen, 'Abd Allah married his cousin, Umm Isâ, daughter of Musâ al-Hadi, who bore him two sons (Muhammad al-Asghar and 'Abd Allah), born in 192/806, one of whom contributed to In 192/806, having stabilised the war-front with the Byzantine empire, al-Rashid took personal charge of the situation in Khurasân, which was disturbed by the revolt of Ra'if b. Layth, grandson of Našr b. Sayyâr (the last Umayyad governor of Khurasân), against the centralising policy of the governor 'All b. Isâ b. Mâhân, who represented the abnâ' al-dawla (Khurasânians resident in 'Irâk). Accompanied by 'Abd Allah (al-Ma'mun) and al-Fadl b. Sahl, but also by the hadjib-vizier al-Fadl b. al-Rabî', successor to the Barmakids at the head of the central administration, he set out, but died at Tûs on 3 Dîumada II 193/24 March 809, al-Ma'mun having preceded him to Marw with a part of the army. Immediately, the new caliph in Baghdad began to take measures designed to reinforce the position of the central power in opposition to the autonomous aspirations of greater Khurasân, in line with the policy that had been in force for fifty years; he ordered the return of the army and of the treasury to Baghdad, which deprived the prince-governor al-Ma'mun of the means to "pacify" rapidly and completely the troubled regions (Transoxania; Sistan-Kirmân, disturbed by the revolt of the Kharidjî Hamza since 179/795; etc.). Nevertheless, al-Ma'mun did not lack the ingenuity to consolidate his position in confrontation with the caliphate, and following the example of his father, he devolved his responsibilities upon the Sahâls, who received full powers to manage affairs and to safeguard his rights of inheritance to the caliphate, which were sealed in the Ka'ba. A process of pacification and mobilisation of the forces of the eastern provinces was achieved by means of the recognition of the autonomy of local chieftains, the support of the aristocracy, which saw in the potentialities of the empire an opportunity of gaining unprecedented wealth and prestige, an increase in the wages of the army, the reduction of the kharâj by a quarter, the restoration of the efficiency of the administration and recourse to the mazâ'îm [q.v.], regularly presided over by al-Ma'mun. Particular efforts were applied in the direction of the fadâbâh and mutakallîmûn suffering persecution in 'Irâk (the Mu'tazila), whose opinions were canvassed. These various concessions, following the line of the Barma-kid policy of al-Fadl b. Yahayä, as practised at the time of his recruitment of an 'Abdâ'îs madâ'în (army (in 177/794), had the expected effects in regard to the maintenance of the territorial integrity of the province subject to the authority of al-Ma'mun (ending the various insurrections, except that of the Kharidjî Hamza in Sîstân) and the rallying of local populations to the "son of their sister" and a member of the Family of the Prophet whose rights to the imâmâ of the umma had been endorsed by the da'wa hâdžîmiyya, installed at Marw.

Similarly, in the West, supported by his hadjib-vizier al-Fadl b. al-Rabî' b. Yûnus, chief of the ma'dîrî of the caliph, whose role had been augmented at the expense of the kâthî of the administration
(represented by the Barmakids), his confidential ally Bakr b. al-Mu'tamir (the holder of the Seal), their chief Bakr b. al-Mu'tamir, chief of the Abnā\(^3\) (determined to preserve their privileges at the expense of the autonomist aspirations of Khurāsān), and the surviving Barmakids, including Mūsā b. Yahyā, who rallied to his cause, while Muhammad rejoined the camp of al-Ma'mūn. 'Abd b. Šāhī, the principal supporter of al-Ma'mūn, was arrested. Rule of law was reinstalled, and al-Ma'mūn was trusted to Šabīb b. Naṣr, grandson of Mālik b. al-Haytham al-Khuţā'ī (one of the twelve nukabā\(^3\) of the da'īwa hākimiyā, who became the confidential ally of Abū Muslim al-Khuţārānī), while Egypt, governed by Abd al-'Azīz b. 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Asḍī (descended from a Ḥāshimitе da'ī'ī, former governor of Khurāsān), was potentially dissident. Only the Hijāz, which had benefited from irrigation projects and from the riches of Zubaydā, was firmly behind al-Ma'mūn (at the expense of the ʿAldīs). This bipolarisation has been the object of a historical misunderstanding, with the eastern provinces being identified with “Maghrib” and the western provinces with the contemporary Arab countries. In fact, greater Khurāsān extended only as far as Rayy and Hamadān (in the west). Mūsā b. Fārsī (a supporter of al-Ma'mūn) and the most advanced centres of Islamisation and Arabisation in the period of al-Ma'mūn were situated in al-Ma'mūn's empire (divided between al-Ma'mūn and al-Ma'mūn) than in the former Roman-Byzantine empire (Syria-Egypt); cf. R. W. Bulliet, Conversion to Islam in the medieval period: an essay in quantitative lexicostatistics, Cambridge, Mass.-London 1979. Likewise, the rivalry between al-Ma'mūn and al-Ma'mūn is not explained by the origin of their mothers (Arab and Iranian), in view of the patrilineral system of the ʿAbbāsid family, recalled by al-Maṣūr, son of a Berber concubine, to Muhammad al-Nāf al-Zakkiyya (who prided himself on being of pure and free descent on both the paternal and maternal side) to refute the legitimacy pretensions of the ʿAldīs (in 144/762; cf. al-Tabarî, iii/1, 211-15). Al-Ma'mūn attempted to copy the example of al-Maṣūr (in regard to 'Īsa b. Mūsā), of al-Maḥdi (in regard to the same 'Īsa b. Mūsā), and of al-Hādī (in regard to his brother al-Raḥīq), seeking to institute a direct line of succession, at the expense of his brothers (al-Mu'tamin and al-Ma'mūn). This attempt to modify the established order had its supporters, the mawāfi of the caliph, and the abnā\(^3\) al-da'wla of Irāk, whose privileges were threatened by the success of regional autonomism, beginning in the Maghrib and extending to greater Khurāsān, the pillar of the ʿAbbāsid régime. Under these circumstances, it comes as no surprise to find the eastern provinces supporting the defender of their aspirations. This was the first time that their status was officially defined (by the “Meccan Documents”) and that their representative was not only an ʿAbbāsid prince but also an heir to the caliphate. In other words, if victorious, the Khurāsānīs would win their autonomy and be assured of an influential position in the structure of the state. For al-Ma'mūn, it was his good fortune to reside beyond the jurisdiction of the reigning caliph, thus avoiding the fate undergone by 'Īsa b. Mūsā (obliged to abdicate in favour of the sons of al-Maḥdi) or that all but suffered by al-Raḥīq (whose son was an Hādī). His brother al-Mu'tamin did not have the same opportunity and his case confirmed a contrario the lot of al-Ma'mūn.

The conflict began in 194/810, sparked off by the appointment of Khurāsān's Mu'tamīn, the young son of al-Ma'mūn, to the list of heirs to the caliphate: al-Ma'mūn and al-Mu'tamin. A delegation was sent to Marw to persuade al-Ma'mūn to return to Baghdaḏ, where he was to take on the role of adviser of the caliph. Offered by his refusal, al-Ma'mūn attempted to re-assert his authority over the whole of the empire; he demanded the sending of the surplus revenues of certain provinces (Rayy, Kūm, and western Khurāsān), then the appointment of a new chief of fiscal agents and finally the appointment of a chief of postal services or intelligence officer at Marw, al-Ma'mūn's capital. The perspicacity of al-Fadl b. Saih, and the determination of the Khurāsānīs to defend the autonomy that they had finally acquired, helped al-Ma'mūn to refuse any modification of the letter of ‘Meccan Documents’ and thus to avoid any involvement with the mechanism set in motion by the advisers of al-Ma'mūn with the object of threatening his position. The rift opened wide in 195/811, with the removal of the caliph's name from the coinage and the tīrāt of Khurāsān. Taking advantage of the strength of his position, al-Ma'mūn resolved to settle the question of relations between the central power and Khurāsān, while there was still time. He proclaimed his son Mūsā b. Fārsī (son of an ʿAldī) second heir (at the expense of al-Mu'tamin), in flagrant violation of the “Meccan Documents”. Al-Ma'mūn replied by taking the title of Imam, following the example of the Imam Ibrāhīm, son of Muḥammad b. ʿAlī, heir of Abū Ḥāshim (son of Muḥammad b. ʿAlī). This return to the principles of the first da'īwa hākimiyat at Marw was further underlined by appeals sent to the various Arab tribal factions of Khurāsān, exalting the role of the nukabā\(^3\): Abū Dāwūd Khālid b. Ibrāhīm al-Dhuhāl b. Shābīyānī (confidential ally of Abū Muslim), Khaṭṭaba b. Shābī al-Ta'ā (commander of the revolutionary army), Mūsā b. Kāl b. al-Tamīnī, Mālik b. al-Haygān al-Khuţā'ī, etc. In addition, the authority of the Imam is of a more recent origin than that of the Amir al-Mu'minīn, this prefiguring the “imperial-papal” policy of al-Ma'mūn. Communications between Irāk and Khurāsān were cut, and the frontiers guarded to prevent the sending of intelligence to Baghdaḏ, while al-Ma'mūn's intelligence service was in action at the court itself (through the efforts of al-'Abbās, son of the former heir to the caliphate 'Īsa b. Mūsā, and other informers recruited by al-Fadl b. Saih).

The “Meccan Documents” were undermined and then revoked at the behest of al-Ma'mūn, who finally ordered his brother to recognise his complete authority over Khurāsān. The rupture became total with the appointment of 'Alī b. 'Īsa b. Māḥān, the deposed former governor of Khurāsān, as governor of Ḥijāb (the provinces of Kuṃm, Nihāwand, Hamadān, Isfāhān), with the mission of restoring the caliph's authority over Khurāsān (Dhūmādsā II 195/3 May 811). The caliph's army was composed of the abnā\(^3\) "sons" of the Khurāsānīs, army garrisoned in Irāk, of whom some were supporters of the conflict with Khurāsān (notably 'Alī b. 'Īsa b. Māḥān), while others showed themselves loyal, in spite of the reservations of some (in particular Khuzayma, son of Khālid b. Khuzaym al-Yamānī, governor of the region bordering on the Byzantine empire, the Qāsimīs [cf. al-Qāsimīs: ʿAbd Allāh b. Khaṭtab b. ʿAbd Allāh] and still another al-Ṭābas). Consequently, it is not appropriate to identify the par-
tisans of al-Amm with Arabs bent on vengeance, since this leads to a flagrant ... 812). The siege of Baghdad lasted thirteen months, prolonged by the popular resistance of the Khuzaa [q.v.], people Arabs or conquered and to solve the social problems of the empire. The politico-military "establishment" was divided on the question of centralisation as opposed to the autonomy of provinces, whose supporters were likewise of Arab and non-Arab origin. It is for this reason that a certain number of artisans of al-Amm with Arabs bent on vengeance, since this had destroyed the Kays army of al-Djazira, was governing Egypt in the name of al-Amm); Zuhayr, son of al-Musayyib b. Zuhayr al-Dabbâ, a native of Balkh; this former supporter of 'Isâ b. Mûsá (who accepted the idea of a partial autonomy for the Khuzarâns), having espoused the cause of al-Hâdi and become a confidential ally of al-Rashid, took the part of al-Ma'mûn, who appointed him chief of his bodyguard (although his son Hâtim was governing Egypt in the name of al-Amm); Zuhayr, son of al-Musayyib. They were on the side of al-Ma'mûn (who appointed him governor of Sittân), as did his brother al-'Abbâs, retained as chief of police by al-Ma'mûn (although another brother, Muham- mad, was an army officer in Baghdâd in the service of al-Amm); Shabib, grandson of Khaibar Shabib al-Mu'izzî, was appointed governor of al-Ma'mûn (who appointed him head of the Kûmân); the other of his family supported al-Amm; Muhammad b. al-'Ashârâ of al-Khuzaâ, whose family was resident in a village of Bûkharâ, supported al-Ma'mûn, while his grandsons of his namesake (who was a deputy of the nakhî) were in the camp of al-Amm.

The reserved attitude of 'Abbâd Allah, son of the nakkâsh al-Ma'mûn, who had borne a grudge against al-Ma'mûn since the latter ordered the sending of the army of al-Rashid and the treasury to Marw, in 193/809. Once more, Tâhir was victorious, and 'Abbâd al-Rashid was killed (196/812). The whole of the province of Dîbâlî was now conquered, opening the road to Irâq. To block the route of the Khuzarâns, al-Amm mobilised two new armies, one of 20,000 and the other of 20,000 Arabs commanded by the KaysAhmad b. Mazyad al-Shây'bânî, representing the Rabî'a of al-Djazira. Once more, Tâhir skillfully succeeded in playing these two sections of the army against each other by exploiting their rivalries (Kayis chieftains of their rights by the Khuzarâns for 60 years!). These repeated reverses suffered by the abnâ' of Irâq and the impracticability of mobilising the Arabs of al-Djazira forced al-Amm to attempt to raise levies in Syria, in spite of the recent revolt of the Sufyânids against him (195/811). 'Abbâd al-Malik b. Sâlih was reinstated as governor of the 'A'sâ'im of al-Djazira and Syria, and Husyân son of 'Ali b. 'Isâ b. Mâhân, his lieutenant, was sent on a recruiting mission to Syria. However, the division between al-Ma'mûn and Kâbil (Yemen) did not constitute a propitious climate, all the more so in that the Arabs of Syria had learned lessons from their participation in the struggle for the caliphate, and the support given to the 'Abbasids 'Abbâd Allah b. 'Ali against the caliph al-Manṣûr (136/754). Finding his task impossible, al-Husyân organised a coup d'état at Baghdâd; in Rajab 196/March 812, he ordered the arrest of al-Ma'mûn and proclaimed his brother al-Ma'mûn caliph. Nothing better illustrates the divisions of the abnâ' than the counter-coup which restored the caliphate of al-Amm, while al-Husyân was sent away to fight the army of Tâhir, but was killed in retribution. Henceforward, the bâji-vizier al-Fadîl al-Rabî, one of the leading instigators of the conflict with al-Ma'mûn, seeing the cause of al-Amm to be finally lost, decided to make a move towards the future by leaving the political scene and plunging into obscurity. He was replaced by the kâmil al-sîr of al-Amm, Ismâ'il b. Şuba'b al-Harrânî, who had little to say regarding the opening of further hostilities with al-Ma'mûn.

On the same date, al-Ma'mûn was officially proclaimed caliph at Marw, while al-Fadîl b. Sâlih was endowed with the title of 'Abd 'Allah (a dual civil and military command), and Tâhir al-Husyân received orders to march on Khuza'în, which was defended by a Muhallabîd, Muhammad b. Yazîd b. Hâtim, resident at Ahwâz. Tâhir won the battle, and this forced the Muhallabîd of Başra, Ibn Abî 'Uyayna, to assure the position of his family by rallying to the new caliph al-Ma'mûn. In return, he was appointed governor of Eastern Arabia (Babrayn, Yamāma and 'Umân), while an 'Abbasîd prince, Ismâ'il b. Dja'far, was charged with the government of Başra. Tâhir's troops marched on Kufa, where they encountered some resistance; they then set out towards al-Madia'în, which they occupied, and finally arrived at a point west of Baghdâd. A second Khuzarâns army, commanded by Harthama b. al-A'yan, one of the leading military chiefs under al-Rashid, advanced as far as al-Ma'mûn in order to attack the caliph from the east (Dhu 'l-Ḥiḍâya 196/August 812). The siege of Baghdâd lasted thirteen months, prolonged by the popular resistance of the 'Ayyûsîn [q.v.].
of humble origin, who exploited the situation to their advantage. This urban guerilla warfare checked the advance of the regular army of Tahir b. al-Husayn, who began a destructive bombardment of the "City of Peace". The provinces situated to the west of al-Ma'mun recognised the authority of al-Ma'mun in 197/813: the Hijāz (where the pilgrimage was under the supervision of al-'Abbās, son of Mūsā b. Ṣa'īd, an early ally of al-Ma'mūn); Egypt, where the ābīn were divided between partisans of al-Maḥdī (al-Āmin) and those allied to al-Ma'mūn, supported by the Yemeni Arabs (against the Kaysīs); Irīkiyya, autonomous kingdoms of the Aghlabids, which he had abolished the power; northern Syria and al-Djazīra, which had lost their governor Ābd al-Malik b. Ṣāliḥ (d. 196/812), took advantage of the situation to establish their autonomy, an example followed by Ādharbāyjān and Armenia.

As for al-Āmin, after squandering the resources of the public treasury (several hundreds of millions of dirhams), he lost his supporters, who negotiated with Tāhir b. al-Husayn in order to safeguard their interests. Finally, he was obliged to seek the protection of Ḥarthāma b. al-ʿAṣayn. But Tāhir captured him and ordered his execution on the night of 24-5 Muharram 198/24-5 September 813; this was the first time that an ʿAbbāsid caliph was thus humiliated and put to death by rebel soldiers, whose conduct contrasted with the more respectful and conciliatory attitude of the veteran Ḥarthāma b. al-ʿAṣayn.

The government of Irāk was entrusted to al-Ḥasan, brother of al-ʿAfḍal b. ʿAbd al-Fāṭīma, as was Basra (where Zayd al-Nāʾīr "the Firebrand" was arrested and sent to Marw). Other Shīʿites were disarmed in the Hijāz and the Yemen: at Mecca, the envoy of Abu ʿl-Sarayyār succeeded in organising the proclamation of Muḥammad al-Dībājī as ʿAlī b. Maḥsūn in 198/24-5 September 813; this was the first time that an ʿAbbāsid caliph was thus humiliated and put to death by rebel soldiers, whose conduct contrasted with the more respectful and conciliatory attitude of the veteran Ḥarthāma b. al-ʿAṣayn.
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Ma'mun against him and ultimately he had him executed in Dhu 'l-Kacda 200/June 816. In consequence, Hātim, son of Harthama b. al-'A'yan and governor of Egypt, wanted to distance himself from al-Ma'mun, with other local chieftains of Adhbarbadgan, Bābak al-Khurrāmī [q. v.] went into action in 201/816 at Badhīd [q. v. in Suppl.] in the mountainous region to the south of the Araxes.

The struggle for power in Baghdad and the attempt to impose 'Ali al-Riḍā as successor to al-Ma'mun granted a respite to the autonomists of Adhbarbadgan, of Armenia, of the Musūm of northern al-Djazira and Syria, of Syria and of Egypt. In fact, the resistance of the abna' forced al-Hasan b. Sahl to abandon the capital. A triple power was established there with the appointment of al-Manṣūr b. al-Mahdī, son of a Persian concubine, as delegate of al-Ma'mūn, from 25 Dju'mādād II 201/16 January 817 onwards. In addition, the urban lower classes supported the movement of Sahl b. Salāma al-Anṣāri, a native of Khurāsān, in the quarter of al-Harbiyya: "[the command] al-amr bi 'l-ma'rif wa 'l-nahy 'an al-munkar became identified more or less with political independence and with the self-government of small social groups" (J. van Ess, Une lecture à rebours de l'histoire du mu'tazilisme, in REI, xxvii/1 [1979], 68 = Extrait hors série 14, Paris 1984, 127), while Abu l-Hudhayl and al-Nazāzīm, who had in the meantime transferred to the court of al-Ma'mūn, worked, on the contrary, for a policy of reconciliation with the 'Abbāsid power. In other words, the process of recovery of the second half of the reign of al-Ma'mūn, was beginning to evolve. In the meantime, on 2 Ramadān 201/24 March 817, al-Ma'mūn proclaimed 'Ali b. Mūsā al-Kāẓim as his successor (at the expense of al-Mu'tamin, his brother), with the title of al-Riḍā min al-Mu'mammad, and abandoned the black colour of the 'Abbāsid in favour of the green colour (the Khāṭib al-khāḍir of the Prophet). Henceforward, the choice of caliph-İmām was to be made from among the descendants of Hāshim, common ancestor of Muhammad and of his uncles al-'Abbās and Abū Ṭālīb the father of 'Alī (a census taken in 818 recorded 30,000 Hāshimītes, who had their own nabi). When the news reached İrāq the stretch of four months lasted during which the separatists reasserted their acumen against this assault on their "acquired rights": the 'Abbāsid governor of Başra İsmā'il b. Ḍafar b. Sulaymān b. 'Alī refused to wear green, while in Baghdad, the sons of al-Mahdī led the opposition. When al-Manṣūr (whose mother was al-Buhturīyya, daughter of the Dabūyīd ispahbad, governor of Tabaristan, Khurāsān) refused to be proclaimed caliph, his half-brother İbrahīm b. al-Mahdī (whose mother was ʾShaḳla, daughter of the Masmūḥīn of Damāwānd, deposed at the time of the conquest of this district) accepted the title (28 Dhu l-Hijād 201/17 July 817) and chose his nephew Ishāḥ b. Mūsā al-Ḥādī, brother-in-law of al-Ma'mūn, as heir to the throne. He was supported by the 'Abbāsid princes, notably İbrahim b. Mūḥammad b. 'Abd al-Wahhāb b. İbrahim al-İmām (known as Ibn ʾAṣāla), Abū Ṭālīb the future al-Mu'taṣīm, the mawādī of the preceding caliph al-İmān, al-Fadl b. al-Rabı' (who returned to his post of ḥāṭib at the court), al-Sinbī d. ʾShaḥāk, re-appointed chief of the police, and the abna', comprising the sons of both 'Alī b. ʾĪsā b. Māḥān and of Abū Khaḍīl, and even of former partisans of al-Ma'mūn, including al-Muṭṭala'b b. 'Abd Allāḥ, grandson of the nabi Mālik b. ʾAbd Allāḥ b. Khuzaymī, or Nu'aym b. Khāzim b. Khuzaymī al-Tamīmī, whom al-Ma'mūn had appointed his brother Khuzaymī, who had remained loyal to al-İmān. In other words, this was the revival of the war between the two camps, dormant since 198/813. The fact that al-İmān was the son of an Arab wife, and İbrahim b. al-Ma'mūn that of a Persian concubine, like al-Ma'mūn himself, and especially İbrahim b. al-Riḍā, was exploited. İbrahim was waged, in terms of the relations between İrāk, (capital Baghdād) and Khurāsān (capital Marw).

The new caliph İbrahim b. al-Ma'mūn succeeded in extending his authority over the capital by putting and end to the activities of Sahl b. Salama al-Anṣāri in the quarter of al-Harbiyya. Then he sought to take control of Kūfa, from which the 'Alīd governor al-İbāhī, brother of 'Abd al-Riḍā, was expelled (Djumādā I 202/November 817). But Wāṣit served as a headquarters for al-İsan b. Sahl, who regained control of Başra. The governor of Egypt, 'Abd al-ʾAzīz b. 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-İzdī, rallied to İbrahim b. al-Ma'mūn, while the autonomous amīr of Ifrikiyya remained neutral as before. The gravity of the situation was hidden from al-Ma'mūn by al-Fadl b. Sahl, until 'Ali al-İrādī disclosed to him that İbrahim b. al-Ma'mūn had been proclaimed caliph, rather than amīr, in Baghdād. Henceforward, at the age of thirty-one years, al-Ma'mūn decided to take personal control of affairs; he recognised that a military solution was not appropriate and that only agreement between the social elements of the empire was capable of saving the régime, by enlarging its social base as a means of halting the drift towards the collapse. In the diffusion of the concession to the aristocracy of İrāk was effected through the announcement of his return to Baghdād, whose rôle as capital of the empire was thus assured; on 10 Ṭaḥā Ṭaḥā 202/22 January 818 al-Ma'mūn left Marw with the court, the administration and the army, leaving ʾGhassān b. ʾAbbād, a cousin of the Sahīds, as governor of Khurāsān at Marw. At Sarakhs, al-Fadl b. Sahl, who had attempted to usurp the authority of the caliph, suffered the same fate as the Barmakids; he was assassinated at the instigation of al-Ma'mūn (2 ʾSha'b 202/13 February 818), but unlike the Barma kids, the other Sahīds were spared; besides controlling Khurāsān and southern İrāk, they held influential posts in the central administration, with the promotion of al-Ḥasan b. Sahl to the post of vizier-amir which had been held by his brother al-İsfāḥānī. A matrimonial alliance was concluded to consolidate this situation, with the betrothal of al-Ma'mūn to Būrān, daughter of al-İsan b. Sahl (the marriage was to be celebrated in Ramadān 210/December 825). Two months later, al-Ma'mūn left Sarakhs for Tūs, making no attempt to hasten the issue. As for İbrahim b. al-Ma'mūn, he was harpered by lack of financial resources and was obliged to combat opposition movements: on the part of ʾAṣad, who raised a revolt in the quarter of al-Harbiyya (suppressed by ʾĪsā b. Mūḥammad b. Abū Khaḍīl); on the part of Maḥdī b. Abīn Ṣalāh (al-Ḥurtī), in the region between Baghdād and Madai'īn (the headquarters of İbrahim b. al-Ma'mūn), who was defeated by Abī Ṭālīb (al-Mu'taṣīm); and on the part of certain abna' who sought to come to terms with the generals of al-Ḥasan b. Sahl. Altered to this conspiracy, in which al-Manṣūr b. al-Ma'mūn was implicated, İbrahim b. al-Ma'mūn returned to Baghdād (14 Safar 203/21 August 818) and had his half-brother arrested, as well as Khuzaymī b. Khaḍīl, the other Sahlīd, although al-Muṭṭala'b b. 'Abd Allāḥ b. Khuzaymī succeeded in escaping. It was then that the army of al-Ḥasan b. Sahl captured al-Madai'īn and the Nahr Dīyās. Meanwhile, in Khurāsān, 'Alī al-Riḍā met with the arrest of İbrahim b. al-Ma'mūn (2 Safar 203/5 September 818), and the Shi'īs were convinced that al-Ma'mūn had had him poisoned
(whence the name of *Mashhad* [q.v.], given to this place). Not only was a heavy taxation levied, but in *Baghdad*, certain *abāz,* 2 conspired against Ibrahim b. al-Mahdi; [33] b. Abi Khalid was supposed to capture him and hand him over on Friday 29 Shawwāl 203/205 May 819, but his plan was revealed and he was imprisoned. To free him, the family of the Banū Khālid entered into conflict with Ibrahim b. al-Mahdi and rallied to the cause of al-Ma'mūn (*Dhu 'l-Kaʿda* 203/205 May 819), who was in *DJurdjān* at this date (in other words, it had taken him sixteen months, since leaving *Marw, to cover the twenty journey-stages which separated this town from *DJurdjān*). Feeling the cause lost, once more, the *bāḍiḡ al-Fadl* b. al-Rabiʿ deserted his caliph and his post and plunged again into obscurity. As for Ibrahim b. al-Mahdi, he was reduced to using his rival Sahl b. Salama al-Ansar in an attempt to mobilise the lower classes of *Baghdad.* After two years as caliph, Ibrahim decided to leave the political scene, at the same time escaping from a conspiracy of some of his military chiefs who had plotted to hand him over to al-Hasan b. Sahl (16 Muharram 204/13 July 819). The authority of al-Ma'mūn was restored in *Baghdad,* while al-Hasan b. Sahl withdrew from political life (on account of his ill-health). In other words, the way was clear when al-Ma'mūn (Dhu 'l-Kaʿda 203/May 819), who was in *DJurdjān* at this date (in other words, it had taken him sixteen months, since leaving *Marw, to cover the twenty journey-stages which separated this town from *DJurdjān*), entered into conflict with Ibrahim b. al-Mahdi and imprisoned. To free him, the family of the Banū Khalid was supposed to capture *Baghdad,* certain conspiracies of some of his military chiefs who had plotted to hand him over to al-Hasan b. Sahl (16 Muharram 204/13 July 819). The authority of al-Ma'mūn was restored in *Baghdad,* while al-Hasan b. Sahl withdrew from political life (on account of his ill-health). In other words, the way was clear when al-Ma'mūn (Dhu 'l-Kaʿda 203/May 819), who was in *DJurdjān* at this date (in other words, it had taken him sixteen months, since leaving *Marw, to cover the twenty journey-stages which separated this town from *DJurdjān*), entered into conflict with Ibrahim b. al-Mahdi and imprisoned. To free him, the family of the Banū Khalid was supposed to capture
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ners (India) or political enemies (Byzantium). Scholars of all persuasions (Muslims, Christians, Jews, Zoroastrians and Šabians) and from different provinces of the empire (Khârâz, Farghânâ, Khurâsân, Tabaristan, al-Djazîra and Irâk) contributed to the advancement of Arab science, heir to the sciences of antiquity, adopted and adapted according to the requirements of Arab-Islamic civilisation.

These borrowings from various foreign cultures were not to the taste of the traditionists (muhaddîthûn) who adhered to the Kur’ân and the Sunna as sources of the law. While certain tafsîrûn were supporters of the religious orthodoxy (‘ilm) in questions of jurisprudence (particularly the Hânâfîs of Irâk), the majority tended to distrust divergences of opinion and, to maintain the purity of religion, re-affirmed the authority of the Kur’ân completed by the Sunna (at that time being edited in textual form, a process begun by Mâlik b. Anas).

Al-Ma’mûn applied himself to encouraging politico-religious controversies, on the one hand between representatives of different religions (cf. G. Tartar, Dialogue islamico-chretien sous le calife al-Ma’mûn. Les épîtres d’al-Hâshimi et d’al-Kindî, doctoral thesis, Univ. of Strasbourg, ii, 1977, repr. in the Bulletin Ecclésiastique, special issue, October 1982; Gudjastâk Aâbâshî, ed. and tr. A. Barthélemy, Paris 1887; the subject is a polemic between a Zoroastrian converted to Islam and a Christian). On the other hand, and most of all, between ‘ulamânî of the different tendencies with regard to the interpretations of Islam. Aware of the gulf between Mu’tazîlîm concepts (hitherto classed as zandaka) and those of the fâkalîs and muhaddîthûn, opposed to the notion of the created Kur’ân, al-Ma’mûn was at pains, over the years, to promote the Mu’tazîlî point of view, of which the political implications were obvious: the Imamî, seeking to correct the inequitable effects of the established order (particularly in terms of the taxation levied on citizens) borrowed from the Mu’tazîlîs that which he judged necessary for his purpose, this being the dogma of the created Kur’ân (only God is uncreated and eternal), which he was able to use in rectifying the order himself, by means of his knowledge (‘ilm). This perspicacity brought him close to the example of the Imam, the first of the Companions of Muhammad, who came to have understood that a practical interpretation of Islam was necessary after the upheavals set in motion by the success and the extent of the Arab conquests (634-44).

Furthermore, with the object of wooing the support of the Shi’ites, the Imam was proclaimed “the best of the companions” (imâm), and entrusted to Abu Ishâq Muhammad (al-Mu’âsîm, successor to al-Ma’mûn) and charged with the government of Egypt, where the situation was explosive. In 212/828, he took control of the armed forces, and divided them into three main army groups (each comprising a company of abnîs, troops of the ‘Âdâbîm and recruits drawn from the eastern provinces): the first under the command of Idhâbîs, charged with the maintenance of order in Irâk and in Djîbl and Fars, adjoining greater Khurâsân, which was entrusted to Talba b. Tâhir; the second under the orders of al-Abâbîs b. al-Mâ’mûn (responsible for the war-front in the struggle against the Byzantine empire in al-Djazira and northern Syria); and the third entrusted to Abû Ishâq Muḥammad (al-Mu’âsîm, successor to al-Ma’mûn) and charged with the government of Egypt, where the situation was explosive. In fact, from 214/829, the Mothems and the Copts fomented a revolt against the system of taxation and inflicted a defeat upon the forces of al-Ma’ṣâm. In northern Adhârâbâydjân, Bâbak al-Khurrami succeeded in killing Muhammad b. Humâyad al-Tâsi (214/829) and repelling his army, forcing al-Ma’mûn to charge ‘Abd Allâh b. Tâhir, veteran of the pacification of al-Djazîra and then of Egypt, with the suppression of this movement. However, before being able to intervene against Bâbak, ‘Abd Allâh b. Tâhir was transferred to Khurâsân on the death of his brother, Talba (214/829), this coinciding with the end of the revolt of the Khârîjîs Hamza b. Adârak (which had lasted for a third of a century in Sîstân-Kirmân). The task of pacifying Djîbl, Adhârâbâydjân and Armenia was then entrusted to ‘Ali b. Highâm, one of al-Ma’mûn’s leading generals, who did not however succeed in changing the territorial status quo.

This policy of restoring the unity of the empire preceded the outbreak of a new war-front against Byzantium, already under way with the settlement of Andalusiâns in Crete (210/826) and the conquest of Sicily by
the Aghlabids of Ifrikiya (a campaign launched in 211/827). In addition, deserters from the Byzantine empire were gathered together and posted in frontier sites (cf. P. Lemerle, L’histoire des Pauliciens d’Asie mineure d’après les sources grecques, in Travaux et Mémoires du Centre de recherches d’histoire et civilisation de Byzance, v [1973]; H. Gregoire, Manuel et Théophile, in Byzantion, ix [1934]; M. Rekaya, Mise au point sur Théophile et l’alliance de Bâbék avec Théophile, in ibid., xliv [1974]).

The first campaign began in 215/830 under the personal command of al-Ma’mun, who thus intended to prove himself worthy of his title of Imam, according to the Zaydi doctrine, which then obtained. The goal of this campaign was to maintain the rule of the Abbasids in the urban proletariat of Baghdad (cf. W. M. Patton, Ahmed ibn Hanbal and the Mihna, Leiden 1897). The conflict between the khāṣa and the ʿāmma of the capital was revived (leading the successor of al-Ma’mun to found a new capital at Sāmarrā).

Shortly before his death, al-Ma’mun chose as his successor not his son al-Abbās, who was in charge of the ʿĀṣārūna (in the manner of al-Mu’tamid, who was to be the third heir of al-Rashid), but his brother al-Mu’taṣim who was responsible for the new recruits from Transoxania. His political testament recommended the pursuit of his politico-religious work, incomplete in Radjab 218/August 833, the date of his death near Tarsus.

In conclusion, it is not inappropriate to compare al-Ma’mun’s world with that of Abū al-Malik b. Marwān (65-86/685-705), both of whom restored unity to the empire after a long civil war and promoted a political and cultural upheaval (of the 2nd/8th century in the case of Abū al-Malik, and of the 3rd/9th century in the case of al-Ma’mun). Their successors benefited from their work (built up over twenty years) and developed its main points of policy during their reign (of ten years); al-Mu’taṣim put an end to various centres of persistent revolt (the Khurramiyya of Djbīl in 218/833, the Zutt of the marshlands of lower Irāk in 219/834; the Khurramiyya of Bābāk in Adhbarbāyjān in 222/837; the ʿabnāʿ favourable to al-Abbās b. al-Ma’mun in 223/838; and the Sufyānīd al-Mubarkaḵ in Syria in 226/841). He endorsed the Tahirids, the pillars of the regime, going so far as to suppress the autonomist revolt of Mazyār, the prince-governor of Khurram. His political testament recommended the pursuit of his politico-religious work, incomplete in Radjab 218/August 833, the date of his death near Tarsus.

In spite of his preoccupation with the Byzantine war-front, and the political difficulties aroused by the persistent rebellions of the Zutt (of lower Irāk), of Bābak al-Kurramī in the north of Adhbarbāyjān, complicated by the sedition of All b. Hīqām, governor of Djbāl, of Adhbarbāyjān and of Armenia (executed in Djamāda I 217/June 832), al-Ma’mun did not neglect cultural matters (foundation of the Bayt al-Mihna in 217/832) and did not lose sight of his objective of having his “imperial-papal” policy recognised by the Sunni ʿulāma’. While preparing for the major campaign of 218/833 (of which the objective was Amorium, the natal city of the current Byzantine dynasty and thus the heart of Byzantium itself), al-Ma’mun engaged in a trial of strength with the ʿulāma’. In the Islamic sciences, instituting the mihna [q.v.] (Rabī’ I 218/April 833), four months before his death. Henceforward, Mu’taṣim was to be adopted by all as the ʿulamā’ (from 219/834), in order to preserve the strength of the strike force constituted by the army, dominated by Transoxanians, among whom the rôle of the Turkish guard was growing in importance.
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Abd Allah b. Mardanish (Martinez).

At first, al-Ma'mun served in Spain as the lieute-
nant of his brother Abd Allah Muhammad
Abu 'l-'Adil, then on the throne. The latter had almost
left the Peninsula and return to Morocco without
having been able to subdue the rebel leader Abu
Muhammad al-Bayyasi, who was supported by Ferdi-
nand III of Castile, but he was soon betrayed by
his own men in his own land and assassinated in
624/1127. This murder was followed by the almost
simultaneous proclamations of al-Ma'mun and ano-
other Almohad pretender, nephew of the preceding,
Yahya b. al-Mansur, who took the
honorable title of Al-Ma'mun, al-khalifa al-
Mansur. At a time when the Almohad dynasty was
much troubled by the strife stirred up by pretenders, he was
able by his energy to postpone for several years its
final collapse.
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to take Marrakush, to massacre the Christians and destroy their church and to plunder the town. On hearing this, al-Ma'mūn, then busy with the siege of Ceuta, hurried off to the capital at once but fell ill and died on the way, in the valley of the Nafud, 13 days after the end of Dhū 'l-Hijja 629/1032


MA'MÜN B. MUHAMMAD ABU 'L-AS'IM; founder of the short-lived line of Ma'mūnids Khārazm-Shāhs in Khārazm [*q.v.*]. Ma'mūn was governor, probably as a nominal vassal of the Sāmānids [*q.v.*], in the town of Gurgandj [*q.v.*], which during the 4th/10th century had been prospering commercially at the expense of the ancient capital Kath [*q.v.*]; seat of the old-established line of Afrīghīd Khārazm-Shāh [*see KHĀRAZM-SHAHS*]. In 383/993 the Afrīghīs were overthrown and their dynasty extinguished, so that Ma'mūn became ruler of a unified Khārazm.

Very soon he was drawn into the struggle between the last Sāmānīd amīn, in particular, Nūh b. Ma'mūr, the last Samanid dynasty extinguished, so that Ma'mūn and the Afrīghīd Kharsujūr, a high-ranking military commander of the Sāmānids, who recommended him to the court in Baghdad after 343/953, left the capital in his youth and went to Rayy, where the famous Sāḥib Ibn 'Abbād [*q.v.*] made him a member of his learned circle. However, 'the scorpions of envy from the part of the boon-companions of the Sāhib were creeping around him', so he decided to move and went to Nīghāpur, where he was introduced to Ibn Simdjūr, a high-ranking military commander of the Sāmānids, who recommended him to the court in Buḫkārā. The brilliant young poet having arrived there, al-wazīr Abu 'l-Husayn al-Urbīb and his successor Abū Najr showered gifts and honours upon him. Al-Ma'mūn seems to have dreamed of regaining—or usurping—the throne of the old-established line of his forefathers (me^mur), of the naval arsenal (tersane) and so on. With its still somewhat clumsy mannerism, this poetry forms an interesting document for the development of the sophisticated Persian style, showing it at an early stage and in Arabic guise, as already pointed out by Bertels.

As far as one can tell from research done to date, the change was a matter of gradual transition, and not the result of any clearly-marked shift in governmental practice. This was, however, a period when traditional scribal institutions were undergoing extensive change, and scribal officials were being used increasingly for assignments or missions (me^mur), other than those evoked by such traditional designations for scribal roles as kāfa (from kāfli, normally applied to scribal officials only in the plural form khalifā), or khalafūs (also normally applied to officials only in the plural form khalifātūn). Usage in historical works of this period suggests that repeated references to individuals who were 'ordered' (me'mur) to perform a particular mission (me'murīyat) gradually caused these terms to float free of association with specific persons or duties and acquire the general meanings of "official" and "official position or appointment". In the History of Wāṣíf, published in 1219/1804, and in that of ʿĀṣim [*q.v.*], written about five years later, there are numbers of section headings containing the terms me'mur or me'murīyat (e.g. Wāṣíf, i, 148, 155, 140, ii, 110, 116, 119, 147, 154, 185, 207, 266, 268, 272, 294; ʿĀṣim, i, 62, 155, 174, 223, ii, 20, 26, 166). At some points, the word me'mur appears with meanings approaching that later conventional in Turkish. Me'murs go to Egypt and return (Wāṣíf, i, 172-3); the me'murs of the naval arsenal (tersane) are accused of negligence ('Āṣim, i, 51); Russian consuls behave inappropriately toward government officials (duvet me'murdar, ibid., i, 178-9).

From roughly the 1830s onwards, the term me'mur began to be associated in Ottoman official usage with the term mülküyse, which was then coming into use as a noun meaning "civil administration" or "civil service". Eventually, a civil official came to be known as a mülküyse me'mur, a compound that contrasted both the man and his branch of service with the scribe (kāfī, etc.) of the scribal service (kāmīyse), as it had been known prior to the beginning of reform. Since
the terms mülkü and mülküyye convey associations with both land ownership and sovereignty, generalised use of the new nomenclature may have been a result of the growing association of civil officials with provincial administration, thus with the vast domain of employment external to the bureaux in the capital city, in which most scribal officials had historically served. When Mahmūd II [p. v.] reorganised the central offices as a series of ministries, the first title of the new minister of the interior was, in fact, umur-i mülküyye nâşîrî, or "Minister of Civil Affairs". The title was conferred in 1251/1836 (Lufti, v, 29-31), but was changed to Minister of the Interior (tabird-i ilkî nâmî) a year later. Ultimately, however, the term mülküyye me'mür and its variations, such as the common plural me'mür-i mülküyye, clearly referred, not just to local administrators but to civil officials in general (Findley, 65-6, 140, 364, n. 66). Despite some inconsistency in usage, this fact became clearer as a systematic personnel policy emerged for this branch of service (ibid., 140-1, 297-0, 326-35). In the Turkish of the republican era, me'mür remains, first and foremost, a noun that means "official" and refers especially to the civil service.

Nineteenth-century lexicographical works were slow to register the use of me'mür in this sense. This fact alone does not reflect the tendency of the authors to rely on earlier written works; but it is probably also another sign that the shift in usage was not clearly marked. Works that do not mention the new usage include Alexandridis (1812), Bianchi (Vocabulare, 1831, s.vv. "fonction", "fonctionnaire", "officier"), Hindoğu (1838, s.v. "me'mür"), and Handjéri (1841, s.vv. "fonction", "fonctionnaire", "officier"). Even Redhouse, whose long years in Ottoman service made him a great authority, gave only conservative definitions in his first lexicographical publication, the Muntakhabât-i lughat-i othomânîyye, prepared by the ear-

nin eighteenth century and first published in 1269/1852-3 (see the printing of 1285/1868-9, 88). Even in his last dictionary, he gave the traditional meanings first, as was his wont (Turkish and English Lexicon, 1890, s.vv. me'mür, me'mürîyet). By then, however, indications of the new usages had long since appeared in Rhasis (1828, s.v. "fonctionnaire" and "civil", giving as one translation of the latter term mülkü [sic], with the example "troubles civils, ihtildîldî-i mülküyye ou dâğîliyye"), Bianchi (Dictionnaire turc-français, 1843, s.vv. "fonctionnaire"), and in Guzel-oglu (1852, s.v. "fonction"). In 1835, Bianchi and Kieffer (Dictionnaire turc-français, s.vv. me'mür, me'mürîyet, mülkü) had given the new meanings, but had associated them with Egyptian usage.

The reference to Egypt does reflect usage there, at least in Ottoman Turkish, under Muhommâd ʻAli Paşa. In Ottoman-language Egyptian documentation of that period, one finds me'mür as a general term for "official" (Deny, 106); by the 1820s, mülküyye was also in use in Egypt with essentially the meaning "civil affairs" (e.g. dîdanî-i mülküyye, as opposed to dîdanî-i dâğîliyye; ibid., 108, 111-5). From this period dates the use of the term me'mûr as a title for the chief officer of a given type of local administrative district (ibid., 130, 565); this usage has survived in Egypt. In general, mwaṣṣaf, rather than me'mûr has been the common term for "civil official" in modern Arabic.

1254/1838. In 1278/1862, upon a suggestion from the local governor Ismacil Pasha, the settlement was renamed Ma'murat al-Aziz in honour of the reigning sultan 'Abd al-Aziz [q.v.]. The name was extended to the sandjak and then in 1296/1879 to a new wilayet formed on these upper reaches of the Euphrates. It was soon transformed in popular parlance into al-'Aziz/Elaziz, and the present name Elazığ adopted in 1937.

Until the end of World War II, the growth of Elazığ was somewhat irregular. While the town probably consisted of about 10,000 to 12,000 inhabitants at the beginning of World War I, the first census conducted by the Turkish Republic in 1927 recorded 20,052 inhabitants. In 1940, this figure had risen to 25,465, but the shortages of the war years led to an exodus of population, so that in 1945 only 23,695 inhabitants were counted. However, from then onward, the city has gone through a period of dramatic and uninterrupted growth (1950: 29,317; 1955: 41,667; 1960: 60,289; 1965: 78,605; 1970: 107,364; 1975: 131,415).

The most important factor determining the growth of Elazığ in recent years has been the construction of the Keban power plant at a distance of only 45 km from the town (lake area: 68,000 ha., productive capacity 3,871,000 kwh/year). Throughout the construction period, building workers employed on the Keban power plant were usually housed in the town, so that during the nineteen-sixties and seventies, Elazığ was inhabited by many more males than females (1960: 32,449 males, 27,840 females; 1975: 69,797 males, 61,681 females).

Among the factories constructed in the area, some of the more important ones are connected more or less directly with the Keban dam project. Thus a cement factory belonging to the public sector of the Turkish economy was founded in the city, possessing a capacity of 400,000 ton/year. In addition, the city is located close to an important mining area, in which chrome is extracted; this situation accounts for the relatively high percentage of miners in the Elazığ district (2.5% of the active population in 1965). Due to these activities, the level of urbanisation in the district of Elazığ (40.2% in 1970) has surpassed the average not only for eastern Anatolia, but even for Turkey as a whole (38.7% in 1970).

The growth of Elazığ has also been stimulated by a side effect of the Keban dam, namely the total flooding of close to a hundred villages. In addition, over a hundred others have lost a large part of their agricultural lands. Among the 20,000 people who were forced to move, many apparently chose to settle in Elazığ and to invest the indemnities paid by the government in houses and small business. Some of the recipients of major indemnities were encouraged to invest their money in a holding company, which by 1972 had built a factory producing plastic pipes and tubes, and by 1977 had also erected a leather factory employing 260 workers. State offices and enterprises also absorbed some of the migrants, mainly in subordinate capacities. However, just as the electricity produced by the Keban dam is mainly consumed outside, the area, it appears that a considerable percentage of the money received as indemnities was invested in the large cities of western Turkey.

Bibliography: Helmuth von Moltke, Briefe über Zustände und Begebenheiten in der Türkei, Berlin 1877, 212 etc.; Kâmil al-A'âm, iii, 2032, vi, 4330; V. Cuinet, La Turquie d'Asie, Geographie administrative, statistique descriptive et raisonnee de chaque province de l'Asie Turque, Paris 1897, 335; Gurzinde Bell, Amurath to Amurath, London 1911, 329-32; E. Banse, Die Türkei, Eine moderne Geographie, Brunswick 1916, 227; T. C. Başevektecli, İstistik Umum Müdürülüğü, 1946-1954 zirai çeviri ve istisnalar, Ankara 1955; METU Department of Restoration, Doeneden do ikinci yarısı, Ankara 1974; Devlet İstatistik Enstitüsü, Rawshana-isp [see RAWSHANIYYA] and Yusufzays. In 995/1587 Man Singh was transferred to the governorship of the suba
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of Bihar, where he pursued a vigorous policy against both recalcitrant Hindu rādjas and disaffected local Afghan chieftains fleeing to eastern Bengal. His campaigns against them were continued in his next appointment, as sābabār of Bengal, in 1002/1594. He built a new capital at Agmahal which he renamed Rādjmahl [q.v.], with fort, palace and large mosque (see Catherine B. Asher, Inventory of key monuments, in G. Mitchell (ed.), The Islamic heritage of Bengal, UNESCO-Paris 1984, 120-1). Further chastisement of dissident Afghans, and the conquest of Kashmir, occupied him until 1014/1605, when he returned to the imperial court at Agra with the mansab of 7,000. He was less successful as a courtier than as a military commander, for he urged the claims of a rival, possibly the descendants of Kurkumaz, to the throne of Bengal, in 1002/1594. He died a natural death in 1605.

As the master of two sandjas, Fakhr al-Dīn established himself in Sidon. He recruited a mercenary army of 7,000 mamluks and some 7,000 local Afghans, and cunningly used this force to remove the beylerbeyi, A1I Djanbulad, the usurper Pasha of Aleppo, by the Ottomans in 1022/1613. Fakhr al-Dīn fled to Damascus, but was permitted to return home in 1027/1618, to resume office as sandjak-beyi of Sidon, Beirut and Saşad. During the years that followed, he crushed rival chiefs in every direction, at first with Ottoman support and approval, until most of rural Syria fell under this control. Alarmed by the growth of his power, the Ottomans organised an expedition against him in 1042/1633. In the face of the Ottoman offensive, his power rapidly collapsed; his eldest son, 'Ali, was killed in battle, and he and his remaining two sons were captured and taken to Istanbul in 1045/1635. There Fakhr al-Dīn was put to death by strangulation in that year, along with his son Manṣūr. His youngest son, Husayn Ma'ān-zada [see MA'ĀN-ZADA], survived him to become chamberlain to the Sultan and Ottoman ambassador to India. This Husayn was an informant of the Ottoman historian Nātimā [q.v.], and the author of a book of adab literature entitled Kitāb al-Tamyiz.

At home, Fakhr al-Dīn was survived by a nephew, Mulhūm, whose political claims in the Shūf (the Sidon hinterland) and the other Druze districts (the Gharb, Djurd and Matn, in the Beirut hinterland) were challenged by the 'Alam al-Dīns—as already mentioned, the descendants of the 'Alam al-Dīn Sulaymān b. Ma'ān. At various times, Mulhūm held the sandjak of Saşad, or the sandjak of Batroun, the latter in the eyalet of Tripoli. Upon his death, reportedly in 1668/1658, he was survived by a son, Ahmad, who succeeded in expelling the 'Alam al-Dīns from the Druze districts and the Kīsrawān in 1708/1667 and in installing himself in their place as the local multazim, in subordination to the beylerbeyi of Sidon (an eyalet since 1700/1660). By holding this position without interruption for thirty years (1706-11/1667-97), Ahmad Ma'ān maintained his family's power, de facto, in the sidon Mountain, possibly the grandson of the first, died in 1585 while Ottoman forces were invading the Druze districts. This Kurkumāz left two sons, Fakhr al-Dīn and Yunis. By the 1590s, his son Fakhr al-Dīn (d. 1045/1635), commonly believed to have been the elder of the two, was already set on a career of political success which was to make him the dominant figure in the politics of Syria during the first three decades of the seventeenth century.

From small beginnings as a mukaddam and Ottoman multazim (tax farmer) in the Shūf, Fakhr al-Dīn rose by 1011/1602-3 to be the sandjak-beyi of Sidon-Beirut and of Saşad, under the beylerbeyi of Damascus. He had already taken possession of Beirut, along with the southern parts of the district of Kīsrawān, as far north as Nahr al-Kalb (the Dog River), in 1006/1598. In 1014/1605, he took possession of the whole of the Kīsrawān. He next became involved in the rebellion of 'Ali Djānbulād, the usurper Paşa of Aleppo, by coming to his support against the beylerbeyis of Tripoli and Damascus. This aroused the suspicion of the Porte against him for the first time.
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From small beginnings as a mukaddam and Ottoman multazim (tax farmer) in the Shūf, Fakhr al-Dīn rose by 1011/1602-3 to be the sandjak-beyi of Sidon-Beirut and of Saşad, under the beylerbeyi of Damascus. He had already taken possession of Beirut, along with the southern parts of the district of Kīsrawān, as far north as Nahr al-Kalb (the Dog River), in 1006/1598. In 1014/1605, he took possession of the whole of the Kīsrawān. He next became involved in the rebellion of 'Ali Djānbulād, the usurper Paşa of Aleppo, by coming to his support against the beylerbeyis of Tripoli and Damascus. This aroused the suspicion of the Porte against him for the first time.
With the death of Ahmad Ma’n, the direct Ma’nid male line became extinct, and the iltizam of his territory passed over to his nephew (the son of his brother’s son) Bahíar I Şihâb (1109-1118/1697-1706), then to his grandson (daughter’s son) Haydar Şihâb, Sunni Muslim chiefs from Wâdi al-Taym, in the Anti-Lebanon. The ʿAlam al-Dins, apparently as Ma’n in the indirect line, rose to challenge this Şihâb succession sometimes by intrigue, sometimes by military action, until they were defeated in battle and killed to a man in 1125/1711.

In the modern Republic of Lebanon, the Banû Ma’n have become a national legend, and their tenure of their mountain territory in the southern Lebanon, as ma’tazims for the Ottoman State, has come to be regarded as a precursor to the modern Lebanese State. Fakhr al-Din, in particular, is regarded as a Lebanese national hero, although Lebanon in his time was no more than a geographical expression. The real achievements of the Banû Ma’n are of a different order. By controlling the predominantly Maronite district of Kirsrawân alongside the Druze districts of the Shuf, Gharb, Disur and Maţn, Fakhr al-Din and his Ma’n successors, more by accident than by design, laid the foundations of a political symbiosis between Maronites and Druzes in the sanqûds of Beirut-Sidon (after 1660, part of the eyalet of Sidon). This became, in its turn, the mainstay of the family’s de facto autonomy enjoyed by the same territory in subsequent Ottoman times. By encouraging silk production, and protecting foreign traders, the Ma’ns furthermore secured for their territory a modest prosperity unknown in other rural parts of Syria in Ottoman times.


Ma’n b. Aâs: Al-MAZUNI, Aраб poet belonging to the Ma’zuni tribe of the Muzayna (see Ibn al-Kalîbî, Casket, Djâmbhara, Tab. 88), which was established in a fertile region between Medina and Wâdi ʿl-Kurâ. He was considered to have been a muḥḍādram poet, but was probably born shortly before the mission of Muhammad and lived most of his life under Islam. He lost his sight towards the end of his life, which came about no earlier than 64/684, at least if the verses in which he complains about the hospitality offered by ʿAbd Allâh b. al-Zubayr [p. v.] in Mecca are authentic. Although probably converted along with his tribe before the capture of Mecca, he does not seem to have participated in the conquests, and his poetry more or less reflected the situation created by the new religion, which is mentioned only occasionally. Moreover, the available biographical information is sparse and is mainly concerned with his private life, his wives and his daughters (whom he by no means considered insignificant persons). Closely attached to an estate which he owned not far from Medina, and to the Bedouin life-style which he followed in his home territory and which he maintained even when visited Basra, where he is said to have met al-Farazdak [q. v.] and to have married a woman of his tribe, also of Syria, the country of origin of another of his wives. He wrote eulogies of a number of Muslim personalities, including ʿUbayd Allâh b. ʿAbd Allâh, ʿAṣîb b. ʿAbd Allâh b. al-ʿAzîz b. ʿUmar b. al-Ḵaṭîb b. al-Saʿîd b. al-ʿAsk, without deviating from the Bedouin tradition. Although Ibn Sallâm and Ibn Kustâbaya appear to ignore him, he is considered a talented poet, regarded by Ma’sawiya as almost the equal of his fellow-tribesman Zuhayr b. Abî Sulmâ. The fact is that his poetry contains, alongside personal references, passages of a moralistic nature. His name does not feature in the lists of diwâns, collected by the early ruwâtî, but P. Schwarz discovered in the Escorial an incomplete manuscript, with a commentary the contents of which go back to al-Kâli [p. v.] and published it under the title des Man b. Aus (Leipzig 1903) with an introductory account of the poet (cf. Noldé, in ZA 1903, 274 ff.; Reckendorf, in OLZ 1904, 138-40; R. Geyer, in WZKM, xvii, 246-70). Kamal Muṣṭâfâ reprinted the Schwarz edition, with some additions and omissions, under the title Man b. Aus, haydûth, ghârûth, aghbârûth, Cairo 1927; these collections could probably be enriched by the use of new sources. O. Rescher partially translated the diwân in his Beitrag zur arab. Poetik, vi/2, Istanbul 1956-8, 1-28, and M. R. al-Nadawi has devoted a study to the poet, Maʾn b. Aus al-Muṣâni, in Maṣallât al-Maṣâlim al-ʿIlmi al-Hindi, i (1936/1976), 107-25. A new edition of the Diwân, based on Muṣṭâfâ’s edition plus a combing of adâb works, etc., is by ʿUmar Muḥammad Sulaymân al-Kâji, Diwân Muʾāṣir Muḥammad b. Aâs al-Muṣâni (47 poems and fragments).

Bibliography: In addition to the references cited, see Dâjîzî, Bayân, index; idem, Buḫûdâ, ed. Hâjdîrî, 205, 379; Abî Tamâmûn, Hâmsâ, ii, 2-4; Buṭûrî, Hâmsâ, index; Aḥbânî, x, 154-8, Beirut, xii, 50-9; Naḍābâd, ed. Bevan, 819; Kâlî, Amâlî, ii, 234; ʿAskâri, ʿImânîyân, 55-6; Ḫusûrî, Zahr al-ʿâdîb, 816-7 (cf. Ibn Abî ʿl-Ḥâdîd, Ḫârî Naḥāf al-balâgâh, ii, 125), Marzûbânî, Maṣâmîn, 199; Ibn Ḥadâr, Liāba, no. 8451; Baghdâdî, Khûsîn, index; Bâlûkî, iii, 258; Ḫâkûn, Bulûdân, index; Safâdî, Nâṭî al-himyûn, 294; Abâkûrûs, 273-2; Brockelmann, S, I, 72; O. Rescher, Abrîs, ii, 107; R. Blachère, HLA, 320-1; Sezgin, G4S, ii, 269-70, ix, 275. (M. Plessen - [Ch. Pellat])

Maʾn b. Muhammad. B. Ahmed b. Šumâdîn al-Tughîbî, Abu ʿl-ʾAmâs, founder of a branch of the dynasty of the Tughîbîs which in the little principality of Almêria [see al-Marîyâ] in eastern Spain in the middle of the 5th/11th century. The principality had been founded in the latter’s death in 428/1037, their overlord ʿAbd al-ʿAzîz b. Abî ʿAmâr, king of Valencia, declared it his principality in 438/1047-8, placed his brother-in-law Maʾn b. Šumâdîn as governor there. The latter belonged to a noble family of Arab origin; his father
had been one of the generals of the celebrated Hādżib al-Mansūr [qv.], and was governor of the town Huesca [see WAGHI]. Ma'n remained loyal to the king of Valencia for nearly four years, then cast off his allegiance to the Abbasids and declared himself independent. He reigned at Almería for a few years longer and died in Ramān 443/January 1052.


(E. LÉVI - PROVENCAL)

**MA'N b. ZĀIDA, ABU 'L-WALĪD AL-SHAYBĀNĪ.** 

Military commander and governor of the late Umayyad and early Abbasid period. He came from the ashraf of the Shaybānī tribe and rose to importance through the patronage of Yazīd b. Umār b. Hubayrā (see IBN HUBAYRĀ), the last Umayyad governor of Irāq. He fought against the advancing Abbasids at the beginning of the Abbasid period. However, he was said to have killed the enemy commander, Khayatab b. Shabbīb [qv.]. He joined his master Ibn Hubayrā in the defence of Wāṣīt and was one of the few leaders not to be executed, apparently because he was in the defence of Wāṣīt and was one of the few leaders not to be executed, apparently because he was in the service of the Abbasids.

Thereafter he remained in hiding until the rebellion of the Rāwandiyya in the newly-founded capital of Ḥāshimiyya (variously dated 139 to 141/756-9), when he was able to rescue the caliph al-Mansūr and was appointed as a commander. He joined the king of Valencia for nearly four years, then cast off his allegiance to the Abbasids and declared himself independent. He reigned at Almería for a few years longer and died in Ramān 443/January 1052.


(E. LÉVI - PROVENCAL)

**MA'N b. MUHAMMAD — MA'N b. ZĀDA**

435

Very little is known about the childhood of Husayn and his younger brother Hasan. However, when Sultan Murād IV in 1043/1634 commissioned the governor of the province of Damascus, Kūčük Ahmad Pāgha, to eradicate the Ma'nīds, Fakhr al-Dīn instructed Husayn to take shelter in al-Markab citadel situated on the outskirts of Lādhiyya. Husayn was arrested and sent to Aleppo, whence he was eventually dispatched to Istanbul. In 1044/1635, his father and two of his sons were put to death, but the life of Husayn was spared because of his youth. He was sent to the Palace pages' school. After graduating from there, he served at the Ottoman court in the Khādsodan. It appears that he showed competence, because he was promoted to be a private secretary to Sultan Ahmed III [qv.]. He held the post of chief assistant at the treasury, khātāt-i kubā, and then in 1066/1656 that of kaptaji bashi or head of the Sultan's guards. Later in the same year, he was sent as the Sultan's special envoy (elcit) to the Moghal sultan in India Shāh Dīhān (1037-68/1628-57), travelling by land to Baṣra in the company of an ambassador sent by Shāh Dīhān, and from there they sailed to India: Husayn refers to this journey in his own surviving work *al-Tamīz*. Arriving in Dīhil, he found that the emperor had died and that fighting had broken out between his sons. It seems that his stay there did not last long, and he went back to Istanbul carrying a message of good wishes from Murād Bakhsh, son of the deceased sultan. It is possible that he was not on good terms with the new Grand Vizier Mehmed Köprülű (1656-61) [see Köprülű], since he was not appointed to any official post, although fortunately his property was not confiscated. This enabled him to devote ample time to his work *al-Tamīz*, for which he made use of his own rich library and other private libraries in Istanbul. During this period of his life, it seems that the court historian, Muṣṭafā Na'imā [qv.], (d. 1128/1716) came to acquire himself with Husayn and to make use of his knowledge and of his library; on several occasions, Na'imā requests his indefatigable help, especially in finding his vast knowledge, his modesty and zuhd. He states that his information about both Sultan Ibrāhim and Sultan Mehmed IV was taken orally from Husayn, but a recent study doubts this role accredited to Husayn by Na'imā.

The *Tamīz* comprises 26 books with a fasl (section) appended to each chapter. In the *fasl* he mentions the merits of the subject he is analysing, whereas in the *fasl* he relates what other learned sages have said for or against that particular subject. His citations came from innumerable sources, but mainly from the Kur'an, Hadith, al-Nahj al-balashīga and the Iḥyā 'ulum al-dīn. Na'imā states that on the request of Husayn, he made several copies of the *Tamīz*, which were presented by the author to the dignitaries of Istanbul, and particularly to the Grand Vizier Husayn Kermīr. It appears that he finished the first final copy in 1686.

Na'imā places Husayn's death in 1102/1690, while Muhammad Khalīl al-Husaynī al-Murādī (d. 1206/1791) mentions that this took place in 1109/1697, and this last report was accepted by some Lebanese historians such as the Patriarch Išṭān al-Duwāyhi (d. 1704), Haydar al-Shāhīb (d. 1835) and Ehūtūnī al-Sawārī (d. 1150).
Tannús al-Shidyak (d. 1859), who claim that Husayn intervened with Ottoman officials in 1697, when the grandson of amīr Ahmad al-Maʾnī, the last Maʾnī amīr, rather than amīr Bashīr al-Shihābī, to govern al-Shuf. If Naʾīmā is accurate in reporting the date of Husayn’s death (1102/1690), this aspect of local Lebanese history clearly needs further investigation.


In Ibn Hazm’s grammatical theory, finally, there is a strict distinction, contrary to the generally-accepted usage, between the intention of the speaker and the inherent meaning of the word. In this respect, Ibn Hazm’s grammar is fundamental in the history of Arabic grammar.

2. In philosophy. This term is used to translate a number of Greek expressions. Ma'na is frequently used as a synonym of ma'āl, corresponding to the Greek noēma, a concept, thought, or idea. Sometimes ma'na is used to translate the Greek term 'prokatalepsis' (as in al-Fārābī's commentary on Aristotle's De Interpretatione) and sometimes ma'na (as in his commentary on Aristotle's De Intellecctu). Išāb b. Hunayn uses ma'na in his translation of the De Interpretatione, but he also translated Aristotle's use of prókatalepsis (real things) by ma'ānī. (For an argument against the Latin translation of ma'na by intimo, see Gyeke). Al-Ghazālī uses ma'ānī to interpret the mechanical sense of 'natural sign in the soul'. Ibn Sinā's distinction between ma'ānī of the first and second understanding probably stems from Porphyry's distinction between terms of first and second imposition. The latter, ma'ānī of second understanding, are abstract notions which are applied to the notions of first understanding. The expressions ma'ānī ma'ālā, intelligible notions, or ma'ānī or just ma'ālālā, are often found in Ibn Sinā, all frequently translated as intellecta. These terms are important for his argument of the complex relationship between logic and language (see Sabra).

Mu'āmmar b. ʿAbdād al-Sulamlī, the Başrān Muťazālī philosopher, is undoubtedly the chief exponent of the use of the term ma'na as a vital part of a metaphysical system. According to him, every ma'na (entity) is brought about by another entity, which itself has its origin in a third entity, and so on ad infinitum. Mu'āmmar speaks of an infinite chain of determinant ma'ānī, the first determinant of which is God, and through which God is indirectly the real cause for the accidental external appearance of substances. For example, he talks of God creating countless ma'ānī of colour, the final effect of which is the accident 'colour'. The infinite chain of ma'ānī as entities, everlasting, and the occasionally evil accidents brought about thereby are caused by the substance through the real features of nature, not God. Ma'na is used by Mu'āmmar to represent the principle of individuation of one substance from another. Horovitz identifies ma'ānī with Plato's ideas, while Horton thinks they originate in the Indian system of categories. Watt identifies ma'ānī with Aristotelian etsid and Plato's ideas, as a real determination of a substance. Wollson relates it to Aristotle's concept of nature as the cause of motion and rest, a claim hotly contested by Frank. The latter describes it as an intrinsic causal determinant, a Stoic notion which certainly seems to be present in Mu'āmmar's distinction between primary and secondary causal determinants. Frank criticises the accounts of Mu'āmmar's use of ma'na provided by al-Ḥāzīlī and al-Shahrastānī and insists that ma'ānī in the original system inheres in the material substrate of atoms, not with the accidents (references in Frank). Daiber, in the fullest account of ma'ānī in Mu'āmmar's system yet to appear, on the contrary stresses their relational properties as opposed to their property of inherence in substance.

In poetry. Marked out to serve as a reflection on the language and to take its place in a cultural synthesis, poetry, after the preaching of Islam, assumed its role under the surveillance of academic phraseology. Scholars began to derive arguments from it to support their theories. Thus called upon by morpho-phonology, syntax, lexicography and even morphology, poetry served as an instrument and reduced to being just a speech practice meant for providing arguments for the basic disciplines of language and thought. Hence one should not be surprised at the lack, until the 4th/10th century, of a true theory of meaning visualised as starting from poetical experience. Until then the word ma'na had only two meanings:

(1) The meaning of a word or proposition in a certain given verse. This meaning limits the reading to a purely contextual explanation. The Kitāb Ma'ānī al-ghīr of Abū ʿUṯmān Saʿīd al-ʿUṯmānī, transmitted by Ibn Durayd, gives an example of these courses and monographs devoted to verses considered difficult. Lexically, attention is concentrated on terms which have become rare in usage (gharib) or culturally marginal (waqūfā), but also on those syntactic expressions which have the expressions ambiguous. Numerous works devoted to poetry are subsumed under this pragmatic aim and the elucidation of meaning.

(2) The meaning of a trope. The procedure here is similar, that of a clarification of the meaning, but the specific nature of the figurative expressions opens up perspectives which were later to become a semantics of poetry.
In this way, a fragmentary poetical text, reduced to citations, finds a place in lexicography, syntax and rhetoric. The school exercise of explaining it corresponds to a brand of criticism. The latter, born out of philology, requires the fitting of the various tropes of the maṣnā‘a or ḍharaḍ, with the supposition that what is said corresponds exactly to what it was intended to say. Every displacement between the intention and the statement betrays the poet’s inability to express what is correct with complete exactitude and shows up an inadequacy in the tools of the language. The maṣnā‘a is a target which may be missed in two ways: either by not respecting the established correlations between the word and its referent, or between the syntactic expression and the logical distribution of its meanings; or else by disturbing the rules of construction of such figurative expressions as comparison, metaphor, metonymy, etc. The divergence between what is said and what it was intended to say (bū‘ad) is the measure of the ambiguity in the meaning (ḍharaḍ). Criticism of meaning remains, within this framework, a criterion of effectiveness.

This enterprise ends up by updating the cultural codes prevailing in the language and makes an important contribution to the study of an archaeology of meaning. But one must note carefully that the works devoted to classification of meanings and tropes (Ibn Kutayba, al-Mubarrad, Tha‘lab, Ibn al-Mu‘taṣmez in the 3rd/9th century) do not have poetry in view in the first place, or else they do not make the tropes analysed there a specific phenomenon of poetic writing. Moreover, even the terms connected with a century, it is quite wrong to consider the marsū‘a as an analysis of thematic forms, even with an author writing. Till the end of the 3rd/9th century, this is quite wrong to consider the ḍharaḍ as an analysis of thematic forms, even with an author writing. Ibn Kutayba, who devotes a chapter of his Kitāb Maṣnā‘a l-ṣinawi to marāṣih.

It is Kudāmā b. Dījāfar [q. v.] in his Nakhd al-ṣīr who puts forward a general theory on the nature of poetry. This theory aims at defining an aesthetic, hence at regulating taste (gazāk), by setting out the rules of a science of what is good in poetry. Since the latter is an art (sinā‘a), its actualisation can be placed on a scale of values which it is possible to distil by reference to a set of established rules. Kudāmā brings forward these canons of the connections existing between the constituent elements of poetic writing (laṣf, maṣnā‘a, usam and ḍhīyya). The maṣnā‘a here does not mean significant, since the latter is a fact of language, but the register of expression. Thus there are six maṣnā‘a in poetry: maṭāb, ḩīda, marāṣih, tashbih, waṣf and naṣīb. Four of these names denote a semantic field relatively clearly delimited. Kudāmā is here remaining within the track traced by his forerunners. He is an innovator in that he included tashbih in this list; he considers it as a general way of proceeding for the production of poetic statements, and all his attention is concentrated on the figures of thought. Waṣf brings in the general problem of the relationship of the statement to the object described. We can discern here a trace, small but clear, of the Greek theory of meaning. The distinction of tashbih and waṣf is thus here set aside, for Kudāmā himself clearly, on this occasion, distances himself from all moralistic purposes.

Maṣnā‘a is definitively that particular form (iṣra) which poetry sketches out in a general sense. What is good may be measured by the amount of the conforming of the statement produced to an ideal statement (gazāk). The progress of poetry is contained in this movement which leads towards the perfect forms.

In fact, reflection about meaning in poetry eluded the udābā, who remained fixed on the need of philological and lexical explanations, and had no theoretical system which could enable them to go further ahead. Work on the maṣnā‘a and tashbih was to remain as a subject of thought for the analysts, especially for Ibn Sinā‘, ‘Abd al-Kādir al-Djurdjani, Ibn Rūghd and Hāzim al-Kartadjanni. Our point of departure is a re-interpretation of the Aristotelian mimēsis, which al-Kartadjanni in the end separates completely from speculative discourse. Tādhyīl denotes “the imaginative representation of the object which mimetic discourse (i.e. poetry) fixes in the speaker’s imagination. The meaning is thus contained in a relationship of the object with its aesthetic representation as the producer of an effect”. In this way, a fresh posing of the problem of meaning is formulated, and “the specificity and autonomy of poetry is circumscribed”. The poet, as the creator of images, thus throws of the task of being truthful to life and becomes consequently free to project on to the object chosen all the features which his imagination pictures for him. The theory of the poetic uslāb set forth by Ibn Kūlādūn in his Mūka‘adda is actually a theory of the genuine poetic image. The uslāb is the abstract form of the meaning which becomes fixed in the poet’s imagination. The latter realises it in statements made up of a thing signified (maṣnā‘a) contained within a framework of the phrase (tarkīb). The noncontour put forward by Ibn Kūlādūn stems from this: kalām/fann (poetry, in contrast to prose) maṭāb (madh, ṣīb, naṣīb) asālīb/aghrād or maṣnā‘a and tarkīb. Ibn Kūlādūn in this way completes his predecessors’ analysis by studying the mechanism of production of maṣnā‘a. Bibliography: Texts: Since the texts utilised are well-known and amply cited in the studies written so far, it is enough to say that the logicians’ developments of the topic of poetic theory are given in ‘Abd al-Rahmān Badawi’s Al-Aristīlīlī, fann al-ṣīr, Cairo 1954, with a better ed. of Ibn Rūghd’s commentary and a 1st ed. of al-Fārābī’s commentary on Aristotle’s Poetics has been tr. with an English commentary by I. M. Daiyat, Alexandria’s commentary on the Poetics of Aristotle, a critical study with an annotated translation of the text, Leiden 1974. Studies: J. E. Benchekih, Poétique arabe, Paris 1975; Ḍiʿā, A. ‘Usfīr, Maḥām al-ṣīr, Cairo 1978; K. Abu Deeb, Al-Furājān’s theory of poetic imagery, Warminster 1979; Benchekih, Min al-kawāṣil al-lisānīyya ila ʿl-ṣīr al-biṣṣayn, Ibn Kūlādūn wa-maḥābiyya al-ṣīr, in Amāl nadrat Ibn Kūlādūn, Casablanca 1981, 47 ff.; ‘A. al-Musāffī, al-Tāfīrī al-lisānī fi ‘l-hadār al-arbā‘iyara, Tripoli and Tunis 1981; H. Sammūd, al-Tāfīr al-haḥīf ‘ind al-ṣīr, ussuwu wa-ta-tawwururu ila ʿl-karn al-sādīs, Tunis 1981; H. Foda, Al formule due sens, essai sur al-Nuṣṭa fi ‘l-gaz al-Qur‘ān d’al-Rūmnā, in Analyses-Théories (1982), no. 1, 45-70; idem, La rhétorique au cœur des enjeux art. Littérature arabe, in Encyclopédia Universelle.
MANAF, name of a deity of ancient Arabia. This IVth form masdar from the root w-a-r is connected with the Qatabanite nafs "the exalted", an epithet describing Adhar-Venus at its zenith, as opposed to ʾshraa "the eastern" and ʾshraa "the western". From the same root is derived tanaf "that which climbs high in the firmament", an epithet of the sun, as opposed to ṣḥrīya "that which rises", and ṣādān "that which sets" (cf. A. Jamme, Le Panthéon sud-arabe prèslamique d'après les sources épigraphiques, in Le Muséon, 1x [1947], 88 and n. 225, 102, 106; on the meaning of this root and the vocabulary which is derived from it, cf. TA, s.v.). "Manaf was one of the greatest deities of Mecca"", states al-Tabari (i, 1092). Such a statement is nevertheless surprising, bearing in mind how little information we have on the subject. Only Ibn al-Kalbi (K. al-Azmām, ed. and Fr. tr. W. Atallah, Paris 1969, 26) devotes a few lines to it, repeated by al-Ṭabarī (i, 1091-2) and Yākūt (iv, 651); however, going by the inscriptions, the name was known in Thamudic (A. van den Branden, Les inscriptions thamoudeennes, 48 [Huber, 12], 225 [Huber, 696]), in Ṣafaitic and in Ḥiyanitic (G. Ryckmans, Les noms propres sud-sémitiques, i, Louvain 1934, 18; idem, Les religions arabes prèslamiques, Louvain 1953, 17), and altars were dedicated to him in the Ḥawrān (cf. P. Mouterde, Inscriptions grecques conservées à l'Institut français de Damas, no. 33, in Syria, vii [1925], 246-52 and at Volubilis in Morocco (cf. L. Robert, in Revue des études grecques [1936], 3-8).

Probably of South Arabian origin, the cult of this deity was widespread among the Ḥurayqīyētes, Ḥudhayl and Tamim, as is shown by the theophoric names composed with his name (cf. Ibn al-Kalbi, Anām, loc. cit.; Ibn Durayd, Isḥāqī, 1x, 16, 66; TA, iii, 470, 1, 7 f. to al-nīr). One of the most famous is that of ʿAbd Manaf, one of the four sons of Kuṣayy, reformer of the cult in Mecca. His mother had promised him to the god, so as to protect him from the evil eye, for he was so handsome that he was surnamed al-kamar "the moon" (al-Ṭabarī, loc. cit.). Ibn al-Kalbi, reproduced by Yākūt, notes a practice common to all the idols, mentioned by G. Ryckmans (Les religions arabes prèslamiques, 17) as being peculiar to Manaf; menstruating women did not touch them as a token of blessing and kept at a distance from them. Two verses, one by Bāḥṣ b. Kays, relating to Manaf, the other ʿAbī Ṣaḥīḥ, relating to Isāf, allude to this (Ibn al-Kalbi and Yākūt, locs citatis; Yākūt, i, 235).


MANAKIB (A.), plural substantive (sing manakha) featuring in the titles of a quite considerable number of biographical works of a laudatory nature, which have eventually become a part of hagiographical literature in Arabic, in Persian and in Turkish.

To define this term, the lexicographers make it a synonym of akhlāq, taken in the sense of "natural dispositions (good or bad), innate qualities, character", and associate it with nākība, explained by nafs "soul", ḫikalā or ṣabba, likewise signifying "trait of character, disposition", but also with fākhā al-nāṣ, "perspicacity", in such a way that the connection with the radical n-k-h, which is particularly expressive and implies especially the concrete sense of "perforate, pierce (a wall, for example)"; thus, in an abstract sense, "succeed in penetrating a secret", becomes perfectly clear. Perhaps it should be approached as is suggested by Ibn Manẓūr (LA, sub radīc e n-k-h, via nāṣ = "chief", thus named because he is privy to "the secrets of his fellow-travellers (dakhālit anw ar al-taʾamm) and to their manakīb, which is the means of knowing their affairs"; in short, manakīb would signify almost simultaneously both "traits of character" and "acts and deeds", and its use to introduce a biography centred not only on the actions, but also on the moral qualities of an individual, would be entirely legitimate. Finally, also worth consideration is an alternative meaning of the verb, which is to follow a narrow path", and a subtle connection may be observed between two senses of the singular manakha: on the one hand, "narrow street between two houses", or "difficult path on the mountain" (cf. Yākūt s.v. al-Manakīb; Ṣaṭa, ii, 468) and on the other hand, "nocturnal action", in contrast to maṭlāba "villainy, subject of shame" (see maṣḥāli, as is supported by the evidence of numerous titles, particularly that on the Kāšīb al-Manakīb wa t-maṭlābīh by Hibat Allāh Ibn ʿAbd al-Wāḥīd (Brockelmann, S II, 908), where the two antithetical terms possess the added advantage of mutual rhyme. If the last explanation suggested is correct, one is entitled to consider that a semantic evolution has occurred comparable to that of sita [q.v.].

However, although this last term may be accompanied by a depreciative epithet (e.g. sayyīr), manakīb, sometimes made more precise, sometimes not, by a qualitative (djamāl, karīm, etc.), is always taken in a good sense; the term may be rendered approximately by "qualities, virtues, talents, praiseworthy actions", and introduces a laudatory biography in which the virtues, merits and remarkable deeds of the individual concerned are given prominence. It will be observed that, immediately following the development of mysticism and the cult of saints, it is the marvellous aspects of the life, the miracles or at least the prodigies (karāmāt [q.v.]) of a Sūfī or of a saint believed to have been endowed with miraculous powers, which are the subjects preferred, and manakīb ultimately acquires the sense of "miracles" or "prodigies". It is perhaps a reminiscence of this last sense that is used to form an abstract applied in the sense of "mysterium" in Tāriqah or ṣaḥāḥīyāt al-ʿaskarīyāt, Beirut 1975.

Such is, schematically outlined, the apparent evolution of this concept, although it is not easy, in reality, to follow it with precision. In fact, the most ancient texts bearing the title of manakīb have in general hardly survived at all, and their existence is only known to us thanks to the biographers and bibliographers of the Middle Ages; on the other hand, that which could be called "the manakīb genre" is hard to isolate, since it is practically impossible, on account of constant interference, to establish a neat classification according to the etiquettes affixed by authors to the account of the life and enumeration of the virtues of the individual or the group chosen. The nomenclature in fact comprises a full gamut of titles which must be examined.

—taḥkīm, i.e. quite neutral, implies no particular quality and introduces any biography; it may be said, however, that this term features in titles where another would be expected, for example Tariqah Ahmad b. Ḥanbal or Tariqah al-Ṣafī bi ʿAbd al-Dhahabī (see ʿAbd al-Munadījīd, Muṣālim al-muʿāwīfi bīl-dīnākṣīyīn, Beirut 1398/1978, 445), while the founders of judicial schools are most often entitled to manakīb (see below).

—taʿrīf, likewise neutral, but already used by ʿĪyād
(see below) for the Prophet, appears in the title of lives of saints, possibly for reasons of discretion, in a period where manakib seems to be confined to the hagiographical sphere. For example, 'Abd al-Salâm al-Kâdiri (d. 1110/1698) devoted al-Muṣâba al-amâd fî l-tâsrîf bi-Sayyidna Ibn 'Abd Allâh Ibn Ma'n al-Andalusi (see E. Lévi-Provençal, Les historiers des Chorfa, Paris 1922, 278), while the monograph on the same saint by Muhammad al-Mahdî al-Fâsi (d. 1109/1698) [see al-Fâsi in Suppl.] is entitled 'Arjî 'Alâsîr al-munna bi-manakib Sayyidna (Stûl) Muhammad b. 'Abd Allâh mubârî li-sunnâta (Chorfa, 275) in Leiden, see P. Sj. van Koningsveld, Timar Arabic manuscripts—volumes of historical contents acquired by the Leiden Univ. Libr. after 1957, in E. van Donzel (ed.), Studies on Islam, Amsterdam—London 1974, 95. Similarly, Muhammad al-Masânâwi al-Dîlî (d. 1136/1724 [see al-Dîlî in Suppl.]), is the author of al-Taâ'sir fî l-shaykh 'Abî 'l-Abbâs al-Yamani (Chorfa, 302), 'Abd al-Mâqîd al-Zâbâdi (d. 1163/1750) [see Chorfa, 314], wrote the Hîfâd fîl mu'amâd bî l-tâsrîf fî l-shaykh Ibn Miṣâbî (d. 730/1290), and al-Dâ'î (12th/18th century), al-Raud al-zâhir fî l-tâsrîf fî l-shaykh Ibn Husayn wa-aqtabî fîl-akbarî, on the saint of Tamgrût named al-Kâbab (d. 1045/1635-6) [see Tawfîq, ed. Istanbul XXiv [1930], 1-15] on the pious men and women of early Islam; al-Diyâ' al-Ma'âmî (d. 645/1249-5) [see al-Diyâ' al-Makdisî (d. 600/1203); see Munadjdjid, 46, 442] eulogised the manakib of Dâ'far b. 'Abî Tâlib (ed. M.H. al-Yasin, all-Dhâbiyyâ) in the 7th/13th century, the afore-mentioned Muḥbîb al-Dîn al-Tâbarî, has, like al-Ghafîkî, celebrated the 'ten assured of Paradise' in al-Riyâd al-na'dîr fî manakib al-sa'dîr (ed. Cairo 1372/1953); al-Dhâhibî is himself credited with al-Thîyân fî manakib 'Ummân (Munadjdjid, 445) and Ibn 'Abd al-Hâdî (d. 909/1503); see Munadjdjid, 274, 276) even wrote a Ma'âd al-ilâhih fî manakib Sa'd b. Abî Waqâs (ms. Zâhiriyat 3248). If, for 'All b. Tâlib and his descendants, the use of manakib is fully justified in the works of those authors who particularly revere their memory (see below), the same cannot to a certain extent be said of 'Umar b. 'Abî A'azzâ, thus eulogised by Ibn al-Dhâwî, it is hard to say why the last-named (Kâôfî, iv, col. 560; Brockelmann, S I, 915-17) and, for example, al-Barzanjî (Brockelmann S II, 934) gave the title Manakib to their biographies of Abû Bakr and of 'Umar b. Al-Khâtâb. It is true that it is impossible to find the explanation in the variation which manifests itself in the Qur'ân al-sawâ'id min al-qâ'idât al-su'dîl [of Ibn al-Athîr] wa-Magâhî al-sawâ'id [of al-Hâshîmî], Medina 1381/1961, in which hadâlah concerning the Companions as a group are given under the title of Jâbîl (ii, 490-500), whilst those relating to the same Companions considered individually are given under that of manakib (ii, 500-81).

—mâjkhîr and mafaddîl, "exploits, objects of pride", normally feature in the titles of collections in tradition of tribes, peoples or groups and are the reverse of makhfîkîh; therefore, al-mâjkhîr, as is sometimes makhâsin, in those of monographs of individuals who have played an eminent political, politico-religious or military role. An example which may be mentioned, from Morocco, is a Raudat al-tâsrîf fî mafaddîl Moulâàna Imâ'm b. al-Shârî'î by an Idrînî (d. 1136 or 1157/1743-5 [q.v.]) which concerns a sultan (Chorfa, 275): al-Munâbâl l-mâjkhîr 'alâ mafaddîl al-Mansûr (ms. in Leiden, see von Kellinghausen, 94;
Brockelmann, S II, 679) by Ibn al-Kadl (d. 1065/1616 [q.v.]), where ma^dthir is sometimes replaced by ma^dthine, is a panegyric of the sultan al-Man^ur al-Dhahabi; on the other hand, the Rawdat al-mahdsin of al-Hasan al-Basri by Ibn al-Djawzi (d. 660/1262; see Munadjidid, 97) shows less discretion, since he entitled his work Mandkib al-kutub, the title of which no further proof is needed of the monopoly over the use of mandkib, the fact remains that a degree of fluctuation in the choice of terms demands constant vigilance.

While the Manakib of al-Bagi b. Abi Tlilb by Ahmad b. Hanbal (d. 241/855 [q.v.]) which Hadjdji Khalifa (ii, col. 1843-4) mentions, saying that later authors have to a large extent exploited this biography, and perhaps also that by al-Kudf (d. 300/931; Brockelmann, S I, 209), are probably no more than collections of traditions relating the virtues of the Prophet’s son-in-law, this probably does not apply to the Mandkib All b. Abi Tlilb by al-Kh^z^r^z^Azim (d. 568/1172; Brockelmann, S I, 623; there is said to be a ms. of it at Nadaf (al-Samawi library), which further possesses others; see RIMA, iv, 237, to the Manakib Al Abi Talib by al-^Abd al-^Aziz, and the most ap-
Dynasties, families, distinguished individuals, also have their compilations of manakib which are apparently nothing more than glorious deeds or achievements. Thus the following, which were gathered together those of the Banu 'l-A'bbās (Kazîf, ii, col. 1841) and al-Sūlī (d. 335/946-7 [q.v.]), those of Ibn al-Furat (d. 312/924 [q.v.]), as is noted by Ḥājjī Ḵalīfa (iv, col. 559), while Ibn al-Samāṭ (d. 674/1275-6 wrote a Kitāb Manakib al-ḵalIFA [Ḵazīf, ii, col. 1841) and Sadr al-Dīn al-Baṣrī (7th/13th century) dedicated to Baybars (d. 676/1277 [q.v.]) al-Manakib al-Suhayliyya wa l-maṣḥūra al-mustansiriyya (Broekelmann, i, 457), where the two terms used in parallel are evidently regarded by the author as synonymous. This Mamūk sultan was himself the subject of a biography by Šaḥīf b. ᴨ. Anas (d. 730/1330), Ḥusn al-manakib al-ṣirriyya al-munṭazaa aʿm al-sīrāt al-ṣāḥīyya, ed. al-Ḵhwāyjī, Riyād 1396/1976. The Manakib Bani Ḵālid wa-maṣḥūra Bani Ḵumayma (Ḵazīf, i, 377) and the Kitāb Manakib al-ḵitām fī manakib al-umman by a somewhat presumptuous author known as Shumaym al-Ḩilī (d. 602/1204; see Ḥaddījī, col. 1841) and Sadr al-Dīn al-Basn (7th/13th century) al-Haddīq al-WARDIYYA Fī Mandakib ( yayın tardīm) al-aʿīma al-Zaydiyya by the already-men- tioned Haydarābād (d. 288/900) for Malik b. Anas (see al-Makkarī, Ḵafīfat-awliyāʾ by Abū Nuʿaym [ed. Haydarābād 1307). This Ḵafīfat-awliyāʾ, xiii, 72) testify once more to the use of manakib as an antonym of maṣḥīb and as a synonym, here too, of faddīl or of maṭḥīr/mafākhir. These latter terms could without inconvenience be substituted for manakib in the titles of those works written in praise of the ḉābāsīd which have just been mentioned, and of the following, which contain biographies of the political figures: al-Kawakib al-durriyya fī l-mandakib al-Badrīyya, a maqāma (q.v.) written in 791/1389 by al-Ẓamakhshan (d. 791/1389 by al-Durr al-thānnī mandakib Nur al-Dīn (wa-dhikr tardīm) al-aʿīma al-Zaydiyya by the already-men- tioned Haydarābād (d. 288/900) for Malik b. Anas (see al-Makkarī, Ḵafīfat-awliyāʾ by Abū Nuʿaym [ed. Haydarābād 1307). This Ḵafīfat-awliyāʾ, xiii, 72) testify once more to the use of manakib as an antonym of maṣḥīb and as a synonym, here too, of faddīl or of maṭḥīr/mafākhir. These latter terms could without inconvenience be substituted for manakib in the titles of those works written in praise of the ḉābāsīd which have just been mentioned, and of the following, which contain biographies of the political figures: al-Kawakib al-durriyya fī l-mandakib al-Badrīyya, a maqāma (q.v.) written in 791/1389 by al-Ẓamakhshan (d. 791/1389 by al-Durr al-thānnī mandakib Nur al-Dīn (wa-dhikr tardīm) al-aʿīma al-Zaydiyya by the already-men- tioned Haydarābād (d. 288/900) for Malik b. Anas (see al-Makkarī, Ḵafīfat-awliyāʾ by Abū Nuʿaym [ed. Haydarābād 1307). This Ḵafīfat-awliyāʾ, xiii, 72) testify once more to the use of manakib as an antonym of maṣḥīb and as a synonym, here too, of faddīl or of maṭḥīr/mafākhir. These latter terms could without inconvenience be substituted for manakib in the titles of those works written in praise of the ḉābāsīd which have just been mentioned, and of the following, which contain biographies of the political figures: al-Kawakib al-durriyya fī l-mandakib al-Badrīyya, a maqāma (q.v.) written in 791/1389 by al-Ẓamakhshan (d. 791/1389 by al-Durr al-thānnī mandakib Nur al-Dīn (wa-dhikr tardīm) al-aʿīma al-Zaydiyya by the already-men- tioned Haydarābād (d. 288/900) for Malik b. Anas (see al-Makkarī, Ḵafīfat-awliyāʾ by Abū Nuʿaym [ed. Haydarābād 1307). This Ḵafīfat-awliyāʾ, xiii, 72) testify once more to the use of manakib as an antonym of maṣḥīb and as a synonym, here too, of faddīl or of maṭḥīr/mafākhir. These latter terms could without inconvenience be substituted for manakib in the titles of those works written in praise of the ḉābāsīd which have just been mentioned, and of the following, which contain biographies of the political figures: al-Kawakib al-durriyya fī l-mandakib al-Badrīyya, a maqāma (q.v.) written in 791/1389 by al-Ẓamakhshan (d. 791/1389 by al-Durr al-thānnī mandakib Nur al-Dīn (wa-dhikr tardīm) al-aʿīma al-Zaydiyya by the already-men- tioned Haydarābād (d. 288/900) for Malik b. Anas (see al-Makkarī, Ḵafīfat-awliyāʾ by Abū Nuʿaym [ed. Haydarābād 1307). This Ḵafīfat-awliyāʾ, xiii, 72) testify once more to the use of manakib as an antonym of maṣḥīb and as a synonym, here too, of faddīl or of maṭḥīr/mafākhir. These latter terms could without inconvenience be substituted for manakib in the titles of those works written in praise of the ḉābāsīd which have just been mentioned, and of the following, which contain biographies of the political figures: al-Kawakib al-durriyya fī l-mandakib al-Badrīyya, a maqāma (q.v.) written in 791/1389 by al-Ẓamakhshan (d. 791/1389 by al-Durr al-thānnī mandakib Nur al-Dīn (wa-dhikr tardīm) al-aʿīma al-Zaydiyya by the already-men- mentioned Haydarābād (d. 288/900) for Malik b. Anas (see al-Makkarī, Ḵafīfat-awliyāʾ by Abū Nuʿaym [ed. Haydarābād 1307). This Ḵafīfat-awliyāʾ, xiii, 72) testify once more to the use of manakib as an antonym of maṣḥīb and as a synonym, here too, of faddīl or of maṭḥīr/mafākhir. These latter terms could without inconvenience be substituted for manakib in the titles of those works written in praise of the ḉābāsīd which have just been mentioned, and of the following, which contain biographies of the political figures: al-Kawakib al-durriyya fī l-mandakib al-Badrīyya, a maqāma (q.v.) written in 791/1389 by al-Ẓamakhshan (d. 791/1389 by al-Durr al-thānnī mandakib Nur al-Dīn (wa-dhikr tardīm) al-aʿīma al-Zaydiyya by the already-men-
Among the Hanbalis, Ibn Taymiyya (d. 728/1328) was not slow to benefit from a favourable treatment, as three of his contemporaries dedicated compilations of manakib to him: Ibn 'Abd al-Ha'if (d. 724/1324), see Munajjedid, 157), al-'Azm al-Sib'al al-'Aliyya fi manakib shahid al-Islam Ibn Taymiyya (ed. Cairo 1556), Ibn Kudama al-Makdisi (d. 745/1344), see Brockelmann, S, II, 119 and al-Bazzar (d. 749/1349), al-Azam al-sib'al al-'Aliyya fi manakib shahid al-Islam Ibn Taymiyya, ed. Munajjedid, Beirut 1396/1976.

The Ma'alimik which prevails in North Africa owes much to one of its interpreters, Sa'dun (d. 240/854 [q.v.]), founder of a local line of memory, who dedicates a compilation of manakib, after Abu I-U4rab gave the title fasahib to his biography and to that of Ma'llik, while he had written a Kitab Manakib Bani Tamin. Among the eminent representatives of Ma'alimitik in Fesrkiyya, al-Kabiisi (d. 403/1012 [q.v.]) was the object of manakib (ed. H.R. Idris, Algiers 1959) on the part of Abu 'Abd Allah Muhammad al-Ma'llik (d. 438/1046), a similar honour was awarded to his disciple Abu Bakr Al-Mas'ud b. 'Abd al-Rahman (d. 432 or 435/1040;—see Idris, Deux maistres de l'ecole kairouanaise, in AIEO Alger, xiii [1955], 30-41) by a pupil of the latter, Ibn Sa'dun (d. 485 or 486/1092-3;—see Idris, ibid., 35-6). It is appropriate in this context to stress the importance of biographical works relating to this Ma'llik school which was so active in the Magrib, especially al-Fashhii fi manakib fahsh al-Kayrawani by 'Ali al-Tadjudi (d. 422/1030;—see Idris, Deux juristes kairouanais, in AIEO Alger, xii [1954], 153). The Tarif al-Madaris wa-ta'rikh al-mas'ilik al-'Aliyya fi-ma'rifat al-Ma'llik (ed. A. Bakir, Beirut 1967) by al-Kitab 'Iyad (d. 544/1149 [q.v.]), which begins with a lengthy biography of Ma'llik and in which the articles on the leading fahshi contain a paragraph entitled fahshah ( = manakib), and the Ma'allamim al-mutan'in al-ma'rifat af'al al-Kayrawani by Ibn Najidi (d. 839/1435 [q.v. in Suppl.]), who took up (see ed. Tunis, iii, 262, 263) the Ma'allamim al-mutan'in al-ma'rifat al-mahshurin min 'ulama' al-Kayrawan in of al-Dabbagh (d. 699/1300 [q.v. in Suppl.]), already continued by Ibrahimi al-Awwani (d. 720/1320), and is also furnished with Kayrawani manakib such as those of Sidi Abu Yusiif al-Dahmani or of Abu 'Ali al-Kadidi. R. Brunschvig (Hafsidai, ii, 392), who quotes these last-named authors, reckons that the biographies of the Ma'allamim "are closely linked to the manakib genre", meaning that they tend towards hagiography.

Hagiography

This second tendency appears all the less astonishing as certain of these Kayrawani jurists were drawn, from the beginning of the 4th/10th century, into the ascetic movement which held sway in Fesrkiyya and died more or less in an odour of sanctity or as "martyrs" in the ranks of the insurgents led by Abu Yazid (d. 336/947 [q.v.]): it is thus in this period that the manakib genre begins in the Magrib to take on a gradually more marked hagiographical tone. Featuring prominently among these persons is al-Rabi b. al-Ka'itani (d. 334/946) who, having renounced his activities as a fuqahii, withdrew from the world and died in an odour of sanctity or as "martyrs" in the ranks of the insurgents led by Abu Yazid (d. 336/947 [q.v.])—it is thus in this period that the manakib genre begins in the Magrib to take on a gradually more marked hagiographical tone. Featuring prominently among these persons is al-Rabi b. al-Ka'itani (d. 334/946) who, having renounced his activities as a fuqahii, withdrew from the world and died in an odour of sanctity or as "martyrs" in the ranks of the insurgents led by Abu Yazid (d. 336/947 [q.v.])—it is thus in this period that the manakib genre begins in the Magrib to take on a gradually more marked hagiographical tone. Featuring prominently among these persons is al-Rabi b. al-Ka'itani (d. 334/946) who, having renounced his activities as a fuqahii, withdrew from the world and died in an odour of sanctity or as "martyrs" in the ranks of the insurgents led by Abu Yazid (d. 336/947 [q.v.])—it is thus in this period that the manakib genre begins in the Magrib to take on a gradually more marked hagiographical tone. Featuring prominently among these persons is al-Rabi b. al-Ka'itani (d. 334/946) who, having renounced his activities as a fuqahii, withdrew from the world and died in an odour of sanctity or as "martyrs" in the ranks of the insurgents led by Abu Yazid (d. 336/947 [q.v.])—it is thus in this period that the manakib genre begins in the Magrib to take on a gradually more marked hagiographical tone. Featuring prominently among these persons is al-Rabi b. al-Ka'itani (d. 334/946) who, having renounced his activities as a fuqahii, withdrew from the world and died in an odour of sanctity or as "martyrs" in the ranks of the insurgents led by Abu Yazid (d. 336/947 [q.v.])—it is thus in this period that the manakib genre begins in the Magrib to take on a gradually more marked hagiographical tone.
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al-Djabanyam (d. 369/979) and the patron saint of
Tunis, Muhriz b. Khalaf (Sidl Mahrez, d. 413/1022
[q. v . ] ) , have been the object, through the offices of, respectively, al-Labldl (d. 440/1048) and al-FarisI (d.
ca. 440-50/1048-58), of hagiographies which have
been published and translated by H.R. Idris (Mandqib
d'Abu Ishdq al-Jabanydni par Abu l-Qasim al-Labidi et
Mandqib de Muhriz b. fialaf par Abu Tdhir al-Fdrisi,
Tunis 1959, 111-20; one can also find there a short expose on the genre studied in the present article and a
description of several mss. containing various collections of mandkib, as well as the text and the translation
of those concerning (161-2, 329-30) Ibn al-Nafis (d.
479/1086) and (163-7, 331-3) Abu Zayd al-Manatikl;
see also Yusuf al-Hanashl, Kutub al-mandkib wamazdhir min al-haydt al-idjtimd^iyya bi-Ifnkiyafi 'l-karn alrdbic li ' l-hidjral al-^dshir milddi, in al-Fikr, xxvii/6
[1982], 111-20).
From that time onward, the development of
hagiolatry, then of religious orders, favoured in the
Muslim world as a whole the evolution and the rich
proliferation of a specialised mandkib genre, and there
is scarcely a single famous ascetic, venerated saint,
founder of a tarika [q. v. ] or eminent Sufi who did not
earn his own monograph or at very least an article in
general works, the titles of which do not necessarily
contain the word mandkib; this is the case, as has been
observed, of the Hilyat al-awliya? by Abu Nu c aym or
of the Indian and other Tadhkiras [q. v. ], or indeed, in
a later period, the Akhbdr al-akhydr (ed. DihlT
1309/1891) by cAbd al-Hakk Dihlawl (d. 1052/1642
[<?.y.]). But reference may be made to, for example,
the Mandkib al-abrdr min mahdsin al-akhydr by Ibn
Khamls 'al-Mawsill al-ShafTS
(d. 552/1157;
Brockelmann, S I, 776), the Mandkib al-abrdr fi
makdmdt al-akhydr by Muhammad b. al-Hasan alShaficl (d. 676/1277-8; Kashf, iv, col. 559), the
Mandkib al-^ibdd min sulahd^ al-bildd by al-Sayraft, of
whom HadjdjT Khalifa says (ii, col. 1843) that he took
some of his biographies from the Safwat al-safwa by
Ibn al-Djawzi, the Mandkib al-asfiyd^ (ed. Calcutta
1895) by Shu c ayb b. Djalal al-Dln Manfri (after the
8th/14th century) and, in Turkish, the Mandkibiawliyd^ of ShanfT-zade (d. 1040/1630-1; Kashf, iv,
560).
The eminent eastern saint Uways al-Karam (d.
37/657 [q.v.]), who is not lacking in biographies (see
for example Abu Nu c aym, Hilya, ii, 79-87), has,
omissions excepted, only at a late stage been the object
of a monograph, and in Turkish, by al-LamicI (d.
938/1531-2 [ q . v . ] , Mandkib-i Hadrat-i Uways al-Karam;
for mss. see G. K. Alpay, Ldmi^i Chelebi and his works,
mJNES, xxxvi [1976], 82, no. 9. The legend of AbO
Ayyub (d. 52/672) is recounted by Hadjdji cAbd Allah
in al-Athdr al-madjidiyya fi 'l-mandkib al-khdlidiyya (ed.
Istanbul 1257/1841), and Ibn al-DjawzI celebrates the
mandkib of Ma c ruf al-Karkhl (d. 200/815-16 [q.v.]),
609-80. On Dhu '1-Nun (d. 246/861 [q.v.]) we are
aware of al-Kawkab al-durri fi mandkib Phi 'l-Nun alMisri, attributed to Ibn c ArabT (d. 638/1240), but not
mentioned by O. Yahya (Histoire et classification de
I'oeuvre d'Ibn ^Arabi; a ms. of this work exists in
Leiden, see van Koningsveld, 108), while Ibn cArabI
himself has mandkib composed in his honour (Kashf, ii,
col. 1843), in particular by al-Suyutl (d. 956/1549) according to Hadjdji Khalifa (ii, col. 1835). The great
saint cAbd al-Kadir al-DijIlam (d. 561/1166 [q.v.})
naturally has his place in the hagiographical dictionaries, and it is even said that the Mir^dt al-zamdn
by Sibt Ibn al-DjawzI supplied al-Yunlnl (d.
726/1326) with the material for a collection of his

mandkib (Kashf, ii, col. 1842), which would be a further
indication of the close links that have already been observed between general biography and hagiography
when religious persons are concerned. HadjdjI
Khalifa lists numerous other monographs on the
eponymous founder of the Kadiriyya [0.z>.], notably
Asnd 'l-mafdkhirfi mandkib al-shaykh ^Abd al-Kadir by alYafFi (d. 768/1367 [q.v.]). Another founder of an
order, Abu 'l-cAbbas Ahmad b. CA1I al-Rifaci (d.
578/1183 [see AL-RIFA C I]) soon earned his mandkib
from the pen of al-Wasitl (d. 589/1194; see
Brockelmann, S I, 781, who also mentions the compilation by Dja c far al-BarzandjI, 1179/1765). For
their part, the Mawlawiyya [ q . v . ] , and in particular
their first shaykh, Djalal al-Dln RumI (d. 672/1273
[q. v. ]) and his successors, quickly inspired Aflaki
(8th/14th century [<?.y.]) to compose, in Persian, the
Mandkib al- ^drifin wa-mardtib al-kdshifin (French tr. Cl.
Huart, Les saints des derviches tourneurs, Paris 1918-22;
ed. T. Yazici, Ankara 1959); numerous other
religious persons have their mandkib written in
Turkish (see Kashf, ii, col. 1842, iv, col. 560); for instance, Ahmet Yasar Ocak presents in^, cclxvii/3-4
(1979) a Turkish mathnawi of Elwan Celebl (after
761/1360), Menakib 'ul-kudslya ft menasib 'il-unslya:
une source importantepour I'histoire religieuse de I'Anatolic au
XIIIe siecle, devoted to Baba Ilyas and his descendants. The saint so much respected in Egypt, Ahmad
al-Badawi (d. 675/1276 [q.v.]), has been honoured by
various compilations (see Brockelmann, S I, 808), but
c
Abd al-Samad Zayn al-Dln (d. 1028/1634-5), no
doubt judging mandkib insufficiently expressive, entitled his al-Djawdhir al-saniyyafi ''l-kardmdt al-Ahmadiyya
(numerous editions). Ibn Kiwam (7th/13th century)
owes to his grandson the Mandkib al-shaykh Abi Bakr Ibn
Kiwdm (mss. Zahiriyya 5398, 6951), while Ibn Tulun
(d. 953/1546 [q. v. ]) is content to entitle his biography
Tuhfat al-kirdm fi tardjamat Abi Bakr Ibn Kiwdm
(Munadjdjid, 291). Nakshband (d. 791/1389 [q.v.]),
eponymous founder of the Nakshbandiyya, speedily
acquired his mandkib through the offices of al-Sharif alDjurdjanl(d. 816/1413; Kashf, ii, col. 1841), while the
Khalwatiyya [q.v.] have been honoured by Muhammad b.- al-Makkl in al-Nafahdt al-rahmdniyya fi mandkib
ridjal al-Khalwatiyya (Istanbul 1927) and by Ibn c Azzuz
al-TunisI (Kashf, iv, col. 560). Ibn al-Bazzaz alArdabill (8th/14th century [q.v. in Suppl.] wrote a
biography of SafT '1-Dln, founder of the Safawiyya
order and eponymous ancestor of the Safawids, alMawdhib al-saniyyafi mandkib al-Safawiyya, or Safwat alsafd^ (lith. Bombay 1329/1911). The patron saint of
Aden or c Adan, Abu Bakr Ibn Aydarus (d. 914/1508
[see C AYDARUS]), found his panegyrist in the person of
his contemporary Husayn b. Siddlk al-Ahdal (d.
903/1497 [see AL-AHDAL]), author of the Mawdhib alkuddus fi mandkib Ibn ^Aydarus. Al-Dja c farI (d. after
1157/1744) wrote al-Tabib al-muddwi bi-mandkib alshaykh Ahmad al-Nahlawi on a saint who died in
1157/1744 (see Munadjdjid, 347), and mulld Nizam
al-Dln is the author of the Mandkib-i Razzdkiyya in
honour of the pir Sayyid cAbd al-Razzak [see FARANGI
MAHALL in Suppl.]. In the 13th/19th century, the
vogue for mandkib was perpetuated in the east. The
Egyptian Sufi saint Ahmad al-Sawi (d. 1241/1825) inspired a collective work, al-Nur al-waddd^ fi mandkib
wa-kardmdt cumdat al-awliyd^ Sayyidi Ahmad al-Sdwi (ed.
Cairo 1347/1928), al-Duwayhi (d. 1874 [q.v. in
Suppl.] has left behind a biography of his master
Ahmad b. Idris, partially reproduced in a compilation
of Salih b. Muhammad al-Madam, al-Muntakd al-nafis
fi mandkib Kutb dd^irat al-takdis Ahmad b. Idris, Cairo
1960, Khalifa al-Safti (d. 1296/1879) is the author of


the manakib al-shaykh ʿAbd al-Laṭif al-Kayyat (d. 1238/1822; ms. Yale 1209), and Husayn al-Dījīr dedicated the Nuzhat al-fikr ft manakib manā'īn ʿalā ḥarām al-tašāwuff (ed. A. Faure, Rabat 1958) of Ibn al-Zayyāt al-Tādli (d. 627/1229-30), founder of the tarīqa ḥisāfīyya, has found his hagiographer in the person of ʿAlī al-Dījīrāwī, author of al-Manḥal al-sāfī fi manakib al-Saṣwān al-Haṣanayn al-Hiṣāfī, Cairo 1330/1911-12.

Rich though the list of Ḥāḍīḍī Khālīfīa is, it is still incomplete, for it is highly probable that many hagiographies of a more or less popular nature, which must have circulated in Sūfī circles, have escaped this conscientious bibliographer, without counting, of course, those which appeared at a later time. Whatever the reason, he makes scant reference to the collections of manakīb composed in North Africa and particularly in Morocco, which was a breeding-ground of saints and marabouts. Just as hitherto there has been no attempt to cite all the relevant titles or to go beyond the 19th century, so we will confine ourselves to discussion of those Maghrībī works which appear to be the most characteristic.

The earliest compilations of Ḥīrīkīyan manakīb have already been mentioned. The Moroccan saint al-Sabtī (d. 601/1205 [q.v.]), whose memory has remained very much alive in the Maghribī, inspired a number of writings of them (ms. in Rabat, Algiers, Tunis, Paris etc.; see E. Lévi-Provengal, Les manuscrits arabes de Rabat, Paris 1921, no. 403; Brockelmann, S II, 1013).

ʿAbd al-Salām b. Ṭaḥfīsh (d. 625/1227-8 [q.v.]) has been honoured by al-Warrāk; Abū Saʿīd Ḥalāf al-Bāḏīj (d. 629/1230) enjoyed the same distinction, after 635/1235, through the offices of Ḥabīb al-Raywānī (see the catalogue of the mss. left by H.H. ʿAbd al-Waḥḥāb, in Hüsāyīn al-Dījīrāwī sa' tālīnīyīn, vii [1970], no. 205; Public Library of Tunis, ms. ar. no. 30). Al-Shāhīdī (d. 656/1258 [q.v.]), his disciples and even his grotto situation in the Ḩabīb al-Zalāḏījī (ms. ʿAbd al-Waḥḥāb, no. 655), have been the object of collections of manakīb which have survived (ms. ʿAbd al-Waḥḥāb nos. 45, 321, 653). In the same period (7th century), there lived in the Turks the saint ʿĀṣa al-Maḥmūbīyya [q.v.], whose manakīb have been published (Tunis 1344/1925). To a Tunisian saint of a later time, Sīdī Ben Ṭars (d. 868/1463; see R. Brunsvig, Hafsides, ii, 341-50), ʿUmar al-Raḵīḏī dedicated the Dīwān al-ḥayrūs wa-wadāy al-ṭariq br-manakīb al-shaykh Abī ʿAbd Allāh Ahmad b. Ṭars (ed. Tunis 1305); to a member al-Ṣamār (d. 981/1574 [q.v.]), of the order of the Ṭarāʾūsīyya founded by the above-named, numerous compilations have likewise been dedicated, among which that of Muḥammad b. Muḥammad al-Munṣṭirī, Tankhī ṭaqād al-azḥār ... fi manakīb Sīdī ʿAbd al-Salām al-Ṣamār, was published in Tunis in 1325/1907-8. A large number of monographs on Tunisian saints have yet to be published. Two mss. of the Great Mosque of Tunis (nos. 1097 and 3873) contain some fifteen of them, and in the catalogue of ʿAbd al-Waḥḥāb manuscripts more than half-a-dozen maḏmūna are to be found (nos. 45, 205, 321, 519, 520, 541, 655) comprising a total of some 45 texts (some of them in duplicate or triplicate); it is likely that private libraries have also preserved a certain number of them or manakīb, a genre which is, moreover, fairly monotonous, where virtues and miracles are compiled on the testimony of witnesses, living or dead, who are named. Works of panegyrist or of devotes, they should not be expected to show any critical tendency, and some of the historical information that they purport to contain is to be treated with caution. Often composed by the semi-literate who address a poorly-educated public, they are written in simple language, as close as possible to the spoken idiom .... In this sense, they constitute linguistic documents of some interest. Similarly, the insights that they supply, unpretentiously, on the topography and the 'reality' of their period are by no means to be disregarded, but above all they throw a useful light on the mentality and customs of these people, insignificant folk who congregated around the mystical shaikhs, eager to benefit from their baraka.''

In the course of the ensuing period, the cult of saints did not weaken in Tunisia, but the activity of the hagiographers seems to have declined somewhat. A. Chenoufi (Un savant tunisien du XIXe siècle, Tunis 1973, 495) notes that this literary genre "contains very few works", and, although monographs were probably still being composed, in addition to al-Fath al-munir fi taʾṣīl al-tarīqa al-shabbiyya by Muḥammad al-Maṣūfī al-Shābī (10-11th/16th-17th century), the third chapter of which contains the miracles and prophecies of the founder of the Shābīyya fraternity and of his sons, he points out and analyses only two hagiographical works: the first (149-53) is the Nūr al-arḍāsfi ft manakib Sayyīdī (Ṣūdī Abu) (sic) l-Ghayth al-Shābīshī (d. 1301/1612), written in 1032 by al-Muntasār b. Abū Līyāh al-Ḍawāsir, who put together a number of miracles (karāmah) "all of them equally impausible" (according to Ḥāḍīḍī Khālīfīa, i, col. 1835, a certain Muḥammad b. Ṭabīb al-Ḩarābūsī, d. 1020/1611, had already recorded the manakib of this saint); the second (385-6) is the Timūl al-salāhah wa l-aʿṣām li-μaṣʿūlim al-imām ft aṣūlīyī al-Kayrawānī (ms. Paris ENLOV, 452) by Ḥabīb al-Kinānī al-Kayrawānī (d. 1292/1875), which purports to be a sequel to the Maʿāṣīm al-imām by Ibn al-Nāḍīrī (see above) and contains "material borrowed from earlier manākīb.

Travel narratives of a later period [see RIHLA] are not lacking in hagiographical tendencies, but this does not apply to that of al-Sanāṣīr (d. 1318/1900 [q.v.]), who is nevertheless the author of numerous texts which A. Chennoufī (Un savant tunisien du XIVe siècle, al-Sanāṣīr, sa vie et son œuvre, Tunis 1977, 181-6) classifies under the heading "works of a hagiographical nature"; they do not bear the title manakīb, but the Tuhfat al-akhyār bi-maṣʿūlīd al-Muḥāṭār, where there is an account of "the miraculous happenings which attended the birth of the Prophet, and those which characterised his youth", and al-Maʿuṣūrd al-maʿāṣī fi dījūl al-ṭarābīn, which contains the laudatory biographies of the forty companions of al-Shāhīdī (see above) testify to the permanence of this literary genre in Tunisia.

In Morocco, hagiolatry made its appearance at approximately the same time as in Ḥīrīkīya, thus well before the springing-up, in the 9th/15th century, of the wave of mysticism which was to spread throughout North Africa and before the emergence of maraboutism as a characteristic of religious activity. In fact, the first elements of Moroccan hagiography appear as early as the 7th/13th century in the form of dictionaries such as the Tašauwūf wa ṣifā wa-nīṣāf niyāl al-tašauwūf (ed. A. Faure, Rabat 1967); of Ittihatīyīn al-Qādirīyyīn al-Maṣūfī (ed. Tunis 1327/1909-10; ms. Paris ENLOV, 452) which contains 277 biographies of san-
tons and Sūfis of the 5th-7th/11th-13th centuries, or al-Maṣṣīd al-Sharīf ... fi dhikr suūrah al-Rif (tr. G.S. Cohn, in AM, xxvi [1956]), of al-Badāris (d. after 722/1322) and of the Shadhiliyya (ms. in Leiden), a monograph, the Kitāb al-Maṣā'id fi manākīb Abī Ya'qūb (ms. in Rabat; see Chorfa, 239-40). Ibn Rasyūn al-ʿAlāmi (d. 1055/1645) is the author of the Manākīb al-Raṣūmiyyīn on his father and his paternal uncles (Ḥajjī, 520). To Ibn ʿAṣyūn al-Ṣarrār (d. 1109/1697) is attributed al-Raṣūli al-ḥāfūz fi ʿallah al-sāhibīn min ʿallah Fās (ms. in Rabat; see Ḥajjī, 712). The Saṣafat man intiṣār maṣāʾib al-ṣūrah duṣṭūrubh (lith. Fās n.d.) by al-ʾIrānī (d. 1151-1389 [q. v.]) is a catalogue of Moroccan saints, forming a sequel to the Daṣwa of Ibn ʿAskar. A Syrian emigre in Morocco, al-Ḥalabi (d. 1120/1708) is the author of al-Dur al-naṣīf wa l-nūr al-anīs fi manākīb al-ʿImām ʿĪdrīs b. ʿĪdrīs (lith. Fās, 1300, 1304; see Chorfa, 287). Abū al-Raḥmān al-Ḥāsfisi, who has already been mentioned on account of the fact that, like al-Ḥarāfī, he preferred qaṣfa to manākīb, nevertheless also wrote the Bustān al-ḍarīfīn fi manākīb al-ṣūrah Abū Muḥammad Abū al-Raḥmān (ms. in Rabat) on the saint and poet in malḥun al-Madīnī (q. v.). Also to be mentioned is the Marākit ʿUmar al-ḥaṣaṣṭān al-khaṭīb al-ṣuyūṭīyīn Muḥammad al-Raṣūli (ms. in Rabat), left by the founder of the Fāsi ʿUmar al- Ḥaṣaṣṭān (ms. in Rabat). Finally, it will be noted that Hamdūn b. al-Muṣāfīr (ms. in Leiden, see van Koningsveld, 94). Ahmad b. ʿAṣṣir al-Ḥāsfī (d. 1163/1750; see Chorfa, 313-14) is the author of a hagiographical work on his homonym, the patron saint of Fās (d. 764 or 765/1362 or 1363), the Taṣuṣat al-ṣarīf bi-ḥaṣaṣṭān Sayyīdīn (Ṣīdī) al-Ḥāsfī Abū al-Ḥāsfī Abū al-Ḥāsfī Moḥammad b. al-Muṣāfīr (ms. in Leiden, see van Koningsveld, 96). Ibn Kunfūdī al-Kusāntīnī (d. 810/1407-8 [q. v.]) uses manākīb in the sense of "prodigies" when he gives the title Taṣūṣat al-manākīb fi taḵmīl al-maṭūrīb (ms. in Rabat) to a commentary on his astronomical treatise, the Taṣūṣat al-muṣāfīr fi taḵmīl al-aṣbābīk, but curiously, he refrains from employing the term in the Us al-ṣarīf wa ʿezz al-ḥāṣarīkī, which is a biography of the patron saint of Tlemcen Abū Muḥammad (ed. M. al-Fasī and A. Faure, Rabat 1965). On account of the often-quoted ḥadīth: bi-ḏikr al-ḥāṣarīkī tanzīl al-raḥma "mention of the virtuous (s = saint) makes mercy descend," hagiographical literature developed to a considerable extent in Morocco under the ʿUṣūlīrīn dynasty, and the ḥadīth genre, even though this term is not always used, plays a significant role in the form both of hagiographical dictionaries and of monographs of saints or at least of persons whose memory is revered. To become familiar with ourselves here to reference to those which seem partic-
not always felt, even in the 19th century, necessarily to imply the accomplishment of miracles.

As may be observed through a perusal of the intentionally-abridged list which precedes, several hagiographers have compiled compilations in whose principal aim is to offer to the reader a moral portrait and information on the noble virtues and scrupulously to follow their example. Since the earliest centuries of Islam, manākib, which is thus invited to acquire their real or supposed virtues and scrupulously to follow their example. However, hagiolatry which begins to emerge at this time and subsequently expands to a considerable extent, is concerned to recount the lives of saints whose memory has not yet been effaced, while the gradual foundation of religious orders, a gradual process over the years, leads to the proliferation of ḥālīs who are to a greater or lesser extent tinged with an aura of sanctity; thus the manākib genre takes on an increasingly marked hagiographical nature, and the term which designates it, having been applied to the qualities and actions and behaviour of any human being, however little virtuous, becomes synonymous, in the public mind, with prodigies, even more with miracles performed by a saint recognised as such, or by a Ṣūfī, a marabout or indeed by a simple mortal to whom, rightly or wrongly, miraculous gifts are attributed.

Systematic research into the bibliographical catalogues, of biographical works and of general histories of Islamic literature, as well as a more detailed examination of texts bearing the title manākib, would certainly serve to bring into sharper focus the preceding outline. Just as the study of the tahākūt genre undertaken by I. Hafsi (in Arabic, xxiii/3 [1976], 227-65 and xxiv/1-2 [1977], 1-41, 150-86) has shown how a term as simple as the plural of tahākūt has undergone, in the sphere of biographical literature, an astonishing semantic evolution, so parallel researches into the manākib genre deserve to be undertaken, seeing that it involves a delicate and ultimately quite complex concept.

**Bibliography:** The principal sources have been cited in the article. What is offered here is a simple reminder of the titles of a few works to which reference has repeatedly been made: E. Lévi-Provençal, Les historiens des Chorfa, Paris 1922; R. Brunschvig, La Berbérie orientale sous les Hafsides, Paris 1940-7; A. Fu'ād Sayyid, Sources de l'histoire du Temps de l'Épopée musulmane, IFAO, Cairo 1974; P. Sj. van Koningsveld, Ten Arabic manuscript-volumes acquired by the Leiden University Library after 1957, in E. van Donzel (ed.), Studies on Islam, Amsterdam-London 1974; M. Haji, L'activité intellectuelle au Maroc à l'époque sa'dide, Rabat 1976; S. al-Munajjīd, Mu'ājam al-ma'arrāḏān al-dimaghāfīrīn, Beirut 1398/1979 (Cf. Pellat, **Al-MANĀMA**, the capital city of the amirate of Bahrain [q.v.] in the Persian Gulf. The city is located at latitude 26° 13' N and longitude 50° 35' E, on the north-eastern coast of the island of Bahrain, which was formerly known as Awāl. The shallow waters between Manāma and the neighbouring island of Muharrak [q.v.] have long been used to provide good shelter for native craft. It has been suggested that the name Manāma (Ar. 'a place of resting, sleeping') may reflect the proximity of a number of prehistoric burial mounds.

The early history of Manāma remains obscure, for reliable references are few and their topographical nomenclature is both vague and confusing. When the Portuguese seized Bahrain in the 10th/16th century, they built their major fortification on the coast at Kāl'at al-ʻAjdājī, some 4 miles west of Manāma. The Persians, who wrested control from the Portuguese in 1011/1602, held the archipelago for much of the
following turbulent period of 180 years, during which time they erected a defensive position on the current side of Manama. In 1197/1785 the Al Khalifa [q.v.] clan of the Utub tribe invaded the islands from Zubara in Katar, and after a siege of some 2 months the Persians were expelled from that fort. The Al Khalifa — who remain the ruling dynasty — did not, however, enjoy an unchallenged accession to power, and the Al Bu Sa'id [q.v.] rulers of 'Uman mounted a series of expeditions against Bahrain between 1214/1799 and 1244/1828 during which time the small town was attacked and occupied on several occasions. In the next century Manama became an important entrepôt port serving much of eastern Arabia, though its fortunes fluctuated in response to the vagaries and violence of local and regional political rivalries. Although Manama was becoming the commercial centre of the archipelago, the Al Khalifa usually resided at Muharrak, which was also the harbour used by the island's large pearling fleet. The ruling family used the fort at Manama only during the hottest months of the year, and it was not until the second decade of the 20th century that the town became the true capital of the amirate. European activities had, however, been concentrated at Manama since the end of the 19th century. In 1893 the Dutch Reformed Church of America established a mission in the town, and in 1902 that organisation built a hospital and a dispensary. A British Assistant Political Agent was appointed and took up residence in 1900; four years later the post was upgraded to a Political Agency. According to Lorimer, the population of Manama in 1905 was approximately 25,000, of whom 60% were Shi'i and 40% Sunni Muslims. There were, in addition, a small number of Hindu, Jewish and Christian residents. The development of the modern city began after the First World War. In 1920 a municipal administration was established, educational facilities at the primary school level were created, and electricity supplies were inaugurated in 1930. The discovery of oil at Diabat al-Duakhân in 1932, and the subsequent development of that resource, helped to stave off the otherwise serious economic and social consequences of the decline in pearl fishing. In 1935 the British established a naval base at Ra's al-Djufayr, some 2 miles southeast of Manama, following withdrawal from the Persian island of Handjäm. This base later became the major centre of British naval activity in the Gulf. In 1942 a causeway road was built linking Manama with Muharrak. In 1946 the British Political Residency was transferred from Bûshahr to Manama. By 1950, the population of the town had grown to over 40,000 and the following decades have seen even greater expansion and development. By 1981 the population was believed to be over 121,000, and Manama had become an important regional centre for banking, commerce and communications. Bibliography: As there are no works devoted exclusively to Manama, the reader is referred to the bibliographical sections of the entries for Bahrayn and Al-Khalifa, which list the standard sources. The following recent monographs contain some additional information. E. A. Nakleh, Bahrein: political development in a modernizing society, Lexington 1976; M.G. Rumaihi, Bahrain: social and political change since the First World War, London 1976; Fuad I. Khuri, Tribe and state in Bahrein: the transformation of social and political authority in an Arab state, Chicago 1980 and Mahdi Abdalla al-Tahir, Language and linguistic origins in Bahrein: the Baharna dialect of Arabic, London 1982.

MANAR, MANARA (A), 'lighthouse', an elevated place where a light or beacon is established; the means of marking (with fire, originally) routes for caravans or for the army in war; lampstand ('candelabrum', archaic meaning); minaret (in this sense normally in the fem., manara, whereas for 'lighthouse', in both the masc. and fem., manâr, manâra). In some modern Arabic dictionaries we also find fanar. It is by chance that this latter word resembles phare (French), faro (Italian, Spanish, which derive their origin from Pharos = the islet situated at the entrance to the port of Alexandria, on which Alexandria became the famous lighthouse; see below). Fanâr has no doubt come into Arabic via Turkish fanârî (fener, which comes from the Greek pharos, whose diminutive phanarião was used, for example in Byzantine Greek; in a parallel fashion, in mediaeval Latin fanarium = lantern, lighthouse, beacon light, French fanal (cf. von Hammer-Purgstall and I.A., s.v. Fenerîtes; but the Türk Ansiklopedisi, 1968, xvi, 230, confuses phanari and Phanos. From Turkish, the word has also passed into Persian. Classical Arabic literature describes several uses of fire among the ancient Arabs (nîrân al-'Arâb = 'fires of the Arabs'); see al-Dhâbi, Hayyâvân, iv, 461-91, v, 123, 133-4; al-Nuwayrî, Niânâ, i, 109-13; T. Fahd, Le feu chez les anciens Arabes, in Le feu dans le Proche-Orient antique, Leiden 1973, 43-61). Some of them were intended to guide caravans, convoys and individuals who were travelling, by night, indicating the route for them, or the beginning of it (irîdâl al-sârî). The roads were shown with 'landmarks' (stones, etc., with fire; then the meaning was extended to those even without fire); the historical legends give the ruler of Pre-Islamic South Arabia, Abraha, the title 'the man of the manara', for he was the first to mark out the routes, in time of war (see al-Suyûtî, al-Wasâ'î, ii, al-Adawi and 'Umar, 146). But among these clearly recorded fires, we find no mention of maritime lighting (see also Yâkût, s.v. manâra; al-Nuwayrî, Ilâmîm, iv, 3: manara of 'Adâd). The word manâra designates several objects (or buildings) which facilitated lighting; for example the candelabrum in the sense outlined above, and which supported the lamp (misîdâh; see al-Dhâbi, Buhûlî, ed. al-Hâjîrî, 19; al-Birrî, K. al-Dhânâshâr; 227: manâra in porcelain; and the iconographic evidence in a miniature of the illustrated ms. Paris BN, Ar. 5847, fol. 13b; Leningrad, Acad. of Sc., Or. S. 23, fol. 30; cf. in the Cairo Geniza, e.g. Camb. T-S, J.l, 15 and Ox. 2821 [16], fol. 56a [and see E. Ashor, in IESHO, vii, 179; idem, Histoire des prix, Paris 1969, under 'chandelier'], and even certain kinds of 'arms' (arm-rests of seats, thrones, etc. (Sadân, Mobihîr, 39, 126). The commonest word to designate the tower standing alongside (or on top of) a mosque and which is used to call the faithful to prayer, is mîz'dâhâ (q.v.), but manâra is also found. This word has produced, in the European languages, forms such as minaret and minareto (A. J. Butler, The Arab conquest of Egypt, thinks that the connection between manâra-lighthouse and manâra-minaret is much more than a pure and simple etymological connection; the lighthouse of Alexandria influenced, in his view, the creation and form of the minaret in Islamic architecture; in the new ed. of Butler-Fraser, pp. LXXIV-LXXV, other references have been added, for, in fact, there is no unanimity among researchers; cf. H. Thiersch, Pharsos, 98-201; Creswell, A short account of Muslim architecture, Beirut 1968, 14; and see massīgîyî). The research published on the pre-Islamic Arabs bears witness to the existence among some of a certain
knowledge of maritime life; however, they did not have very substantial experience. If we add that the "fires of the Arabs" do not contain anything on maritime lighting, we may assume that it is especially after the expansion of Islam that interest in this aspect was awakened. It seems that in the east of the Islamic world (Persian Gulf, Indian Ocean), the Arabs had discovered the sporadic use of fires, and only the more durable "lighthouse" of the khâshâbat [q.v.], near Başra, is mentioned in the description of Arab geographers.

Some sporadic use of fire are even confirmed in the information about the only fixed and noteworthy lighthouse, properly speaking, that of Alexandria: communication by signalling with fires on the departure of Muslims' ships towards the Alexandria lighthouse which, in its turn, gave warning of the arrival of an enemy (by lighting the fire in the direction of the town); some fires were lit on the Mediterranean coast from Alexandria as far as the regions of North Africa, so as to give notice of enemies and direct ships. It is even recorded that opposite the Palestinian coast there were exchanges of signals of this kind was made between ships and the coast (see, apart from the Bibl. below, M. Gaudet-Demombynes, La Syrie, 258-61; ribât, in EI, and especially A. Ef'ad, Coastal cities, in The Jerusalem Catahela, ii, 146-67, which summarise (following G. Marçais and others) information taken from al-Baladhuri, al-Makhdum and Ibn Majârî (according to E. Lévi-Provençal, in Hospit., v, 31 and al-Makrîzî, and cf. al-Kâkâshândî, Khîsat ch. iv of makâla 10). It was a system of lighted fire signals, rather than fixed lighting, but nothing prevented them from profiting from this use of fires for the security of maritime piloting (see al-Hamawî, in the Bibl.). These fires and their sites, near the sea, are called ni'am, ma'âfikî, makdîla and manâzîr; al-Mukdaâtî even uses the word manâzîr for a kind of "lighthouse" or beacon-light and even for a tower (minaret of a ribât?) being used as a lighthouse. Arabic geographical literature, and especially that of the maritime guides, e.g. in the 9th/15th century (Ibn Mâdiîjî and in the 10th/16th (Sulaymân al-Mahri), clearly reflects the dangers presented by reefs and other maritime obstacles and the various means used to avoid them, as if the existence of lighthouses was rare (see I. Y. Krâkòvskîî, Geografiscal'naia literature, Ar. tr., Cairo 1963-5, ii; G. R. Tibbets, Study, Leiden and London 1979, passim; A. M. ʿAtiyâ, Aṣâb al-bahr, Cairo 1981, 79-98).

The famous lighthouse of Alexandria was inherited by the Arabs from the civilisation which had preceded theirs; it had been built, at the entrance to the port, on the islet of Pharos (which is connected today to the coast by a causeway), by Potemkî Philadelphus, around 279 A.D. Since then and until the conquest of Alexandria by the Arabs (in 21/642), it had undergone some modifications and it has been concluded that its functioning and structure deteriorated successively. There is a tendency to accuse, often moreover without reason, the conquerors of the change of régime of being the cause of deterioration, and the assumption that two centuries after the conquest, the lighthouse had fallen completely into ruin (G. F. Hourani, Safarîng, 61: "The wonderful Pharos fell to ruin and no one could be found who knew to repair it") seems exaggerated; for several centuries the lighthouse was indeed used, although its functioning was not as perfect as before Islam.

It is logical to suppose that during the first years of the Islamic régime, maritime traditions persisted as before. It is to the Umayyad period that certain historian-geographers attribute its first deterioration; the legend relates that a Christian, pretending to be a Muslim, was able to convince the caliph al-Walîd (d. 87/705) to allow him to look for treasure near (and underneath) the lighthouse and that the sabotage carried out at that time caused some damage to the upper part of the tower. But the Muslims continued to light the fire on the lighthouse, and only the Arab writers (geographers, etc.) allude to the fact that, in the past, the technique used in its functioning (the lantern) was more perfect, in recounting to their readers that in earlier times it was equipped with mirrors (or a mirror); by concentrating the sun's rays, these mirrors could burn the enemy ships (the historical fact which is hidden here is, perhaps, the existence in ancient times of a reflector or another technical method; the technique consisting of adding a reflector to a lantern was not completely unknown in the Islamic world (see al-Makâkâ, Rawda, 13-14), but it was probably more difficult to repair the damage undergone by a proper lighthouse). In the 3rd/9th century, the governor Ibn Tülûn had the upper part of the lighthouse repaired, but the work was often in wood which was not strong and durable. The use of the lighthouse by the Arabs (lighting the fire on top, at night, by means of special custodians, who even had rooms intended for their lodging) continued until the 5th/11th century. In 578/1182-3 the lighthouse was only 50 cubits high; this diminution in the height of the construction was not as serious as it would appear, since the technique of the construction and to an earthquake (which was neither the first nor the last experienced by the lighthouse), so that the upper part had been destroyed. At the beginning of the 8th/14th century, it was no more than a ruin, despite the efforts made by certain sultans (for example, Baybars I (d. 676/1277) and Baybars II (d. 709/1310), some time earlier to repair it a little. Already al-Malk al-Kâmil (d. 635/1238) had built on this site a mosque, and the fort which is to be found there today (and which now houses the maritime museum of Alexandria) was constructed by the sultan Kâbi Baghdad (d. 901/1496).

As for the form of the lighthouse of Alexandria, it is often described by the mediaeval Arab authors, who strive to accentuate its splendour in the past (one of the "Seven Wonders of the World"); but it is hard to deduce what were its original dimensions, especially because the upper parts (a statue of Poseidon, on top, and the lantern) no longer existed in the Islamic period; some conclude that, during the major part of its history, after the birth of Islam, the lighthouse only reached two-thirds of its original height. Three attempts have been made to record its form and dimensions according to the description of the Muslim historians and geographers by H. Thiersch, Asîn Palacios (who also discovered a description of the 7th/13th century) and E. Lévi-Provençal (who added a source drawing on the description of the geographer al-Bakrî in the 5th/11th century). The latter is the most recent and may also be summarised. The rectangular base of 320 cubits was surmounted by a narrower, octagonal section of 80 cubits, then by another narrower, rectangular section (until the discovery of this description it was considered to be cylindrical) of 50 cubits; no more of it was in existence.

Manâr and farâq have given their names to some neighbouring quarters, e.g. in Istanbul (see Fanar- [alâk] = Fener + köy, J. von Hammer-Purgstall, Constantinopel und der Bosporus, 1822, 270, 279 and the Istanbul miniature of the 17th century, in B. Lewis, Istanbul, Norman, Oklahoma 1963, 99, on the left; see also Fenêtrès et Îles, however, the lighthouse or rather the signalling tower, Kiz Kulesi, at the en-
trance to the Bosporus—dates almost from our own times). With or without a direct connection with maritime illumination, some trading places, an important journal [see AL-MANAR, etc., are called ‘lighthouses’.

The modern age has witnessed several improvements and constructive efforts in the maritime field, including the building of lighthouses (e.g. in Morocco in 1865 [see MUHAMMAD B. ABD AL-RAHMAN], of a more organised nature, in the necessary places.


AL-MANAR, a journal of Muslim thought and doctrine which appeared in Cairo from 1898 to 1940. Its work was the counterpart of that of a printing-house, of the same name, which, besides its own publications, reissued articles previously published in the review, such as the famous modern commentary on the Kurān (Ta’ṣīr al-Manār). Without forming part of any particular school, the Manār subscribed to the reformist line of the salafīyya [q.v.]; this movement of cultural resistance towards colonial encroachment sought to restore to Islam its former power and to re-establish confidence in its traditional values, to bring with the Arabic language, while employing modern techniques. It elaborated an apologetic which is still widely known and influential today.

The Manār was the personal work of one man, Sayyid Rashīd Riḍā [q.v.], born in 1865 near Tripoli (Lebanon). At the end of 1897, the same year as the death of Djamāl al-Dīn al-Afghānī [q.v.], with whom he had dreamed of collaborating, he travelled to Cairo in order to work in partnership with the Imam Muhammad ʿAbduh [q.v.]. Resolved, from the outset, to found a journal which he entitled the Manār (“The Beacon”), he published the first issue at the end of Shawwāl 1315/March 1898. He was, over the course of the years, to include in it a number of articles by al-Afghānī, Muhammad ʿAbduh, al-Kawākibī, Djamāl al-Dīn al-Kāsimī, and others. Scientific questions were tackled by Dr. Tawfīq ʿSībī. After the war of 1914-18, the amīr ʿSharīf ʿArāsānī sent him copy from Geneva. But the bulk of the material was drawn from him own tireless pen.

As H. Laoust writes in his article Le reformisme orthodoxe des ‘Salafīyya’, “its discreet expertise, its Islamic internationalism and the reliability of its general documentation, direct the Manār towards a liberal, cultured minority. The publication of the commentary of ʿAbduh gives it the prestige of a great name. Its leading articles perfectly convey the progressive orthodox view, always well-argued and a balanced in form, of the major contemporary Islamo-Arab questions.” In addition, its judicial discussions, its criticism of books and its news of the Muslim world made it into a link back to 800 (ten issues per year). Each of its 35 volumes possesses either a detailed table of contents, or alphabetical indices, the form of which evolved over the years. The first 34 volumes covered a period of 37 years (1898-1935). As a result of the death of Rashīd Riḍā in 1935, the next volume (no. 35) had its ten issues spread over a period of six years (July 1935-September 1940). The Muslim Brothers [see al-Iṣlahwān AL-MUSLIMĪN] had quarantined its revival, but they preferred to concentrate their efforts on journals of their own. Initially printed in an edition of 1,500, then of 1,000, its circulation rose after the fifth volume with subscriptions from students. The figure of 300 subscribers henceforward guaranteed it a stable, basic readership. There were sometimes temporary difficulties in the distribution of the issues: these were later solved (cf. Turkish censorship in Syria in the first year of publication).

The collected corpus of the Manār provides a mine of information on the attitudes, the focuses of interest, the hopes and disappointments of reformists over a period of nearly forty years. It reflects the major events of the Muslim world seen from Cairo, as well as the personal development of Rashīd Riḍā. The judicial discussions have been separately reprinted in Beirut.

Being centred on the religious and social reform (iṣlah, [q.v.]) of the Islamic umma, the Manār vindicates the salafī heritage of al-Afghānī and of ʿAbduh, exorting a return to the Kurān and to the Sunna with a view to a purer taḥṣīl. It is concerned with the unity of the community, and makes appeals for the surrender of divisions. It opposes those Europeans who seek to efface the last vestiges of the Muslim law. It teaches the compatibility of Islam with science and with reason, in the best interests of mankind at all times and in all places. Following the expression of H. Laoust, “The canonical legitimacy of the sciences, the incorporation into the primitive conception of Islam of the most contemporary social and political ideas to which Muhammad ʿAbduh had attached his name”, have the right of free entry into the Manār. But Rashīd Riḍā remained cautious with regard to what was later to be called al-taṣīr al-ulīmī which seeks to discover in the Kurān all the modern sciences (cf. Manār, xxx, 514-16, on the taṣīrīl of Shaykh Ṭantāwī Dāwāhī on al-Uṣūlī, in Suppl.).

Diverging from the Ḥanafī-Māturīdīsm of ʿAbduh, the Manār turned towards Ḥanbalīsm. The journal’s continual attacks on culpable practices, contrary to the taḥṣīl (mausūl, bids, etc.) are based on Ibn Taymiyya and certain of his fatwas. This paved the way for the reconciliation which was realised through the eulogy of Wahhābism and the transformation of the Manār publishing-house into an active centre of Wahhābī propaganda, beginning after the war of 1914-18 and especially following the conquest of the Hijāz by Ibn Saʿīd (1924-6). In the Manār there is insistence on the need for Muslim propaganda and for guidance (al-daʿwa wa ʾl-ʿirshād). Many lines
are devoted to these topics, particularly to the idea of founding a seminary designed to train enthusiasts for this task. There are articles on Arab nationalism, on relations between Turks and Arabs and on the need to ensure for the Muslim world, mostly Arab. Attitudes towards Şhī‘ism are discussed. Polemic is directed as much against liberal Muslims (cf. that against the Sijṣās, which supported Tāḥā Ḥusayn, etc.) as against al-Azhār. There is news relating to the pilgrimage, the construction of the Ḥijāz railway, the wars in Tripolitania, in the Rif, etc., as well as European colonial policy, particularly in regard to the Syrian question after 1918, the Coptic Congress in Asyut in 1911, the Muslim Congresses of Cairo, of Mecca, etc.; relations with the Christians, their doctrine, missions of Western Christians, Western writers sympathetic to Islam, studies on the greatness and decadence of nations, on pedagogy, on the role of the ‘ulamā’ in the Muslim renaissance, etc. Literary and cultural Arab news items are not lacking. The judicial discussions tackle various difficulties, some of them relevant to the modern world, mentioning the position of Muhammad ‘Abduh (cf. for example the question of the Savings Bank). In short, the periodical contained material suitable for learned and illuminating monographs.

The commentary on the Kur’ān published from the third year onward was the work of Rashīd Riḍā; it included lengthy extracts from the commentary expounded by Muhammad ‘Abduh in evening lectures at al-Azhār, and the respective contributions of the two men were clearly distinguished. ‘Abduh went no further than v. 125 of sūra IV (al-Nisā’) whereas Riḍā continued to the end of sūra XII, (Yaṣīr, v. 107). Some of the positions adopted were daring: ‘Abduh maintained that the texts of the Jewish Scriptures and of the Gospels were authentic and that only their interpretation had been false (Riḍā denied the latter). He claimed that the execution of the Muslim apostate was a measure dating from a time of war during which apostasy constituted desertion in the face of the enemy—today this is not the case and the apostate who does not attack Islam should not be put to death; it is for God to punish him. These examples and other show how ‘Abduh sought to re-open the door of idjtihād. Reference to all these allusions are to be found in the studies mentioned in the bibliography.

Although a positive and very important work in the context of the modern Muslim awakening, it should be noted that the Manār sometimes confined itself to schematic views of an apologetic nature, simplifying in extreme fashion certain historical problems, notably those of the causal influences which helped to bring about the Renaissance of Europe. It also used its influence on behalf of the Gospel of Barnabas, ‘this undoubtedly apocryphal work’ according to L. Massignon, edited for the first time in the 14th century and later in the 16th, sponsoring its translation into Arabic in 1908. This apologetic must have responded to a deeply-felt need, for it enjoyed, and still enjoys, enormous success, even if it contributed little to imparting a sense of objectivity and of history to those who studied it. Similarly, the Manār seems to have ignored a fundamental question: did the adop-


MANĀR, MANĀR (a. m.) minaret.

ii. In the Islamic lands between the Maghrib and Afghanistan.

Unlike the other types of Islamic religious building, such as the mosque and the madrasa, the minaret is immediately and unambiguously recognisable for what it is. The reasons for this are worth investigating. It seems on the whole unrelated to its function of the adḥān [q. v.] calling the faithful to prayer, which can be made quite adequately from the roof of the mosque or even from a house-top. During the lifetime of the Prophet, his Abyssinian slave Bilāl [q. v.], was responsible for making the call to prayer in this way. The practice continued for another generation, a fact which demonstrates that the minaret is not an essential part of Islamic ritual. To this day, certain Islamic communities, especially the most orthodox ones like the Wahhābīs in Arabia, avoid building minarets while they growl at others they are ostentatious and unnecessary. Others are content with the so-called ‘staircase’ minarets which consist simply of a few broad external steps leading to a diminutive kiosk a little above roof level. These perpetuate a practice common in the first century of Islam. While such structures are obviously functional, it is very doubtful whether the same can be said for any minaret much more than 15 m. high. Without mechanical amplification, the human voice simply cannot make itself heard, especially in a noisy urban setting, from the top of such celebrated minarets as the Giralda in Seville [see Iṣbīliyya: 2. Historic buildings] or the Kūb Minār [q. v.] in Dīhil.

If then, the ostensible function of the minaret is somewhat misleading, what other purposes might it have served? If the investigation confines itself to the first instance to the early minarets of the Islamic world—i.e. those predating 1000 A.D.—three possible approaches may be suggested. One is to examine the role of the very earliest minarets in their particular historical setting, on the theory that these examples laid down guidelines for the further development of the form. Another is to see what clues lie in the Arabic words used for minaret, and in their etymology. A third approach would focus on the forms of these early minarets and on their immediate sources, and would
thus involve the assumption that at least traces of the earlier functions associated with these forms survived into the Islamic period. It must be remembered, however, that throughout the mediaeval period, the rôle of the minaret oscillated between two polarities: as a sign of power and as an instrument for the *adhan*. These functions were not mutually exclusive.

It will be convenient to begin by studying the circumstances in which the earliest minarets were built. According to the literary evidence, the first minaret was erected in ca. 45/665 by the governor of 'Irāk, Ziyād b. Abīhi. A *sawmaca* (minaret) was adapted from an earlier Baṣrī structure, the *adhdan* orders were given by the caliph Mu‘āwiya to the governor of Egypt, and the mosque of 'Amr at Fustāṭ was given a quartet of *sawma‘*s, whilst these were also added to other mosques in Egypt. Although nothing remains of these structures, this literary evidence is important in showing that the impetus to build was not a matter of local initiative but came from the highest power in the land, the idea emanating from Syria, where minarets were presumably added to at least some Syrian mosques at this time. It is hard not to see religious-political motives at work here. Christian Syria, within which the Muslims formed a few small enclaves, was lavishly endowed with fine stone churches whose most striking external feature was a tall tower. At the top of these towers was struck the *sindron*—the Orthodox equivalent of the church bell—to summon worshippers for divine service. Some attribute the change in the *adhan* to ʿUmar, but Mu‘āwiya, sensitively attuned as he was to the discrepancies between Christian and Muslim culture, and to the need to reconcile them wherever possible, can scarcely have failed to compare this Christian practice with its simpler Islamic equivalent. It would have been wholly in character for him to have decided to secure for the *adhan* a dignity and formality it had not hitherto possessed by giving it monumental expression. Typically, too, that expression borrowed a Christian form but imbued it with a new Muslim meaning. The slightly later case of the Dome of the Rock leaps to mind as the obvious parallel. The intrusion of political concerns into the forms of early Islamic religious architecture was to be a hallmark of the Umayyad period.

The arguments set out above are susceptible to more than one interpretation. They could support the theory that these early, essentially redundant, minarets were intended simply to demonstrate to the local non-Muslims that the new faith was no less capable than its rivals of devising monumental architecture to glorify itself. However, they could also imply the conclusion that from its very beginning the minaret was intended to function as an outward sign of Islam. A usage formulated in response to a hostile environment would then gradually have become canonical and would have persisted even when circumstances had overaken the need for it. These two interpretations will be considered in more detail below in the context of the form of the earliest minarets.

The second possibly approach to the original function of the minaret is through the etymology of the word itself. An attempt to describe this kind of building. It is perhaps significant that the three words most commonly used — *manāra*, *sawma‘*a* and *mi‘ḥāna*—all arguably refer to quite separate functional aspects of the building. Thus the notion that the minaret served multiple functions is embedded in the Arabic language itself. These functions quite naturally generated appropriate terms for themselves. Whether the prevalence of a given term in a given geographical area reflects the predominance of one function over another is, however, doubtful.

By far the commonest of the three terms is *manāra*, the source via Turkish of English and French *'minaret'*; lit., "place of fire" (*mār*), a word used in pre-Islamic Arabia to denote an elevated place from which signals of fire or smoke were made. Whence the frequent education of the minaret with the lighthouse [see preceding article MANAR]; the cylindrical towers attached to Islamic fortresses along parts of the North African littoral, e.g. in Tunisia, not only served as beacons and lighthouses but were actually called *manāra*. One should, on the other hand, avoid any temptation to connect *manāra* with nīr "light" and to discern a basis for symbolic interpretation of the minaret as an emanation of divine light or as an image of spiritual illumination. The original term *manāra* soon lost its necessary connection with fire, and became used to designate signposts, boundary stones or markers, and watch-towers when no particular association with fire was intended. Hence there emerges that *manāra* came to involve the two distinct notions of fire and of a marker, neither of which, however, had a specific role in Islamic ritual. The lighting of a fire on the minaret of a mosque was an event of utmost rarity in early Islam (it is recorded as having occurred in the case of the Manārat al-ʿArūs in the Damascus mosque), though it is self-evident that the minaret had a value as marker of the principal building of the Islamic community. It seems therefore safe to assume that, in the context of religious architecture, the association between the minaret and fire is irrelevant.

The second term frequently used to designate the minaret—indeed, it is the standard usage in North Africa—is *sawma‘a*. The word means the cell in which a person (usually a monk) secluded himself, with the particular gloss that the cell has a slender pointed apex. Such cells were a regular feature of pre-Islamic Byzantine architecture; they were incorporated into the tall rectangular towers with which churches, monasteries and houses were furnished. Once again, however, as in the case of *manāra*, the etymology is apt to mislead—for while the basic meaning of *sawma‘a* is indeed "hermitage", the word has come to designate, by a process of *pars pro toto*, the entire structure of which the cell was a small part. The specific connotation of *sawma‘a* in the present context is perhaps a "sentry-box" minaret, and eventually a tall, rectangular minaret, rather than the minaret genre itself. For this reason, it is an entirely appropriate term for the minarets of North Africa. Moreover, unlike the word *manāra*, its connotations are religious, albeit with a Christian tinge. Possibly as a result of its association with the minaret, the word is also used more generally to mean "a higher place" or even "a high building", and in this less specific since its connection with *manāra* in the sense of signal tower or marker is plain. In North Africa, however, a distinction clearly exists, for *manāra* is used for signal towers and lighthouses. Appropriately enough in view of its Christian connotations, *sawma‘a* has found a lodging in Europe, in the Spanish word *soma* meaning "minaret".

It is a challenging reflection that the two Arabic words most frequently used to designate the minaret give no clue to the ritual function commonly associated with the building. Instead, they evoke respectively pre-Islamic and Christian associations. The term that does accurately render the ritual function of the building—*mi‘ḥāna*—is, ironically enough, much rarer than the other two, suggesting, perhaps, that earlier "minarets"/"manarās" had functions not ex-
clusively ritual. It derives of course from adhan, hence literally ‘place from which the call to prayer is made’, whose root further gives mu‘adhdhin ‘muezzin, he who gives the call to prayer’. Even this last has pre-Islamic connections, for in the Dāhil al-harīd al-hafrā‘ who made important announcements was known as the mu‘adhdhin. Before leaving the problem of etymology, it may be worth noting that several other words occur sporadically in literary or epigraphic texts as synonyms for at least some of the meanings of manāra: salām/al’ama (‘signpost’, ‘boundary maker’, ‘standing stone’, ‘flag’), mil (positive), mu‘adhdhin (‘tower’, ‘ruin’, ‘ruled’), and sa‘at, ‘a place of watching’, a term especially popular in the Maghrib. The mere mention of these words in the context of the foregoing discussion is enough to emphasise yet again that etymology is a somewhat treacherous guide in determining the function of the minaret. It can safely be asserted, however, that the review of Arabic terminology given above establishes that the minaret performed not one function but several in the medieval Islamic world. Whilst the rarer Arabic words for ‘minaret’ may well reflect the function of the building in the particular context concerned, the most commonly employed word, manāra, was obviously a blanket term which does not readily lend itself to precise elucidation, unless the context offers further, more specific, clues.

The third possible approach to determining the function of the minaret in the early centuries of Islam is by way of morphology. The briefest survey of the formal characteristics of mediaeval minarets is enough to yield one very significant result: that virtually the whole body of surviving minarets belongs to one of two categories. One category comprises minarets with ample interior space; the other, minarets in which the interior space is reduced to the bare minimum required for a spiral staircase to ascend the structure. Minarets with external staircases obviously belong in neither category. Useful as this division is, it cannot shed light on the crucial first century of Islam. Any attempt to explain the function of the minaret by means of its form has to take some account of the earliest recorded minarets, even though none of these has survived. The interpretation placed on the tantalising brief literary accounts which refer to the earliest minarets is therefore crucial.

These accounts are unfortunately either ambivalent or too short to throw any light on the problem. For example, the historian al-Baladhuri refers to the minaret at Basra as a stone minaret. Since stone is specified and the rest of the mosque was of mud brick, it seems legitimate to conclude that the minaret was important enough to have special care taken over its construction. This, then, seems to be a fairly straightforward case. The same cannot be said for the minarets of the mosque of ʿAmr at Fustāţ. The source here is the 9th/15th century author al-Makrizi, who states that Mu‘āwiyah ordered the building of four sa‘awmīs (pl. of sa‘awmā‘) for the call to prayer, and that Maslama placed four sa‘awmīs in the corners of the mosque. Since this is not, in all probability, the first word for minaret that would have come naturally to the Ma młāk historian’s mind, its use in this passage needs some explanation. It is possible that al-Makrizi used it deliberately because it connoted to him tall, rectangular minarets of the Syrian or Maghribi type (very unlike those which he saw all around him in Egypt). His choice of word would in that case have come naturally to the historian’s mind, its use in this passage requiring for a spiral staircase to ascend the structure. While this detail could be no more than abrupt excrescences at roof level, possibly articulated a little further by crenellations. They would indeed resemble Christian towers, but only in a somewhat stunted fashion. They could not aspire to dominate the skyline or indeed make any marked physical impact on the urban landscape. If this motive had loomed large in the mind of al-Walid at the time that he was building the Damascus mosque, it would have been a simple process to heighten the existing corner towers accordingly. That he chose not to do so is clear evidence that the symbolic role of the minaret was not yet generally accepted. Indeed, the mosques of Baṣra and Fustāţ are more prophetic of later developments, even though they were built earlier. At Baṣra, the minaret, whatever its form may have been, was clearly distinguished by its different material of construction, while at Fustāţ the sa‘awmīs were solid up to roof level, necessitating access by ladders. While this detail reflects the early Islamic practice of delivering the adhān from the roof, it is also conceivable that such corner sa‘awmīs had an architectural function as buttresses for the whole building. Their location and strength in turn invites a symbolic interpretation of their function as cornerstones of the faith. The impact of their placing can be gauged from the statement of al-Makrizi that, at the time of the dawn prayer, a muezzin was stationed at each sa‘awmā‘ and that their combined adhān resonated like thunder through the silent city. It might fairly be said, then, that despite the probably rather truncated nature of their resemblance to Christian towers, the sa‘awmīs of the Mosque of ʿAmr did operate as markers of the mosque. This function was certainly performed more
effectively and elegantly by later minarets, but the crucial point is that it is already implicit in the earliest buildings of this genre.

As evidence of the relationship between the Christian towers of Syria and the early minaret, the earliest surviving Islamic monument, at Bosra [q. v.] in southern Syria, is often cited and certainly its minaret fits naturally into a long series of similar towers erected in pre-Islamic times as part of Christian churches, monasteries and houses, often with a defensive function. Yet, this Bosra minaret, notable for its bold projection from the otherwise regular perimeter wall of the mosque, a feature not explicable by e.g. any peculiarity of the site or structural consideration, is actually Mamluk. The Umayyad ma’dqama, according to recent research by Jonathan Bloom, is the staircase minaret along the west wall.

Hence already in the first Islamic century, the religious role of the minaret had been defined in essentials; later times were to bring refinements, but it is in first centuries of the development of the minaret proceeded rather on the lines of variations in form and new secular functions.

For some time, the square form, already well established in Syria, continued to dominate in the Islamic world. Recent excavations have confirmed that the square substructure of the minaret of the Mosque of Sidi ‘Ukhâ at al-Kayrawân in Tunisia is of Aglabid date though some of the upper parts are later (thus weakening a once-popular theory that this minaret reflects the influences of the Pharos of Alexandria, which had a three-tier elevation, each tier smaller than the previous one), but it is quite possible that in its original form the minaret looked much as it does now. Lézine suggested that the lighthouse at Salakta was the formal model, but it is also possible that the Arab conquerors of North Africa, coming westwards as they did from Egypt, should have used the most celebrated tower of Egypt as a model for the minaret of the first mosque built in the newly-Islamised territory. In this mosque of al-Kayrawân, the minaret was placed opposite the musallâ, and it was only a matter of time before the last refinement was added and the minaret aligned exactly with the mihrab [q. v.].

Hence already in the first Islamic century, the minaret had a new and imposing location. It is placed some distance from the entrance, hence may have had the function of a marker, of course the helicoidal towers attached to the Great Mosque of Damascus is the earliest and best preserved example of this type. The substantial enclosed space of the al-Kayrawân minaret (base ca. 10m. square and height ca. 35m.) encouraged the possibility of provision of chambers within the minaret. For some reason, this was not done there, hence the minaret has inordinately thick walls; but later Maghrib and Andalusian minarets, such as the Almohad examples in Seville, Rabat and Marrakesh, employed such chambers and also gave them decorative vaults in stone or brick.

These three minarets of the later 6th/12th century mark the zenith of this genre in Western Islam, perpetuating the outer shell of pre-Islamic and early Islamic Syrian towers, and of the minaret at Cordoba, but they are much larger than their distant Syrian models (approaching 65m. in height) and display rich decoration on all four sides, with cusped, horseshoe or mulfoil arches, often generating a lattice-work design, and also with single or paired windows on each storey. Eventually, too, the Andalusian minarets were to exert an influence on the campaniles of Spanish churches of the period—the wheel coming full circle, as it were, after these towers’ Syrian Christian origins. So strong was the tradition of the tall, square-shafted minaret in the Maghrib, that in the eastern Maghrib it survived the coming of the Ottomans; and in Ottoman Tunis, a novel type of octagonal minaret, with each face richly tiled and the whole crowned by a projecting balcony and steeped pavilion, enjoyed special popularity.

An unexpected and distant by-product of the Syrian tradition is the Saharan or West African minaret. The Saharan type, often very high (e.g. the fairly recent example of the Waldât Djalal at Zibane) has a marked batter to its walls—a feature which had occurred at al-Kayrawân but had not been exploited subsequently in the mediaeval period—and is crowned by an open-plan kiosk. In West African minarets, most of which date from the last four centuries (e.g. Timbuktu and Agades), the later is so pronounced that the minaret resembles a truncated cone, studded with projecting palm beams. These facilitate the constant repairs that such mud-brick structures require. Similar minarets are found as far north as the Mzâb region in Algeria.

The minarets of the Maghrib and Andalusia form a school unique in the Islamic world for its fidelity to an imported model and for its innate conservatism, which maintained a broadly consistent form throughout a vast area for over a millennium. The history of the minaret in the rest of the Islamic world, sc. in Egypt and Turkey and in the area to the east of them, is somewhat more varied. It embraces a very wide range of forms, of alien influences, and of functions both secular and religious.

This wider canvas is immediately apparent in the immediately post-Umayyad minarets which survive in the eastern Islamic world. These are principally to be found in ‘Irâk. Possibly the earliest among them is the so-called Manârât al-Mudjîda, which departs from the norms of the first century by being a slender cylindrical structure of baked brick, with a winding interior stair and sparing external decoration in baked brick; hence it is prophetic of the minarets erected in Iran during the Sâlджîk period. Moreover, it is entirely freestanding, with no sign of there ever having been a building adjoining it. It lay strategically on the route between the ‘Abbâsid princely palace of al-Ukhâyder [see Architecture and pl. XIV there] and Kûfû, hence may have had the function of a marker, with its peculiar form a reflection of watchtowers which had now appeared along the former Sâlджîk times of the Abbasids. It is somewhat more varied. It embraces a very wide range of forms, of alien influences, and of functions both secular and religious.

The most celebrated of early ‘Abbâsid minarets are of course the helicoidal towers attached to the Great Mosque of Sâmarrâ (234-7/848-52) and the mosque of Abî Dulaîf (245-7/859-61) [see Architecture and Pls. XVII-XVIII there]. Although their precise origin is a matter of dispute, the question of a classical or Christian source does not arise. Their forms are deeply rooted in ancient Near Eastern architecture. In both cases, a square base carries an external ramp which spirals upwards, at first gently but then with increasing steepness, around a solid central cylinder. In the case of the minaret at Sâmarrâ (the malûwiyya) the ramp ends after five complete revolutions at an arced kiosk. A similar aedicule probably crowned the minaret of the Abî Dulaf mosque after the ramp had completed four revolutions. The Sâmarrâ minaret is therefore substantially larger, and with a height of 53m. is indeed one of the highest minarets in the Islamic world. As befits its importance, the minaret has a new and imposing location. It is placed some 30m. outside the mosque and is precisely on the axis of the mihrab. By this means, its integration with the mosque and its liturgical function in relationship to the rest of the building is appropriately stressed, while its isolation is sufficiently marked for the minaret to invite attention as a separate structure. The practice of
placing the minaret on the mihrab axis was copied throughout the Islamic world. There seem to be two possible origins for this bizarre helicoidal form for a minaret. Firstly, an Iranian one. There survives at Firuzabad in Fars, the first capital of the Sasanids, a square-shafted tower with the remains of an external ramp winding round it (called a tirbal by the Arabs), and this monument has been interpreted as a Zoroastrian one, which had a fire burning at its summit; and we have noted the Arabs’ readiness to take over architectural forms sanctioned by earlier faiths. Secondly, there is the ancient Mesopotamian form of the zigurat or tower-temple. Whilst most of these had stepped elevations made up of superimposed squares of decreasing size, a few had a square base which carried a huge central cylinder encircling by a rising ramp; a four-storeyed building of this type has been excavated at Khorsabad [q.v.] in northern ‘Irak. To have adopted either of these types as a basis for minarets would have accorded with the anti-Syrian attitudes of the ʿAbbasids. In the event, however, the maluuyya form seems to have been too eccentric to serve satisfactorily as a minaret, and it remained virtually without progeny.

The sole important descendant of the ʿIrakī maluuyya, specifically that of the Mosque of Abū Dulaf, was indeed the minaret of the mosque built by a member of the AbūSulaymān family at Tūnūs, not far from Khoms in Egypt (263-5/876-9) [see ARCHITECTURE and Pls. XXI-XXIV there]. Unfortunately, the present minaret is a reconstruction of the late 7th/13th early 8th/14th century, but earlier historians agree that its original form was spiral.

But these spiral minarets, though fascinating, represent a by-way in the history of the minaret. In the eastern Islamic world, the dominating tradition was henceforth to be that of I rān, where an entirely different form, that of the lofty, cylinder type, developed; this obviously owed nothing to Syria, but might well have owed something to the regions on Iran’s northern and eastern fringes, sc. India, Central Asia and even China (E. Schroeder speculated that the pillar form is an immemorial symbol of “the axis of the universe, and the direct way to Heaven”). Even so, such fragmentary evidence as survives suggest that the very earliest Iranian minarets, e.g. at Dāmghān and Sīrāf, followed the Umayyad square-towered form, but judging by the minaret of the Nāyīn mosque, which has a square, ground-level format surmounted by an octagonal shaft merging into a tapering cylinder, this form was soon modified. The Nāyīn minaret seems to be pre-Saljūq, and the literary evidence confirms that, by the 4th/10th century, extremely tall minarets were a feature of Iranian towns.

The tallies of surviving 5th/11th and 6th/12th century buildings in Iran shows that this was a time of unprecedented building activity, with mosques being, like madrasas [q.v.], expressions of official Saljūq patronage often executed by their amīrs (as at e.g. the mosques of Kāzwin and Burujdār). These soaring Saljūq minarets—often around 30m. high, with a pronounced taper which accentuates their height, internal stairways, and lavish external brick geometric or calligraphic decoration contrasting with the plainness of the mosque walls—are of such assurance and completeness in their form that a previous period of development must surely be postulated. Within this context of Saljūq patronage, one notes that the rich decoration of such minarets testifies to its patron’s readiness to recommend it to less wealthy patrons. That these minarets did not necessarily have a straightforward liturgical function is suggested by the case of 6th/12th century ʿIraqi. In that city it is clear that the Friday mosque that according to custom (not dogma) requires a minaret, it is remarkable to note that this city, one of the Saljūq capitals of Iran, had over a score of minarets in this period. In nearly every case, the mosque for which the minaret was originally intended has vanished. It is tempting to speculate that these mosques were very much simpler and humbler structures which had earlier not had minarets. One may justifiably assume that some evidence besides the minarets themselves would have remained if these minarets had been built contemporaneously with their adjoining mosques as integrated building projects.

The case of the mausoleum traditionally associated with the Sāmānid ʿIsāfī b. Ahmad at Buhkārā shows that by ca. 900 A.D. the effectiveness of brick decoration as a mantle for a building, one of relatively small surface area and therefore cheap, had been discovered, and was now transposed to the minaret (overall brick decoration on contemporary tomb towers, with their much larger diameters, occurs only on larger buildings of that genre). The cylindrical Iranian minaret generated a surprising variety of forms, mostly in the 6th/12th century, with variations in the number and proportions of stages, the cylindrical shaft; two or three tiers of tapering cylinders (e.g. at Zīvār near Isfahān and at Dījām in Ghūr in central Afghanistan); staircases might revolve round a central column or be built into the thickness of the exterior wall and carried on small vaults. Paired minarets probably date from this period, as a means of lending extra importance to the entrance gate of a building (e.g. at Ardistan and Nakhkhiwān), eventually to be brought into the mosque proper in order to flank the entrance to the musalla. There seems to have been no consistent practice governing the location of single minarets within the mosque. When the minaret was erected as an integral component of the mosque, provision was often made for it to be entered not at ground level but from the roof of the mosque. The otherwise at Ardistan, and Dījām might be noted: the comparatively high up the shaft of minarets which are now free-standing are clear evidence that they were originally intended to be part of a mosque.

A few minarets of this period raise searching problems of function. Some are located along major routes or at the edge of the desert (Khusrawgirrī; Zīvār; Mīl-i Nādirī), which would lend support to the theory that they served, no doubt ʿantar ala, as signposts. Since much caravan travel was by night, a lamp at the top of a minaret would allow the building to serve as a landlocked lighthouse. A chance literary reference establishes that in 581/1185 the practice of placing a lamp at the top of a minaret was sufficiently familiar in Khorāsān to occasion no comment. Perhaps the most enigmatic, as well as the most splendid, minaret of the period is that of Dījām, with a height of ca. 30m. unprecedented among Iranian minarets, and its main lower shaft principally decorated by a whole Kurʾānic sūra (XIX, Maryam) plus other, mainly historical, inscriptions, lauding the achievements of the Ghūrid sultan Ghivaš al-Dīn Muhammad b. Sām [see GRORISO]; clearly, there is a motive here of prestige and victoriousness, with the Kurʾānic text perhaps emphasizing the Islamic faith in a land which had not long emerged from paganism. In the eastern Islamic world, the Iranian minaret never recovered the importance it had had under the Saljūqs, but even so, new uses and new types of
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decoration were found for it. In Il-Khanid times, the
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minaret, the main cylindrical shaft rises from a square
or polygonal base and is punctuated by one, two or
even three circular balconies carried on mukarnas [q. v.]
vaunting, the whole being capped by elongated conical
roofs, sheathed in lead and ending in finials. Muez-
zins on each balcony would deliver the call to prayer
in the form of a canon; and the acoustic impact of
these many voices would of course be significantly in-
tensified in a mosque with multiple minarets, the
voices interweaving in different sonorities depending
on the height and distance separating the muezzins.
Whether such musical refinements were entirely audi-
ble is another matter.

Perhaps the most celebrated feature of Ottoman
minarets was not their outward form but their use in
pairs, quartets or sextets as a device to proclaim the
royal status of the building—for it seems that only a
reigning sultan could erect more than one minaret per
mosque. There can be little doubt that these mosques
represent the most sustained attempt in all of Islamic
architecture to reconcile the divergent aims of royal
and religious iconography. These gigantic, needle-
sharp lances clustered protectively, like a guard of
honour, around the royal dome, have a distinctly ag-
gressive and ceremonial impact, largely dependent on
each some 70m. high. Such minarets function simultane-
ously to enrich the exterior silhouette of the mosque—
in the case just cited, for instance, the outer minarets
flanking the principal façade of the building are shorter
than those flanking the dome. Thus a pyramidial effect
is achieved which is still further em-
phasised by the choice of a sloping site. The gently
rolling skyline of Istanbul, with its rural views, was
ideally suited for this kind of display, and the political
significance of the city as the Ottoman capital may
partly have motivated this new use of the minaret as
a component of urban design on a mammoth scale.

Such minarets were also used in a more symbolic way
as markers of the courtyard of the musallah, or of the en-
tire mosque, staking out the boundaries of the
religious domain within a secular environment. Dome
chamber and minaret alike thus acquire extra
significance as symbols of faith. This development
was not new, but only in Ottoman architecture is it
pursued with such singlemindedness. It is therefore
totally appropriate that these minarets should, like
the domes over the misbah, also bear the emblem of the
cresent, supported on a series of superimposed orbs.

If conservatism is the hallmark of the Ottoman
minaret, its counterpart in Egypt is above all varied.
This variety is all the more remarkable because the
Egyptian school is to all intents and purposes concen-
trated on the buildings of Cairo, though it is
represented in some small measure in the provincial
towns of Egypt and in the architecture of the
Mamlûks in Syria and the Levant. Unfortunately,
very few surviving pre-Mamlûk minarets have
escaped extensive alteration. Moreover, the most
important examples to fall within this category are not
metropolitan work at all but are found in various pro-
vincial towns—Ema, Luxor, Aswan and nearby
Shallal, all dating from the late 5th/11th century and
already displaying the characteristic Egyptian division
of the minaret into separately conceived superimposed
tiers, though Hidżâz influences are at work also.

Interesting as these minarets are stylistically, they
are insignificant in comparison with the great corner
towers marking the main façade of the Mosque of al-
Hakim in Cairo, built between 380/990 and
401/1010. With their massive—but later—embattled
square bases, whose taper, like that of an ancient Egyptian pylon, is so pronounced that it is almost a slope, they have all the appearance of bastions. That this military quality was to some degree present in the original layout of the Mahdiya mosque, built in Tunisia early in the previous century, which too had the corners of its main façade heavily emphasised by bastions which matched the main entranche of the mosque in projecting some 3m. from it and moreover projected a full 7m. from the lateral walls. In its original layout, the Hakim mosque maintained the consonance between corner projections and portal already established at Mahdiya, although the projection was twice as marked. Very soon, however—by 401/1010—each minaret was enclosed by a huge salient some 17m. square which allotted it a revolutionary and portentous role. Finally, in 480/1087, Badr al-Djamâl enlarged the northern salient to gigantic proportions—some 25m. square. He thereby not only incorporated the principal façade of the mosque into the expanded fortifications of the city—a clear indication of the essentially military flavour of this mosque—but managed to make the minarets play a major part in this process without noticeable strain or incongruity.

Since the minarets of al-Hakim survive only in an altered state, it is not easy to see where they belong in the corpus of Egyptian minarets. This is all the more regrettable in view of the once-vigorous controversy over the role of the Pharaos of Alexandria, which stood intact until it was partially ruined by an earthquake in 180/796-7, in the evolution of the Egyptian minaret. Pace Creswell, who argued against any connection between the two building types, it can scarcely be overlooked that the surviving Egyptian minarets which date before 1100 all attest a pronounced multipartite division of the elevation. Since this feature is absent alike in the Syrian, Iranian and Maghribi traditions (with two significant exceptions), some rationale for this unusual feature must be proposed, and a probability here seems to be the Pharaos, with the Egyptian minarets as free variations on the Pharaos theme. (One should note that the Pharaos was repeatedly rebuilt by the Muslims until its final disappearance between the early 7th/13th and the mid-8th/14th centuries. Indeed, as Butler noted, the account of 'Abd al-Latif indicates that in ca. 1200 the Pharaos comprised successively square, octagonal and round storeys and was crowned by a lantern or small cupola. It may well be, therefore, that this semi-Islamic Pharaos rather than the original building was the means of establishing the tradition of the multi-staged minaret in Egypt.)

But if the Pharaos did, in one or other of its successive guises, exert some influence on early Egyptian minarets, this does not seem to have been continuous. In the early versions of certain towers, the emphasis was on a tall, square shaft of Syrian type, which may be very plain (mausolea of Abu 'l-Ghadanfar, 532/1137, and Fāṭima Kātbūn or richly decorated (minaret in madrasa of Sultan al-Nāṣir Muhammad), with the so-called makhkara (because it resembled the top of an incense burner), a two-storey octagonal pavilion, crowning it. Subsequently, the makhkara was accorded more emphasis, and its interior divisions made more marked, with differing ground plans, octagonal and circular, and decorative patterns. In later times, the principle persisted of altering the ratio of the component tiers. The main shaft was reduced to the point where it was lost in the surrounding walls of the mosque, leaving the visible part of the minaret as an octagonal shaft with a cylindrical superstructure (minarets of Shaykh n and Sarghānī, both mid-8th/14th century). The transitions between the tiers were often marked by multiple balconies on mukarnas corbelling, recalling Ottoman minarets, and these were indeed used to secure the same antipodal effects in the chanting of the adhāj in as in Turkey. There was an emphasis on absolute height, with the southeastern corner minaret of the Sultan Hasan mosque soaring to 90m., the tallest in Cairo. The makhkara was now replaced by the kūla, so-called because of its resemblance to the upper half of the typical Egyptian water container, pear-shaped and with a flange-like lip. The tip was often orientated towards the kibla. In the final decades of Mamlūk rule, the minaret is crowned by a pair of square-plan pavilions crowned by a cluster of kūlas (funerary complex of Kānstīn al-Ghūrī).

Finally, the popularity of the minaret in Mamlūk architecture invites explanation. In the 8th/14th and 9th/15th centuries, the main building type in Cairo appears to have been the composite ensemble. Its constituent parts could vary from one ensemble to another, but their main functional elements were the mosque, madrasa, khānkhān and mausoleum. Similar complexes had already become popular in Seldījik Anatolia. In Egypt, however, unlike Anatolia, the minaret was from the first regarded as an integral part of such complexes. Whether this was entirely for functional reasons may be doubted. In the dense urban fabric of Cairo, nothing could more appropriately designate such a complex from afar than a minaret; and in this sense, it could be regarded as a public affirmation of its patron's munificence. Their placing varied. Sometimes they were located at the two corners of the principal façade, or flanking a gateway (e.g. Bāb Zuwayla); these were traditional locations. But many of the locations were unusual or even unprecedented. The madrasa of al-Sāliḥ has a single minaret above the central porch of the façade, and the two minarets in the mosque of al-Nāṣir Muhammad on the citadel are at the corner of the kibla wall and to one side of the main entrance. The latter location recurs in the funerary complex of Kāntī Bay. In this unpredictable positioning of the minaret, one may recognise similar concerns to those of Ottoman architects. Now the minaret was, it seems, valued less for its actual or symbolic religious function and more for its role as a marker or articulating feature, both within the complex to which it belonged and more broadly within the cityscape itself. Once again, then, the flexibility of the forms developed by Islamic architects asserted itself.


2. In India.

The minaret in India, commonly referred to by the imāda form minār, may be either (a) a free-standing or (b) an integral part of a mosque or other building. In the second category, it is convenient to distinguish the (actually or potentially) functional from the non-functional forms. With rare exceptions, in some regional styles [see VIND. vii. Architecture] no form of the minār is used at all; Dāwpur; Māwwā; the Dihli sultanates and the pre-Mughal Pandjāb; Sind; Kashmīr, the ‘Imād Shāhī, Nizām Shāhī and Barid Shāhī sultanates in the Deccan. (It might be objected that the non-functional forms do not properly qualify to be called minārs at all; but these forms, with others to be mentioned below, are certainly derived from minār prototypes, and there is no other recognised term by which they may conveniently be described. The term minār is regularly applied to towers of many types and functions.)

(a) The free-standing minār first appears in India as an adjunct to the earliest mosque ("Kuwwat al-Islām") in Dihli, standing outside the original mosque compound, commenced by Kutb al-Dīn Aybak (whence, possibly, its sobriquet of "Kutb Minār" [q.v.]) about 595/1199, and completed before 634/1236 by Ilutmish [q.v.] to a height of some 230 feet. The taper of its profile is very pronounced, nearly 5° from the vertical and it was divided into four stages by encircling balconies supported by madaras cornices. The upper stages show different designs of vertical fluting, the flutes on the lowest stage being alternately rounded and angular, those in the second all rounded, those in the third all angular (the original fourth stage was rebuilt into two storeys in 770/1368 under Firuz Shāh the Tughluq). The occurrence of the Kūrān, LXII, 9-10, in an inscription on the second storey affords presumptive evidence for the use of the minār as a mihrāb. The assertions s.v. Dīth (II, 260) and hindi (III, 441) above, that the fluted storeys develop the polygonal outline of the minārs of Ghazna, taken as the prototype of the Dīth minār, now need modification in the light of later research: A. Hutt, in Three minarets in the Kirman region, in JRAS (1970), 172-80, shows that the section of the base of the minaret of the Masjīd-i Dīāmī of Zaranq shows precisely the same disposition of alternate rounded and angular flutes; this is therefore a more exact exemplar for the Kutb Minār than the minārs at Ghazna, whose section is stellate, based on two interlaced squares. A minār in the Sīstān region, described by K. Fischer in Afghanistan, xii/3-4 (1970), 91-107, of similar form, suggests a nearer prototype on the probable line of transmission to India. (There is thus now even less need to cite the form of the Duddabasappu temple in Dambal, Dharwar district, as a possible prototype of the Kutb Minār plan, as has been advocated by some Hindu enthusiasts.) The characteristic taper of the Kirman examples, and of the minaret of Dīāmī in Āfghanistān, is also closer to that of the Kutb Minār than are the Ghazna examples. These details are emphasised here because of their persistence in certain aspects of mosque architecture, described under (b) below. Other free-standing minārs stand or stood at Kōḍī ("Allāgir") (inscr. 652/1254; erected by Balbān as governor to commemorate victories of the sultan Nāṣīr al-Dīn Māhmūd; tapering with square base and external galleries supported by cornices, with internal spiral stair, but dem. 1862 without any record; Bayānā, cylindrical with slight entasis but unfinished, in city near Ukhārī masjid and Ukhārī masjid, 9th/15th century, and tall minār in hilltop fort, tapered with cobbled balcony, inscr. 871/1466 (?), possibly with a double staircase (entrance blocked on my visit in 1972); Dawlatabad, "Cānd Minār" in inner city, ca. 649/1445, three encircling galleries supported by elaborate brackets, similar profile to minārs of madrasa in Bidar, see below; Bidar town, "Cāwbārā", low cylindrical tower at crossing of main thoroughfares, early 9th/15th century; Čhotā Panduā Bengali: massive minār 50m. from Bāfī masjd, early 8th/14th century, five diminishing tiers resembling half-drawn-out telescope, lowest three flattened; Gaur: Fīrūz Minār, ca. 895/1490, no taper, polygonal form, minaret, 849/1445, three encircling galleries supported by elaborate brackets, similar profile to minārs of madrasa at Bād, see below; Bidar town, "Cāwbārā", low cylindrical tower at crossing of main thoroughfares, early 9th/15th century; Dīžāhārī's favourite elephant, but often attributed to Dārā Shukhā. Finally, the Kos Minārs of the early Mughal period, solid towers of similar profile to the Kutb Minār but only 6-8 m. high, were set at intervals of a kōs [see MISHA. 2. India] along the major thoroughfares. Many purposes are involved in the above: mihrāb; observation post to command dead ground; possibly, following Hindu examples, "victory tower"; other commemoration; platform for shooting or observation game; execution displays; distance markers. The purposes are frequently combined.

(b) Minārs attached to a mosque or other building, however, are provided primarily as mihrābs, although since they are almost always multiplied symmetrically, they obviously have also an important aesthetic function (the single minār in the south-east corner of the courtyard of the Bahmānī Ėk minār ki masjid at Rāyūr [q.v.] is a striking exception). Only in Gudjārāt under the Ahmad Shāhī
sultanate, and in Burhānpur in Khalīdshāh, are paired functional minārs used regularly before the Mughul period; here they are cylindrical, their internal staircase, opening on to one or more encircling balconies supported on heavy corbels as well as to the mosque roof, and are capped by conical roofs with no suggestion of an open turret. The earliest Ahmad Shāhī examples flank the central arch of the liwān, although later they may be placed at the north and south ends of the façade. The latest mosques of the Ahmad Shāhī period, e.g. Rānī Sambārī's mosque and the Īsāpur one, have solid pseudo-minārs at the ends of the façade.

This sudden reintroduction of the miṣīdghana-minār, with an immediate secondary aesthetic function, is not fully explained. Gūḍārāt mosques in Dīhilī Sultanate times such as Hīlāl Khān's one at Dīhilā, the Dājmīnī mosque at Cambay, have only solid conical or cylindrical pillars over the parapet flanking the central bay of the liwān; but earlier Dīhilī Sultanate examples outside Gūḍārāt may show the connection with the Kutb Minār; e.g. the Afhānī din kā gāompūrā mosque at Aḏīmīnār carries two cylindrical turrets, solid and some 2m. tall, over the makṣūra arch, with vertical flutes alternately circular and angular exactly as on the lowest storey of the Kutb Minār (similar fluting occurs on the external corner buttresses of the mosque courtyard). The Dājmīnī Minār profile is perpetuated in the solid buttes of (which flank) mosque gateways, the central bay of the liwān façade, the external minābrāt—projection, and external corners of courtyards, in the Tughluk and Lōḍī periods; these show at least one band of Kutb Minār-like fluting, and their profile is carried up above parapet level to end in a guldasta; especially when flanking the central propylon-like arch of the liwān façade, these suggest paired miṣīdghana towers, and may thus have a psychological purpose. This would seem to be the explanation for many of the examples which follow. In the Bahānī Sultanate, the minār is not used regularly with mosques; that at Rāyūrī mentioned above is an exception, and the Čānd Minār at Daulatābād is doubtless sited with the old Dājmīnī mosque in mind although physically separated by some 100 metres—Dīhilī in every way. A view of broken ground to the east. The profile of both resembles that of the remaining one minār of two at the ends of the entrance façade of the mādrasa of Māhmūd Gāwān [q.v.] at Bīdar, inscr. 877/1472, although the balconies of the latter are carried out from the main shaft in a curvilinear form rather than being supported on brackets in the usual Indian manner. All are crowned with a dome-shaped cap, with no open room at the top. The old brick minārs attached to the courtyard of the much later Makkā Masjid at Bīḍjāpur, also of Bahānī date, have lost their upper parts; their balconies seem to have been supported on wooden brackets. Other Bahānī minārs, all of similar profile, are the pairs flanking the gateways of the barad of Shāh Shāhī Sirāj al-Dīn Dūnaydī and the so-called house of Gēsū Dāriz, both in Gūlbārgā, and those flanking both the outer and inner gateways of the barad at Aːlānd; but these are crowned with foliated domes of three-quarter sphere shape, as in the ʿĀdil Shāhī and Kutb Shāhī styles, and those of the outer gateway have moreover an encircling band of open arches in the Kutb Shāhī manner. Of possible relevance to the designs in north India referred to above are the guldastās which stand at the corners of the parapets of Bahānī tombs in Gūlbārgā, both with the barad very high; these are fluted, although fluting does not extend to the minār. The minār proper is not used at all in the Bahānīs' successor states. The skyscrapes of mosques and tombs of the ʿĀdil Shāhīs in Bīḍjāpur and elsewhere are so liberally provided with vertical pillars as to resemble a burgeoning asparagus patch; and at best pseudo-minārs which may psychologically suggest the miṣīdghana-minār but whose real function is merely artistic. Turrets, charātās and guldastās are also freely used, but the relation between these forms cannot be pursued here. The minār-like structures of the Kutb Shāhīs of Haydārābād and Golkonda, similarly, are usually solid shafts, cylindrical, with characteristic encircling arced galleries, although in a late offshoot of the Kutb Shāhī style in the Dājmīnī mosque of Sīrahgāpattana [q.v.] ("Serengapatam") an internal staircase is provided. That the bases of the pseudo-minārs of the Tōlī Māsji (1082/1671) outside Haydārābād city stand in pot-shaped bases should not be taken as representing any connexion with ancient Indian pillars.

Under the Mughals, the functional minār returns to north India; this is possibly inspired by Gūḍārāt examples, since other typically Gūḍārāt features are introduced into Mughal architecture after the conquest of Gūḍārāt in 980/1573. The first example is that of the four minārs at the corners of the gateway of Akbar's tomb at Sīkandāra, completed in the early years of the 11th/17th century: tapering, white marble (the lowest stage fluted), two intermediate balconies supported on corbel brackets, topped by a conical roof, and are capped by conical roofs with no suggestion of an open room at the top. That the bases of the pseudo-minār-like corner turrets; the mosque of Wazīr Khān at Lāṁbāvar; the Bādüshāhī mosque of Lāṁbāvar, which is also short minār-like corner turrets; the tomb of Rābīʿa Dāvarānī ("Bībī kā makbara") at Awrangbāgzāh; Awrangzīb's mosques in Bānārās, Mathurā, etc.; short corner staircased minārs also at the tomb of Iʿtimād al-Dawla at Āgrā, little more than turrets, seem to be the model for the engaged corner turrets at e.g. the tomb of Saṭṭār Dāngī at Dīhilī, and Mughal mosques in Bengal e.g. Dhākā, Murshidābād, etc. Since there is no necessity for the adāq in tombs, many of these Mughal minārs are thus also principally decorative.

Plates II-III, IX-X., and see also _sirangapatana_. For the 'Adil Shahi decorative forms, see _Bidl._ to _bijapur_. Monuments. For the Mughal minar and associated structures, see _MUGHALS_. Architecture. A fully-illustrated study by the author of _minas, guldstas_ and associated structures is in preparation. (J. Burton-Page)

3. In _East Africa_, the word (Swahili, _mnara_, pl. _minara_), has three connotations:

(1) Before the late 19th century minarets were of extreme rarity. The Great Mosque of Kilwa in Tanzania, the largest of all, did not have one. The only examples are the Great Mosque (1238) and the Mosque of Arba'a Rukun (1268) at Mogadishu, and the Friday Mosque at Merca (1609), all in Somalia and dated by inscriptions; a late 14th century mosque at Ras Mokumbu, Pemba Island; and the Malindi Mosque in Zanzibar Town built in 1831, of which the minaret is reputedly of greater age. Many mediaeval mosques, however, possess an external staircase, sometimes part of the structure of the abutments, from which the call to prayer was given. The earliest such example is at Kaole, near Bagamoyo, Tanzania, while the Great Mosque at Kilwa, Tanzania, has two such staircases outside the mosque proper in its north and south courts respectively.

(2) The word is also used, both in Arabic and Swahili, for the pillar tombs which are an architectural peculiarity of the eastern African coast. Situated generally on the north of _kibla_ side—for Mecca lies almost due north of the eastern African coast—these tombs are formed by a roofless square or rectangular walled structure, providing space for two up to five or six burials, the distinguishing pillar being cylindrical or tapered, square, hexagonal or octagonal, and usually with a string course or some other form of decoration near the top that markedly suggests a phallic origin. (In this connection it should perhaps be noted that at Mtimira, some 12 miles north of Kilwa, a representation of a phallus the size of a man’s forearm surmounts the _mihrab_ arch in a mosque that was abandoned in the 14th century.) The height of the pillars varies greatly from some 10 to 20 feet, but at Mombasa an extreme example reaches some 60 feet and has a base which actually spans the entire tomb. It is alleged today by some Sunni Muslims amongst the Swahili that these pillar tombs are the work of _Shi'i_, but this has never been confirmed.

The only reference to a pillar tomb in literature is in the Arabic _History of Kilwa_, B.L. Or. ms. 2666, which refers to the burial ca. 1364 of sultan _tallit_ b. al- _Husayn_ of Kilwa in a pillar tomb on Mafia Island which was already occupied by the burials of two _fakhis_. This is the earliest date that we possess for these structures, but regrettably the tomb in question seems to have fallen into ruin and disappeared. Pillar tombs are distributed from as far north as Koyama in the _Bajun_ Islands off the east coast of Somalia to as far south as Mboamaji, a few miles south of Dar es Salaam, Tanzania. Their walls are frequently panelled and often elaborately decorated with different motifs sculptured in coral, and sometimes inlaid with plates of Chinese porcelain, rarely celadon, but chiefly blue and white of the Ming dynasty. This practice already existed in the 14th century, as witness Yuan porcelain that was abandoned in the 14th century, as witness Yuan porcelain—see _Mboamaji_, a few miles south of Dar es Salaam, Tanzania. Their walls are frequently panelled and often elaborately decorated with different motifs sculptured in coral, and sometimes inlaid with plates of Chinese porcelain, rarely celadon, but chiefly blue and white of the Ming dynasty. This practice already existed in the 14th century, as witness Yuan porcelain that was abandoned in the 14th century.

(3) A structure on Songo Mnara Island near Kilwa, which gives the island its name, is built on a platform of four steps some sixteen yards offshore. Visiting it in 1950, the late Gervase Mathew found the skeletal remains of a goat which had apparently been sacrificed on top of it. It is described by P. S. Garlake as a mosque, but an Arabic treaty between the then Sultan of Kilwa and a French slave-trader, Jean-Vincent Morice, dated 12 _Shaf'bân_ 1190/4 November 1776, clearly refers to it as _bayt manar_ (sic). Garlake prints a plan of the structure showing a small mosque with a raised platform, but H.N. Chittick, who partly cleared the building in 1961, founds it to be “a truncated pyramid with stepped sides, surmounted by a rectangular chamber”, with doors at the north and south. The present writer did not distinguish the remains of a _mihrab_ when he visited it in 1955. Morice’s two maps of ca. 1776 show it as a three-storeyed building, the three storeys tapering towards the top; he refers to it as _la pagode_. Chittick found only two storeys remaining, the second storey being decorated with numerous large 15th century celadon bowls. J. Crassons de Medeuel, another slave-trader, writing in 1784, says that _la pagode_ which “was very curious looking”, had fallen down at some time during the preceding three years. This sentence follows immediately upon the description of a mosque, thus clearly differentiating it therefrom. M. H. Dorman thought the structure might be an ancient 14th century _deir_ or _kiosk_. It is unlikely because these are unknown in eastern Africa at the period indicated by the celadon bowls, and indeed until the later 19th century. The elaborate decoration suggests rather that the building was domestic, even if the lowest of the three rooms was used for prayer, and that perhaps it was a tower kiosk built so as to take advantage of the evening breeze on what is a hot sticky island. This explanation would satisfy the meaning both of _mnara_ and of _pagode_ in 18th century French.


_MANAS_, the name of the paramount hero of the Kirghiz oral epic tradition and also of the totality of the epics which accreted about him and his kindred by the process of cyclisation, in this case very marked.

Some 4,000,000 lines of _Manas_ are said to have been recorded in Kirgizia in this century, but not one scholarly edition of a self-contained performance has appeared, or, if it has, has yet reached the West. A recording of an episode from _Manas_ was made by R. Dor in the Pamir in 1973, of which a philological edition, with an introduction, translation, and full index; and recordings of _Manas_ in Xinjiang by members of the Institute for Minorities, Peking, are reported to...
have been made during the last decade. In 1911-12, G. von Almasy published 72 lines critically, with recorded by W. Radloff (V. Radzvon and C. Manaske, in 'Tagish-Kazakh' a
tauzrakh of Sat al-Din, attributed to the 16th century, has been accepted as evidence of the flourishing of Manas at that time; yet the two mss. of the Magjma so far cited are dated respectively 1792-3 and 19th century, so that the (likely) possibility that the Manas passage was interpolated to serve the political ends of Khokand requires convincing disproof before it can be considered as evidence for Manas in Kirghiz at so early a date. However, Manas, as it appears in Kirghiz verse for the first time in the Valikhanov recording of Kokojooyun aghi ("The memorial feast for Kokoby)", in 1856, reflects a mature and truly epic tradition which is obviously the product of many generations. Surprisingly, if one goes back to this earlier tradition from the patriotic and at times stridently nationalistic material of the 20th century, one finds that the heroes are not Kirghiz but Noghay; on the very rare occasions when "Kirghiz" are named, it is with irony. Nevertheless, the connection between the mid-19th century epic tradition and the life of the Kirghiz as it has been supplied by the situation of Manas, his son Semetey and his grandson Seytel: all are only sons forming a fragile line of qans that is threatened with extirpation in manhood, boyhood, in the very womb. And such, mutatis mutandis, was the situation of the scattered Kirghiz tribes themselves, dangerously hemmed in as they were on their high pastures by the Chinese, the Kalmik, the Khokanders and the Russians. The "Noghay" of mid-19th century Kirghiz epic are, as were the Kirghiz themselves, only superficially touched by Islam, their treacherous Kalmik antagonist least even by the Kazak Beshkirs. The plots of the various self-contained episodes of the abstraction Manas that were recorded in 1856-69 are clear-cut, stark and existential. The style is rapid, graphic and abounding in beautifully-structured epithets and formulae aimed at connoisseurs. It provides a touchstone by which the published 20th-century material, despite its enrichment by Persian narrative poetry and the European novel, must be pronounced inflated, distorted and, qua epic, decadent.


 contrasts, in Deutung und Bedeutung. Studies ... presented to Karl-Werner Maurer, ed. Brigitte Schladern et

 the Italian poet, for Bitola, in 'Turcica', 1974, 237-60; Plot and character in mid-nineteenth-century Kirghiz epic, in Die mongolischen Epen, Asiatische Forschungen, Bd. 68, Wiesbaden 1979, 95-112; The marriage, death and return to life of Manas: a Kirghiz poem of the mid-nineteenth century, Turcica, xii


 Al-Manasir, Banu (sing. Al-Mansuri), the name of half-a-dozen tribes, or branches of a single tribe, residing in eastern and southern Arabia, Irak, Jordan, the Sudan and Algeria. The Arabian tribe or branch, at least, claim descent from Kahtan through Ghwaynim, and they are thus, in the Arabic genealogical scheme, al-Arab al-'Irabi, or true Arabs. Both they and the Jordanian branch boast of having been originally Christian, hence the derivation of the name from Nasarä. Presumably therefore, the tribe originated in the Yemen, although the name does not appear in any of the South Arabian genealogical works.

 Little has been written about those residing in the Fertile Crescent or in the Sudan, aside from the statements that those in Jordan (al-Balka) are affiliated with the Banu Dhurumiya and those in Irak with the large and important Banu Shammar. In Algeria, the al-Manasir, living along the coast between Tenes and Cherchell, have apparently been Berberised.

 In eastern and southern Arabia, the Banu 'l-Manasir share the entire southern edge of the Rubü al-Kalhi from the border of 'Unan to Nadjran, a distance of about a thousand miles, with the Banu Murra, noted, until modernisation, for their particularly fine herds of camels. Although supporters of the Su'di family, the al-Manasir are not Wahhabis and follow the Mâliki school of law.


 MANASTIR. The name Manastir (Greek monas-

 tiroon) is not an uncommon toponym (cf. Goljman Manastir in Bulgaria and Manastir near Beyshir in Turkey). However, it usually occurs as the Turkish designation for the modern town of Bitola in the Socialist Republic of Macedonia in Yugoslavia. Bitola is situated near the site of the ancient town of
Heraclea where the eastern foothills of the 2,601m. high Mt. Pelister merge in the old style and published in various newspapers and periodicals, his sira and Kisas-l enbiya\(^\text{a}\) in verse and his statistical data of the town under Ottoman rule are extant only since the seventh decade of the century, and only last (as far as is known) until the seventh or eighth decade of the following 10th/16th century (M. Sokoloski, Turski izvorni podatoci od XV i XVI sek za gradit Bitola, in Glasnik INI, viii [1963], 127-56; idem (ed.), Turski dokumenti za istorijata na makedonskot narod. Otpori popisni defteri od XV sek, i, Turks dokumenti za makedonsko istdtistik-i ^umumisi, 5 vols. Skopje 1973, 141-5). The sigduls of the kaflis of Manastir, which offer a penetrating view into almost all aspects of urban life, document the period from 1016/1607 to the end of Ottoman rule in Macedonia (1912) and beyond. They also witness the development of Manastir first into a residence of the walis of Rümeli (in the course of the second half of the 12/18th century), and then to the official residence of the provincial governor (1725-1800). The walis of Rümeli which was redefined in 1836 (M. Sokoloski, A. Starova, V. Boškov and F. Ishak (eds.), Turks dokumenti za istorijata na makedonskot narod, Serija proa: 1607-1699, 4 vols. Skopje 1963-72; i-7, 1627-35, iii (1636-9), iv (1640-2); A. Matkovski (ed.), Turski izori za ajdutstvoto i aramistvoto vo Makedonija, 3 vols. Skopje 1961-80; i (1650-1700), iii (1700-25), iv (1725-75), v (1775-1810); P. Dlambazovski, and A. Starova (eds.) Skopje 1951-8: i (1800-3), ii (1803-8), iii (1809-17), iv (1818-27), v (1827-39). In addition, documents from the archives of the metropolitan of Manastir pertaining to the first half of the 13th/19th century have been published (I. Snegarov, Gručki kodeks na Pelagonejska mitropolija/Griechische Kodexe der Pelagonischen Metropolie, in Godnšk na Sofiskija universitet, Bogoslovski fakultet, xxv [Soﬁa 1948], 2-20. Since the beginning of the 13th/19th century, when numerous European consulates were established in Manastir, consular reports comprise one of the most important historical sources. As a result of its importance, Manastir became the capital of a vilayet of the same name in 1874 and again in 1879 (A. Birken, Die Provinzen des Osmanischen Reiches, Wiesbaden 1976, 71 f.). Its population in 1900 was 37,000, and in 1971, 65,035 (M. Panov, Geograﬁja na SR Makedonija, i, Skopje 1976, 303).

**Bibliography:** A first, uncritical, sketch of the history of Manastir from its beginning is given by Mehmed Tewfik, Manastir vilayetinin tarihçesi ve i\(\text{t}^\text{i}st\)at\(\text{k}^\text{\imath}\)i "um\(\text{a}\)m\(\text{\imath}\)ti, Manastir 1327/1909, Serbo-Croat tr. Glisa Elezovic, Kratka istorija biološkog vilaje\(\text{t}^\text{n}\), in Bratstvo, xxvii (1955), 190-244. Although no comprehensive, scientific treatment of Manastir’s history has been undertaken as yet, a general abstract, based in part on more recent research, has been undertaken by Apostolos E. Vakalopoulos, History of Macedonia 1534-1833, Thessaloniki 1973 (cf. index s.v. "Manastir"). The first, tentative, contributions to a bibliography of "Bitola and environs up to World War I" have been begun by Koço Sidovski, Prilog kon bibliografijata za Bitola i Bitolsko do pravta svetka voina, in Istoriija, ix/6 (Skopje 1973), 264-70; x/1 (1974), 405-8; x/2 (1974), 571-3; xii/1-2 (1976), 329-7. (M. URSINUS)

**MANA\(\text{\imath}\)STIRLI MEHMED RIF\(\text{\imath}\)T (1851-1907),** Ottoman Turkish officer, writer, poet and playwright of the younger Tanzim\(\text{\imath}\)it generation. Born in Monastir [see MANASTIR], son of a regimental secretary and inspector of schools. During the Crimean War situation on the old Via Egnatia even before it was conquered by Tim\(\text{\imath}\)r\(\text{\imath}\)t Pasha in the eighth decade of the 8th/14th century. While documents pertaining to the history of the town under Ottoman rule are extant from as early as the first half of the 9th/15th century (H. Kalez\(\text{i}, Najstarija arapska vakufnama u Jugoslaviji, in POF, v-xii [1961], 55-75), statistical data reflecting the development of Manastir are extant only since the seventh decade of the century, and only last (as far as is known) until the seventh or eighth decade of the following 10th/16th century (M. Sokoloski, Turski izvorni podatoci od XV i XVI sek za gradit Bitola, in Glasnik INI, viii [1963], 127-56; idem (ed.), Turski dokumenti za istorijata na makedonskot narod. Otpori popisni defteri od XV sek, i, Turks dokumenti za makedonsko istdtistik-i ^umumisi, 5 vols. Skopje 1973, 141-5). The sigduls of the kaflis of Manastir, which offer a penetrating view into almost all aspects of urban life, document the period from 1016/1607 to the end of Ottoman rule in Macedonia (1912) and beyond. They also witness the development of Manastir first into a residence of the walis of Rümeli (in the course of the second half of the 12/18th century), and then to the official residence of the provincial governor (1725-1800). The walis of Rümeli which was redefined in 1836 (M. Sokoloski, A. Starova, V. Boškov and F. Ishak (eds.), Turks dokumenti za istorijata na makedonskot narod, Serija proa: 1607-1699, 4 vols. Skopje 1963-72; i-7, 1627-35, iii (1636-9), iv (1640-2); A. Matkovski (ed.), Turski izori za ajdutstvoto i aramistvoto vo Makedonija, 3 vols. Skopje 1961-80; i (1650-1700), iii (1700-25), iv (1725-75), v (1775-1810); P. Dlambazovski, and A. Starova (eds.) Skopje 1951-8: i (1800-3), ii (1803-8), iii (1809-17), iv (1818-27), v (1827-39). In addition, documents from the archives of the metropolitan of Manastir pertaining to the first half of the 13th/19th century have been published (I. Snegarov, Gručki kodeks na Pelagonejska mitropolija/Griechische Kodexe der Pelagonischen Metropolie, in Godnšk na Sofiskija universitet, Bogoslovski fakultet, xxv [Soﬁa 1948], 2-20. Since the beginning of the 13th/19th century, when numerous European consulates were established in Manastir, consular reports comprise one of the most important historical sources. As a result of its importance, Manastir became the capital of a vilayet of the same name in 1874 and again in 1879 (A. Birken, Die Provinzen des Osmanischen Reiches, Wiesbaden 1976, 71 f.). Its population in 1900 was 37,000, and in 1971, 65,035 (M. Panov, Geograﬁja na SR Makedonija, i, Skopje 1976, 303).

**Bibliography:** A first, uncritical, sketch of the history of Manastir from its beginning is given by Mehmed Tewfik, Manastir vilayetinin tarihçesi ve i\(\text{t}^\text{i}st\)at\(\text{k}^\text{\imath}\)i "um\(\text{a}\)m\(\text{\imath}\)ti, Manastir 1327/1909, Serbo-Croat tr. Glisa Elezovic, Kratka istorija biološkog vilaje\(\text{t}^\text{n}\), in Bratstvo, xxvii (1955), 190-244. Although no comprehensive, scientific treatment of Manastir’s history has been undertaken as yet, a general abstract, based in part on more recent research, has been undertaken by Apostolos E. Vakalopoulos, History of Macedonia 1534-1833, Thessaloniki 1973 (cf. index s.v. "Manastir"). The first, tentative, contributions to a bibliography of “Bitola and environs up to World War I” have been begun by Koço Sidovski, Prilog kon bibliografijata za Bitola i Bitolsko do pravta svetka voina, in Istoriija, ix/6 (Skopje 1973), 264-70; x/1 (1974), 405-8; x/2 (1974), 571-3; xii/1-2 (1976), 329-7. (M. URSINUS)
verse translations of many Arabic and Persian kasidas, etc., have not been collected into book form. His other poems, mostly of a personal nature, which he collected in a small divan (divanec) remain unedited. Manastirli Rifat is mainly remembered because of his remarkable contribution to the Turkish theatre in writing, translating and adapting many plays. Some of these plays were written in collaboration with this close friend, Hasan Bedreddin (later Paşa) [q.v. in Suppl.].

Although it is customary to begin the modern Turkish theatre with İbrahim Şinasi’s Şhe’er eserleri (1859), there may probably be many indications that this date should be adopted (see Fahir Iz, Pabuçcu Ahmed in gərgin maceraları, Istanbul 1961, and Metin And, 100 soruda Türk tiyatrosu, Istanbul 1970). However, modern Turkish theatre had a speedy development soon after Şinasi’s play, and reached the proportions of a boom, particularly in the late 1860s and early 1870s, one which lasted until the inauguration of the anti-lirical, reactionary period after 1878. Nâmis Kemal, Şenreddin (Shems al-Din) Sâmi, Ali Bey, Ahmed Wefik Paşa, Teodor Kâsâb and others contributed to this activity. Early modern plays were considerably inspired by the Turkish traditional or folk theatre (Karaköz, Orta oyunu, Meddah [q.v.] and ) to some extent, the techniques of French comedy and farce (Molière being the favourite author). Often Western (mainly French) plays were translated or adapted.

Manastirli Rifat and Hasan Bedreddin joined this movement and published together, in fascicles, between 1875 and 1879, 16 plays, under the general title Temâszî ("Spectacle"), which eventually made up two volumes (Vol. i, fasc. 1-9; vol. ii, fasc. 1-7) of nearly a thousand pages. The majority of these plays, including two comic-operas and one opera-bouffe, of little interest, are translations from the French or via the French. The following 7 plays are original: Vol. i, Fasc. 2, Delîle yahut kântî intikâm ("Delîle or bloody vengeance"), 1875, an historical drama of Eastern Anatolia; fasc. 4, Ebu l-’Ali yahut maviüret ("Abû l-’Ali or humaneness"), 1875, a play on Islamic history; fasc. 6, Ebu l-Fidâî ("Abû l-Fidâî"); a comic opera, in three acts, 1875; fasc. 7, Nâdâmet ("Repentance"), 1875, a comedy; Vol. ii, fasc. 1, Kulemler, a historical drama in five acts; fasc. 4, Fakire yahut mûkâfâât-i îfsît ("The poor girl, or the reward of virtue"), 1876; fasc. 6, Ahmed-i yetim yahut natsiğî-yi sadakât ("Ahmed the orphan, or the result of loyalty"), 1879, an historical drama of the Egypt under the Ťulûnids.

All these plays were performed in the famous Gedik Paşa Theatre in Istanbul. Apart from these plays, written in collaboration, Manastirli Rifat published the following plays independently: Görenek ("Social practice, custom"), 1873, social criticism satirising over-lavish weddings, where families try to outdo one another; Oghmân Ghażî, 1873, Ya ghazi yâ shehid, 1874, two patriotic plays, possibly inspired by the enthusiastic reception of the performance of Nâmis Kemal’s famous Watan ("Fatherland"), which caused such a furor at the time; and Psâdâmên ("The chastest one") which seems to have been inspired by Reçâjâr’s Ekrem’s [q.v.] Afsî Anfelîk (1870), with non-Turkish dramatis personae, about a married woman’s resistance to the valet’s overtures during her husband’s absence. Manastirli Rifat’s other works worth mentioning include: Meğdâmî el-edeb, in four volumes, 1890, a detailed treatise on the art of literature, rhetoric, poetry, prose, etc., and Hıkâyât-i man tâkhabî ("Selected stories"), 1876, a striking example of the spoken Turkish of the time used as written Turkish.


MANât, name of one of the most ancient deities of the Semitic pantheon, who appears in the Pre-Sargonic period in the form Menûmûm and constitutes one of the names of Ishtar (J. Bottéro, Les divinités sémitiques anciennes en Mésopotamie, in S. Moscati (ed.), Le antiche divinità semitiche, 30; Tallqvist, Götterglaube, 373-4); the Kur'ânic scriptio of her name preserves the primitive Âw, which also appears in the Nabatean manûtu (Lizbarski, Handbuch, 319; Wellhausen, Reste, 28). The word changes to i in the Bible (Isa. lxv, 11), as in the Sailler IV papyri, verso, i, 5-6 (in J.B. Pritchard, Ancient Near Eastern Texts relating to the Old Testament, Princeton 1950, 250), where Menî is presented as a Semitic deity forming part of "the Ennead which is in the house of Pharaoh." The difference of gender poses no obstacle to this identification, due to the fact that the i is not radical in the two forms and that the Arabic sources regard it as a feminine termination referring to sakhrû, the stone or rock emboding the deity (cf. Yâkût, iv, 652, 1. 15; Tâl, x, 351 in fine; Ibn al-Kalbi speaks of Manât in the masculine (K. al-Anâm, ed. and Fr. tr. W. Atallah, Paris 1969, 9), thinking in this case of ٢٧٢١. Originally, the two names had the root mwî which is to be found in all Semitic languages with the meaning of "to count", "to apportion", being applied in particular to the idea of "to count the days of life", hence death (manîya), and "to assign to each his share", hence, lot, destiny (cf. C. Bezold, Babylonisch-Assyrisches Glossar, ed. Görze, Heidelberg 1926, 176; Gesenius-Buhl, Hebräisches und aramäisches Handwörterbuch über das Alte Testament, Berlin 1949, 436 ff.; TA, x, 347 ff.; Yâkût, iv, 652).

The Greco-Roman equivalents given to Manât testify to this meaning, since she is identified with Tōxâ or the Fortuna, the dual respectively the form Manâwât (a false plural used for the dual manawûn (Yâkût, iv, 652, 1.12), as in Thamudic, where she is called st stîm "the Lady of Peace", see A. van den Branden, Les inscriptions thamoudiennes, 110 (Haber, 195), and in Nabatean (CIS 198). In Palmyra she is represented on a mosaic, seated and holding a sceptre in her hand, after the fashion of Nemesis, goddess of destiny (J. Starky, Palmyre, Paris 1952, 103 and pl. xii, nos. 5 and 6).

Lîkâl-l-Lât [q.v.] and al-’Uzzâ [q.v.] who form with her the Arab triad (Kur’ân, LIII, 19-20), Manât was worshipped by all the Arabs. It was [originally] a rock for Hudhayl in Kudayd (Yâkût, iv, 652, 1.15 f.), ‘Amr b. Luḥayy [q.v.], who substituted for the cult of belters that of idols, erected for her, in Kudayd, a statue imported from the north, like that of Hubâl [q.v.]. The sacred site of al-Mushallal in Kudayd, about 15 km. from Yathrib, became the gathering place of the Awa’s and Khazraj’, who were the most ardent worshippers of Manât, to such an extent that they considered their pilgrimage to Mecca as incomplete if they had not been to her to shave their
heads. All the tribes of the surrounding area took part in her cult. Before the arrival of the Aws and Khazraj, coming from the south, she was worshiped by the Hedjâhî who led a nomadic life in the region of Yathrib and by the Khuhî‘a in that of Mecca.

Also, from being a simple rock in Kudayd, the third divinity of the Arab triad, following the normal evolution process, ended up by being sculpted to suit the root from which she derives her name, representing one of the faces of the Asiatic Venus, i.e. Fortune, who, according to the testimony of Pausanias (vi, 24, 9), was represented on the banks of the Euphrates. Al-Lált, with whom Manät shared the title of Tāgîyâ (Yâkût, i, 236, 1,11), and al-Uzza represented the two others volets of the triptych.

The destruction of the sanctuary of Manât in Kudayd gave rise to a legend of the same interpretation as that which is associated with the destruction of al-Uzza (cf. T. Fahd, Panthéon, 173).

Sa‘d b. Zayd al-Ashâril (Ibn Sa‘d, i/i, 106, and al-Tahâri, p. 1649), whereas Yâkût states that it was 'Ali b. Tâlib who found in his treasury the two famous swords, Mikhdâm and Rasûb, which Ibn Sa‘d, ii/1, 118, places in the treasury of al-Fals), ordered by the Prophet to go to destroy Manât, in the year 8/629, accompanied by twenty horsemen, appeared before the sâdîn and announced to him her intention to destroy her. "Go on!" he said to him in an ironic tone. Sa‘d went towards her and at once saw a nude black woman rise up with her hair disheveled, uttering curses and beating her breast. The sâdîn called out: "Come on! O Manân, show the anger of which you are capable!". Sa‘d began to beat her to death; then he approached the idol with his companions and they destroyed it.


(1. T. Fahd) MANÂZGERD (see MALÂZGERD)

AL-MANÀZIL (A. or more fully manâzîl al-kamar, the lunar mansions, or stations of the moon (sing. manazîl or manzion), a system of 28 stars, groups of stars, or spots in the sky near which the moon is found in each of the 28 nights of her monthly revolution.

The system seems to be of Indian origin (see Scherer; Pingree [1] and [2]; Billard). Babylonian origin has sometimes been suggested (cf. Hommel), but could never be established from the documents. The 'stars in the moon's path', in the old APIN text (cf. van der Waerdens [11], 77; recently re-dated to 2300 B.C. cf. van der Waerdens [2]) are 17 or 18 in number and rather represent an early stage in the development of the zodiac. The system of the lunar mansions was adopted by the Arabs, through channels as yet unknown, some time in the pre-Islamic period, since the term manâzîl is already mentioned in the Qur’an (X, 5; XXXVI,39). To the single mansions, the Arabs applied names already found with them previously, and originally used to designate their anâzîl (see anawâ). A complete list of the 28 mansions is reported by 'Abd al-Malik b. Ḥabîb (d. 238/852) on the authority of Mâlik b. Anas (d. 179/793); nearly contemporary to this is the list drawn up by the astronomer al-Farghânî. Items of information concerning the lunar mansions were collected by the Arabic philologists in their kutub al-anawâ (see the printed works of Ibn Kuthayr al-Mazrâkhî, Ibn Sîdâ, Muhammad al-Muṣripî, al-Kazwînî, Ibn al-Adjamâbî, Ibn Manzûr/ al-Tîfâshî, and Aḥmad b. Mâdjîd), and by astronomers, who took pains in identifying these mansions astronomically (see al-Farghânî, al-Battânî, al-Sûfî, al-Bîrûnî, and [1], [2], and [3]). Whereas the scientific astronomers of the Arabic-Islamic period did not apparently use the lunar mansions, these apparently were of some importance for the distribution of the ecliptic (besides of the zodiac) in earlier times. Later, they were often used by astrologers and others for different systems of divination (see e.g. Picaei, and 'Ali b. Abî l-Rîjâl; cf. also Savage-Smith, for the lunar mansions in relation to geomancy). Hence they were engraved, found with other calendric and astronomical items, on the back of many Islamic and some western astrological works (cf. Hartner, 2549 f.; Michel, 42; Mayer, pls. XV, XVII, XX, XXII-XXV).

Through Latin translations of Arabic works, the list of the 28 lunar mansions and their Arabic names known to mediaeval Europe from the late 10th century onwards (see Millâs, 251 ff.), and, later, were much used for divinatory purposes (see e.g. Strinckwet, Vian, Svenberg, Weidemann, Lutz and Müller). Lists of the 28 lunar mansions, with their Arab names, have also been penetrated Byzantine astrological texts (see CCAG).

The names of the 28 mansions, and their astronomical identifications, are as follows (for the names, see the individual entries in Kunstich [1], where sources and further details are given):

1. al-hâratîn (also: al-nathîr, byr, or bys Arietis.
2. al-kutayn, bô Arietis.
3. al-sheriyya, the Pleiades.
4. al-tabdân, a Tauri.
5. al-hakîa, aPôries (according to the Almagest, one nebulous object, the first star of Orion; but registered as three individual stars by al-Bîrûnî [3]. Alternatively also, al-masânîn, which properly would be one of the two stars of no. 6.
7. al-hurîn, aPô Geminiorum. There is confusion in the sources as to whether this hurîn is al-hurîn al-mâkihâ or al-hurîn al-masânîn.
8. al-nathîr, a Cancri, or γb Cancri (Ibn Kuthayr, and al-Bîrûnî [3]).
9. al-safîr, b Cancri + Κ Leonis.
10. al-sheriyya, ζ Geminorum (included with this station is the star a Leonis, "Regulus", which had no individual name in the classical Arabic star lore).
11. al-zubrî (also: al-hanîn), bô Leonis.
12. al-sarfâ, b Leonis.
13. al-âsâfsâ, a Virginis, sometimes b Virginis is also added to these.
14. al-sîmâk (i.e. al-simâk al-asâl), a Virginis.
16. al-zubâna, a Libræa.
17. al-shir, bô Scorpii.
18. al-kalb, a Scorpii.
19. al-sahrâla, bô Scorpii. Sometimes, al-siba, or bôr al-shrub, is given as an alternative designation, but some authors refer this name to a different ob-
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ject, viz. the nebulous cluster following behind alshawla, i.e. M 7 Scorpii.
20. al-na^im, the two groups of four stars each,
y&eri + <J9T£ Sagittarii; alternatively, al-wasl, the
space between these two groups.
21. al-balda, a region void of stars, between stations
nos. 20 and 22.
22. sacd al-dhdbih, a M v[3 Capricorni.
23. sa^d bulac, \it Aquarii, to which some authors add
Fl. 7, or v Aquarii, as a third star.
24. sacd al-sucud, f>% Aquarii + c1 Capricorni.
26. al-fargh al-mukaddam (also al-fargh al-awwat), oc[3
Pegasi.
27. al-fargh al-mu^akhkhar (also al-fargh al-thdni},^
Pegasi + a Andromedae.
28. batn al-hut (also al-rishd^). (3 Andromedae.
Some authors additionally register the names of
some stars, or spots in the sky, near which the moon
is seen when failing to reach her proper mansion,
whereas the interstices between two mansions,
generally, are called furdja (see Ibn Kutayba, 86; alMarzuki, 196 f.; Ibn Slda, 12; Ibn ManzGr, 1800 =
al-TTfashi, 205; al-Blrunl [1], 351 f., tr. 353 f.).
The knowledge of the 28 lunar mansions has lived
on into modern times, and agricultural calendars
formed according to them are still today found in
various regions of the Arabic-speaking world and its
neighbourhood (cf. Landberg, Cerulli, Monteil, Serjeant, Hiskett, Galaal, and the literature cited there;
less so consistent are the observations reported by C.
Bailey, q.v.). Such calendars are already known from
mediaeval times (see Liber anoe [ = Kitdb al-anwd^,
Spain, 961 A.D.; translated into Latin by Gerard of
Cremona], and Ibn al-Banna?); they appear to continue older astro-agricultural traditions as paralleled
in Ptolemy's Phaseis and the Babylonian mul APIN
texts.
Bibliography : 1. A r a b i c s o u r c e s : cAbd alMalik b. Hablb, Risdla fi ma^rifat al-nuajum, ms. Ait
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Campani, Alfragano: II "libro dell'aggregazione delle
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al-Mukhassas, ix, Cairo 1319, 9 ff.; al-Kazwinl,
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Les mansions lunaires des arabes, ed. and tr. A. de C.
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1933, see i,4; German tr. H. Ritter and M.
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Sinai and the Negev, in BSOAS, xxxvii (1974), 580-96;
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practice of Somali weather lore, astronomy, and astrology,
Mogadishu 1968; W. Hartner, The principle and use
of the astrolabe, in A.U. Pope (ed.), A survey of Persian
art, Oxford 1938-9, iii, 2530 ff. (repr. separately as
Astrolabica, no. 1, Paris 1978); M. Hiskett, The Arab
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MANAZIR, or 'ILM AL-MANAZIR, the science of optics. The term al-manazir (pl. of a. manzar or manzara, from nazar, "to look at") was used by the Arabic translators of Greek scientific writings as equivalent to ῥαξυξα, optics or the theory of vision. The feminine manzara in the sense of "aspect" or "appearance" (the way a thing or a group of things looks) is attested in al-Šāmilī fī wuz al-dīn al-tairi, where the plural manzārīn is also used in the same sense (ed. A.S. al-Nashšārī et alii, Alexandria 1969, esp. 476-7, 479, 483-4).

The kalām literature, to which al-Djuwayni’s al-Šāmilī belongs, adopted ḥuyūl both for the light rays emanating, for example, from the sun, and for the visual rays (i.e. rays emanating from the eye) which, according to Mu’tazili and Ash’āri kalām, were the vehicles of vision (see the relevant sections in al-Kādi ‘Abd al-Dżabbār’s al-Mughni, iv (Ru’ya al-Bārī’), ed. M.M. Hilmi and Abu 1-Wafa al-Tażāzāni, Cairo 1963, esp. 59-79). However, in the medical literature deriving from Galen, we find the word manazir used in the sense of visual rays (Galen’s ὀξύς), and it is in this sense that Hunayn b. Ishākh speaks of "the reflection (maksiār) of al-manazir" (cf. M. Meyerhof, The book of the ten treaties of the eye ascribed to Hunain ibn Iṣḥāq (809-977 A.D.), Cairo 1928, Ar. text 109; Meyerhof translated manazir here as “images” — see p. 36 of his English translation in the same volume — but cf. the Arabic version of Galen’s De usu partium, Excerpta ms. 850, fol. 29b). It may be noted that the Greek writers on optics, Hero, Euclid, Heron and Theon, used ὀξύς and ἀκραύλιον interchangeable to designate visual rays (cf. A. Leujeune, Euclide et Ptoleme, Louvain 1948, 18-21).

In the scheme of the sciences inherited by mediaeval Islamic scholars from the Greeks, optics was considered a mathematical science. But Aristotle had already characterised optics as one of "the more physical of the mathematical disciplines," a group of enquiries which also included astronomy and harmonics (Physica, i.2). And although Euclid’s book on Optics (ca. 300 B.C.) was formulated almost exclusively in geometrical terms, physical, physiological and even psychological elements tended increasingly to mingle with geometrical considerations in the writings of later Hellenistic mathematicians. Thus for example, Hero of Alexandria (1st century A.D.) compared the reflection of visual rays to the behaviour of projectiles when they strike a hard surface (cf. his Catoptrica, iii, in Heronis von Alexandria Mechanik und Katoptrik, ed. and German tr. L. Nix and W. Schmidt (Heronis Alexandrini opera quae supersunt omnia, i, Leipzig 1900), 322-5). The (lost) first book of Ptolemy’s Optics (2nd century A.D.) expounded a theory of luminous radiation as distinguished from the emission of visual rays; the same work dealt with binocular as well as monocular vision; and it mentioned a certain discorritio (or retigita), a psychological faculty to which was assigned a certain vague role in visual perception (cf. L’ Optique de Claude Ptolémée dans la version latine d’après l’œuvre d’Emile Eugène de Sicile, édition critique et exégétique, Albert Lejeune, Louvain 1965, index and 22, n. 22; and 62, n. 81).

In the Islamic period, this tendency shows itself early in a work by Abū Yāṣūf Ya’qūb b. Iṣḥāk al-Kindī (3rd/9th century [q.v.]), which survives in a 12th century Latin translation entitled De aspectibus (Al-Kindī, Tidus and Pseudo-Euclid: drei optische Werke, ed. A.A. Björnbo and S. Vogl, Leipzig and Berlin 1912 [A. Aboul foqawent Lejeune, Vor der Geschichte der Mathematischen Wissenschaften mit Einschluss ihrer Anwendungen, Heft, XXVI, 3]). Here al-Kindī considers optics to be a mathematical science (ars doctrinaris: ʾilmin tarbiyya), but on one which must satisfy physical as well as geometrical principles (ibid., 3); and he opens his book with a treatment of rectilinear light radiation and the formation of shadows, thus departing from Euclid’s presentation but in agreement with Ptolemy and, it appears, Theron of Alexandria (see the Introduction to Theron’s Recension of Euclid’s Optics in Euclides Optica, Opticorum recension Thomei, Catoptrica, cum scholiis antiquis, ed. I. L. Heiberg, Leipzig 1895, 144 ff.; French. tr. P. Ver Eecke, in Euclide: l’Optique et la Catoptrique, Paris 1959, 53 ff.).

With Ibn al-Haytham [q.v.] in the 5th/11th century, we reach an entirely new stage in the conception of the nature of optics. His great Kitāb al-Manazir ("Book of Optics", of which several manuscripts are extant) begins with the assertion that optics is a synthetic branch of inquiry that combines mathematical and physical considerations. But this was not merely to continue the trend that had already started in late antiquity. Ibn al-Haytham’s position implied a complete break with the visual-ray hypothesis which had been consistently maintained by the entire mathematical tradition from Euclid to al-Kindī and by the medical tradition of Galen and his Islamic followers. Ibn al-Haytham opted instead for the view of "physicists" (tabībṣayn) or natural philosophers, according to which vision consisted in the eye’s reception of a form (ṣūra) emanating from the object seen. But again, this was not a mere imitation, and his theory was the first attempt to treat this view mathematically. The result was, therefore, not only a new doctrine of vision, but also a new methodology. In other words, Ibn al-Haytham was led to formulate problems which either would not have made sense from the standpoint of the visual-ray theory or had been ignored by philosophers aiming primarily to give an account of what vision is rather than an explanation of how it takes place.

Ibn al-Haytham was also convinced that an intramission explanation of visual perception was essentially incomplete without a theory of the psychology of perception, and he accordingly devotes a considerable part of his K. al-Manazir to such a theory. His argument is that since the eye can only receive impressions of the light and colour in the visible object, all other properties of the object, including the fact that it is situated in outer space, must somehow be "inferred" from the received visual material. His theory then consists in describing the models of inference (kāyā) which the "faculty of judgement" (al-kawāna al-nanaghyya) employs in achieving the perception of such visual properties (ma’ānī maḥṣara) as distance, size, shape, opacity, transparency, beauty—in fact, all properties other than light and colour as such. Ibn al-Haytham wrote substantial treatises on the burning sphere and burning mirrors of various
shapes, on the formation of shadows, on camera obscura phenomena and on the halo and the rainbow. Yet none of these phenomena is treated in the Kitab al-Manazir. The book thus illustrates a restricted conception of the phenomenon of light and color. The influence of Ibn al-Haytham's book upon later writers on optics both in the Muslim world and (through a mediaeval Latin translation) in the West can hardly be exaggerated.

It is remarkable that two centuries-and-a-half had to elapse before the Optics of Ibn al-Haytham began to exert any appreciable influence in the Islamic world, by which time the book had already made a deep impression in Europe (especially on Roger Bacon, John Pecham and Witelo). Towards the end of the 13th century, the Persian Kamal al-Din al-Farisi [q.v.] rescued the Optics from near oblivion by writing a large and critical commentary on it, entitled Tanbih al-Manazir bi-dhawi 'l-absdr wa 'l-basd^ir. In this work, Kamal al-Din went beyond discussion of the matters treated in the K. al-Manazir, adding, among other things, recensions (sing. tahrib) of Ibn al-Haytham's treatises "On the halo and the rainbow", "On the burning sphere", "On the formation of shadows" and "On the shape of the eclipse". We have here, then, a book on optics that is not entirely restricted to questions related directly or indirectly to vision. And yet the book does not include a discussion of burning mirrors, a subject which Ibn al-Haytham had thought fit to include in a (non-extant) treatise "On optics, according to the method of Ptolemy". (As for gnomon shadows, these were generally considered a separate subject to be treated in a separate category of writings sometimes referred to as Kutub al-AzAlI, "books on shadows.") But the narrow conception of optics proved tenacious; when in the 10th/16th century Taki al-Din Ibn Ma'ruf (d. 993/1585) wrote his Nur hadakat al-'ibar wa-nur hadakat al-abjar (Bodleian ms. Marsh 119) for the Ottoman sultan Murad III, he based himself directly on Kamal al-Din's Tanbih. But rather than include the topics appended by the Persian mathematician to his commentary on Ibn al-Haytham's K. al-Manazir, he limited himself to the subjects treated in the earlier work.

**Bibliography:** In addition to works, cited in the article, see the bibliography to the Arabic-Latin translation. An English translation of Ibn al-Haytham's K. al-Manazir is forthcoming. (A. I. SABRA)
Manbidj

Nahr Sadjur and on the Syrian Higher Euphrates, published in Holocene settlement in North Syria by Paul Sanlaville and others in the BAR International Series, Oxford 1985, no. S 238. Under the Umayyads, a section of the Banū Taghilī [q. v.] settled on the east bank of the Euphrates and led a nomadic existence near Manbidj, although the bulk of the tribe was established between the Khābūr [q. v.], the Euphrates and the Tigris. They were to distinguish themselves at the end of the 7th/13th century in the struggle against the Tatars. Palgrave (Narrative, London 1865, i, 118) mentions in the region the presence of a modern tribe, the Shammar, who are said to be related to the Banū Taghilī. According to A. Musil (Middle Euphrates, 281), the tribe of the Tarleb (sic) was still leading a nomadic existence at the beginning of the 20th century in the arid plain between Manbidj, Rusafa and the heights of the Qabar Bishrī.

After having been "the mustering point of the Roman expeditions directed against the Sasanid Empire which followed the route of the Euphrates", the latter being a military communication route parallel to the river on the western bank, Manbidj was an important centre of the lines of Chalcis, linked to Aleppo by a Roman causeway, before becoming the capital of the Araiṣīm in the ʿAbbasid Golden Age. In the Middle Ages, it continued to play an important strategic and military role as a bulwark against invasions from the east. The town being not only a staging-post, but also a major road-connection to the west of the Euphrates, on the route which maintained connections between the Mediterranean world and the Asiatic world, between the valley of the Orontes and that of the Euphrates.

A further crossing-point was further south at Ayn Taby (Edessa), opening into the Euphrates. From this point a single stage to the east, as far as the region of Balisāk and, in particular, three junctions leading to routes from northern Syria towards the Djazīrah. At the confluence of the Balīth and the Euphrates, Manbidj was reached from Halab in two days’ journey, passing through Bāb and crossing the Wādī Būtnān [q. v.], a distance of ten farasākhs [q. v.] (approximately 80 km.). From this point a single stage (marhala) remained to be covered. Yākūt gives a figure of three farasākhs to arrive at Qāṣir Manbidj, where the Euphrates could be crossed by means of a bridge of boats, a crossing made today by ferry-boat. From Manbidj, "Ayānī, Kirmīsh (Cyrrhus) could be reached in two days and Malaya in four.

It seems that the darb sulṭānīyya, which passed through Manbidj on the way to ʿIrāk, changed direction at the end of the 8th/14th century, crossing the Euphrates at the latitude of Sīflīn and Rākkā [q. v.], and the route was shifted further to the south. At the beginning of the 20th century, as Franz Cumont testifies, "caravans or ʿarabās [q. v.] setting out towards Ourfā (Edessa) and Mossoul still pass through Manbidj towards the same crossing, where ferry-boats transport them to the left bank of the Euphrates."

Manbidj was again in the Assyrian Empire on its way from Hamā towards the north-east. Protected against the Franks by Bārīn, Fāmīya and Kafar Tāb, it permitted access to Djiāzīra by way of Manbidj, avoiding Halab.

Today, the road from Halab to Manbidj, via Bāb (78 km.) is well-asphalted, as is that leading from Manbidj to Djarablus (37 km.), where the Euphrates is crossed by a metal bridge.

Shortly before the reign of Alexander the Great, in the 4th century B.C., the town was in the hands of a dynasty surnamed ʿAbd Ḥadād (= worshipper of Ḥadād, the god of thunder), who had coinage struck there. For a long period of Antiquity, Manbidj was a religious centre dedicated to the cults of Atargatis and her consort Hadrāt. In the Byzantine period, Manbidj played an important military role in countering invasions from the east. The Greeks endowed it with a double rampart and a temple owning an important treasure, which Crassus sacked before setting out with his legions to fight the Parthians and dying, the victim of an assassin, in 53 B.C.

From the 3rd century onwards, through the good offices of Septimus Severus, the town became, in its role as a bulwark against the Sasanid Persians, one of the principal bases of the "lines of Chalcis". From there, in 363, Julian the Apostate led an expedition against Ctesiphon, in the course of which he was mortally wounded.

Manbidj was part of the Cyrrhestian province, before being promoted by Constantine II, in the middle of the 4th century, to the status of capital of Euphrates Syria. In A.D. 451, the campaign against Manbidj was Stephen of Hierapolis. At the end of the 5th century there lived there an innovative theologian, the Monophysite bishop Philoxenus of Mabbuh, who had a Syriac translation made of the New Testament and published a commentary to it; he died in exile in Thrace in 523. In April 531, Kawāḏ, Emperor of Persia, occupied Hierapolis; Belisarius arrived to resist the invasion and in the same year inflicted a defeat on the Sasanid army at Callinicos, near the confluence of the Balkh and the Euphrates. In 532, Kīrā Asnūrīān, the new Persian sovereign, offered Justinian a treaty of "permanent peace" which was to be commemorated by a monument at Manbidj, but in 540 he attacked the town, which was obliged to pay a ransom for its liberation. It was in this period that a temple of fire was built in the town by the Sasanid Emperors. Kīrā gave the town the name of Manbik, which was arabised into Manbidj.

During the 5th and early 6th centuries, the Byzantine emperors, including Justinian, maintained Hierapolis/Manbidj as a front-line stronghold against the East. In 612, the Persians invaded Syria, took Jerusalem on 3 May 614 and occupied Alexandria (617-19). Heraclius reacted and succeeded in restoring the situation and, in March 650, he came to Manbidj to receive the True Cross which the Persians had carried off from Jerusalem in 614. The chronicler
Pseudo-Dionysius mentions in Manbij a church of Saint Mary and a church of Saint Thomas. According to Ibn Khurradadhbih, in the 3rd/9th century there was there a very fine church built of wood.

In the time of the caliphs 'Umar and of 'Uthmān, after the conquest of Syria, Manbij was one of the sa'awāsim, fortified posts which marked the frontier between the Dār al-İslām and the Byzantine province of Antioch.

In 16/637, the inhabitants of Manbij were attacked by 'Iyād b. Qālimīn, who had been sent as vanguard by Abū Ubayda b. al-Djarrah [q. v.]. They capitulated, and the treaty was ratified by Abū 'Ubayda when he appeared before the town. The surrounding areas of the town were at this time occupied by Yemeni tribes and, in particular, the Banū Taghlib.
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was to be coveted by the Atabeg of al-Mawsil, Djawâl, by Ridwan b. Tutush of Halab and by the Franks. In Safar 502/September 1108, after Djawâl seized Manbij, they joined it to the archbishopric of Tell Bashîr, subject to the Latin Patriarchate of Antioch. Shortly afterwards, the Franks lost the town, to which they were never to return, but there was to be for a long time a Latin prelate consecrated bishop of Manbij in partibus.

In 514/1120, the territory of Manbij was attacked from Tell Bashîr by Joscelin who, barely released from captivity by Djawâl, had crossed the Euphrates on his way to Antioch and, arriving at Manbij, was unable to resist pillaging the lands belonging to Ridwan of Halab. In spring 517/1122, after the amir Hassân b. Gûmûshügin, a Turkish lieutenant of Balak at Manbij, had taken prisoners in the territory of Edessa, Joscelin returned to pillage the region by way of reprisal. In 518/1124, the Arûkûd Nûr al-Dîn Awâlî, the son of Awâlî, b. Amrûk [p. 489], the nephew of U Ghâzî, having become master of Halab, took refuge at Tell Bashîr. Balâk occupied Manbij after the death of the latter in Ramadân 516/November 1122, resolved to attack Tell Bashîr. He entrusted an army to his cousin Husûl al-Dîn Timûr-Tâsh and asked him to invite Hassân to accompany him. Suspicious of Hassân’s lukewarm response, Timûr-Tâsh arrested him and occupied Manbij; while Iîsâ, the brother of Hassân, took refuge in the citadel of Manbij and appealed for help to Joscelin of Edessa, offering him the town in return for driving away the troops of Balak. Joscelin marched towards Manbij with Geoffrey the Monk, lord of Marash, and in Safar 518/March-April 1124, was confronted by Balak as the latter was preparing to attack Manbij. The Franks suffered a grave defeat; Geoffrey was killed, Joscelin fled and took refuge at Tell Bashîr. Balâk occupied Manbij and attached to the princes of Halab, to which he wished to hand over to his cousin Timûr-Tâsh, but on 19 Rabî’û 518/6 May 1124 an arrow shot from the citadel wounded him fatally. His troops disbanded, Timûr-Tâsh brought the body back to Halab and took power there, while Hassân, released from detention, returned to Manbij.

In 520/1126, the Atabeg Barsûkî of al-Mawsil, on a journey through Syria, passed beneath the walls of Manbij. The following year, in Rabî’I 521/April 1127, ‘Imâd al-Dîn Zangî, having become Atabeg of al-Mawsil and master of Halab, did not hesitate to seize the important road junction of Manbij. In 525/1131 Joscelin de Courtenay besieged Tell ʿAran, a site between Halab and Manbij. Injured by a collapsing undermine, he was carried to Tell Bashîr, where he died. The governor of Manbij, accompanied by the amir Sawâr of Halab, took advantage of the situation by attacking the knights of Edessa.

When the Byzantine John Comnenus attacked the region of Manbij in 536/1142, he did not take the town. Two years later, Manbij contributed a contingent of Turkomans to the army of Zangi. On the death of the latter, in 541/1146, his son Nûr al-Dîn, on his way from Halab to lay siege to al-Ruḥâ, passed through Manbij with his siege machinery. It was the amir of Manbij, ‘Îsâ, cousin of Nûr al-Dîn, loyal ally of Nûr al-Dîn, who by taking Tell Bashîr in 546/1151, put an end to the County of Edessa.

In 553/1158 Mağd al-Dîn Abû Bakr, foster-brother of Nûr al-Dîn, governor of the province of Halab, warned by the amir in command of Manbij of a conspiracy against Nûr al-Dîn, failed the plot which had been hatched during the illness of the latter and was to have been put into effect in Muharram 554/February 1150. When Hassân al-Mansûr died (562/1167), Nûr al-Dîn gave Manbij in iktîsâd to Ghâzî b. Hassân, but the latter rebelled and the sovereign then came in person with Mağd al-Dîn Abû Bakr b. al-Dâyâ and Asad al-Dîn Shûrkhîn, in spring 563/1168, to take the town after a full-scale siege. He deposed Ghâzî and gave the place in iktîsâd to Kûb al-Dîn Inâl b. Hassân, the rebel’s brother. Nûr al-Dîn consolidated the defences of Manbij, constructing there, as at Halab, a protective outer wall. After 563/1167 he also built there a Shâfi‘î madrasa for Ibn Abî ‘Uqrîn, while Kûb al-Dîn built one for the Hanafs.

On 14 Shawwâl 571/April 1176, Salâh al-Dîn (Saladin) launched an offensive in northern Syria against Sayf al-Dîn of Halab. He headed towards the north-east, in the knowledge that Manbij was held by Kûb al-Dîn Inâl b. Hassân, a resolute enemy of the Ayyûb sovereign; the siege-engineers had already begun their work when Inâl offered to surrender, giving up his citadel and his treasury, in exchange for safe-conduct. The prospect of taking Manbij had occasioned the appearance of the Franks, and they persuaded Salâh al-Dîn, who permitted Inâl to make his way to al-Mawsil. Manbij was taken on 29 Shawwâl 571/11 May 1176, and the victor found significant spoils there. Salâh al-Dîn recalled his nephew Taḵî al-Dîn ‘Umar b. Turân Shâh, who was seeking to impose his authority in Egypt, and gave him fiêldoms in Syria, including Manbij. In 577/1181, Taḵî al-Dîn al-Muzaffar ‘Umar, prince of Hamât, while in Manbij, attempted to bar the road from Halab to ʿIzz al-Dîn Ibrahim Ibn al-Mukad-dam, but he failed and was forced to retreat to Hamât. In Ramadân 579/June 1179, Salâh al-Dîn appointed his brother al-Malik al-ʿAdîl governor of Manbij and, two years later, he added a minaret to the Great Mosque.

It was during this period (Rabî’I 580/June 1184) that Ibn Dhuqayr, coming from Harrân, mentioned the purity of the air, the beauty of the landscape, the abundance and quality of the water of Manbij. He described its broad streets and markets, noted the piety of the Shâfi‘î inhabitants, mentioned the ancient defensive wall as well as the remains of Roman buildings, and referred to the separate and isolated citadel.

In 586/1190, Manbij, then ruled by Nâṣîr al-Dîn, son of al-Muẓaffar Taḵî al-Dîn ʿUmar, was an important rallying-point for troops setting out to fight Frederick Barbarossa.

In 588/1192, al-Malik al-Zâhir, third son of Salâh al-Dîn, sought to assert control of Manbij, appealing to al-Malik al-Mansûr of Hamât to lend him his support against al-Malik al-Adîl. But al-Mansûr refused to give up the town which controlled the communication routes towards the north-east, the valley of the Upper Euphrates and Diyar Muṣrûj. In Radjab 589/April-May 1193, al-Malik al-Zâhir and al-Malik al-Adîl attacked Manbij; al-Zâhir destroyed the citadel to prevent it being used by an enemy and the town, deprived of defences, was given in iktîsât.

In 591/1195, Manbij was dependent on al-Mansûr of Hamât; al-Malik al-Zâhir came from Kınınsîn to attack it, but he was obliged to return to Hama to Damascus and he abandoned the operation. In Dhul ‘I-Ḥaḍחa 595/September 1199, al-Malik al-Mansûr...

Ca. 600/1204, Manbîdî was a much-frequented place of pilgrimage. At the end of the 6th/12th century the Harâwî refers to the town, no longer to be seen, of al-Hâkâm b. al-Mu'talîb b. 'Abd Allâh b. al-Mu'talîbî, an eminent Kuraşî who lived at the end of the Umayyad period and is said to have died in Syria. This author mentions the mashâd al-Dîn al-Khâdir and the 'mashâd al-dîn al-nûr', where it is claimed that there lies the tomb of some prophet. Ibn Shaddâd (1'îdîl, 57) confirms the existence of this monument, the 'mashâd al-nûr', a personage of the faîrâ [q. v.]; this tomb was situated to the east of Manbîdî. There was also a masjid al-mustâdîf, an oratory where vows were fulfilled. Also mentioned is a 'Temple of the Moon which was a place of pilgrimage for the Sabians'.

In 598/1202, al-Malîk al-Zâhir Gâhîzî who, like al-Malîk al-Afdâl, did not recognise the authority of al-Malîk al-Adîl, sent al-Mubârizâdîk, one of his senior amîrs of Halâb, with troops to take possession of Manbîdî and of Ka'fât Nadîm. Shâms al-Dîn was taken prisoner and incarcerated in the citadel of Halâb. Henceforward, Manbîdî was incorporated among the territories of Halâb, and the domination of the Bânû l-Mukâddâm came to an end. The amir al-Malîk al-Adîl as overlord, and the latter, in 598/-1202, granted Manbîdî to a man named al-Malîk al-Adîl as overlord, and the latter, in 598/-1202, granted Manbîdî to a man named al-Malîk al-Adîl, who struck coinage at Halâb, took it back from al-Malîk al-Adîl, and later returned it to the small town. In 604/1208, the amir of Halâb, who restored defensive walls. At the approach of al-Malîk al-Asfârâz, who had succeeded al-Malîk al-Adîl as head of the Ayyûbîs, Sârîn al-Dîn advanced against the Ayyûbî army, suffered a decisive defeat and lost the town. In 625/1228, the army of Di'llâb al-Dîn Khârażmî-Shâh [q. v.] advanced to Manbîdî, but withdrew at the approach of winter. In 631/1234, al-Malîk al-Asfâr Muhammad received orders from the Ayyûbîd supreme ruler al-Malîk al-Kâmil to muster troops at Manbîdî in preparation for an assault on Tell Bâshîr; as a result, the chieftains assembled on the plain of Manbîdî including al-Malîk al-Asfârî Muhammad, al-Kâmil, al-Malîk al-Mughîth b. Hîmîs, al-Malîk al-Mu'azzafâlî of Hamât and al-Malîk al-Nâsîr of Karak; the commander of the operation was al-Malîk al-Mu'azzam Tûrân Shâh, cousin of the prince of Halâb, who was reponsible for bringing these leaders together.

In 634/1236-7, at the end of the reign of al-Malîk al-Asfârî Ughûfârîn, further construction work was done to the Great Mosque of Manbîdî. In 636/1238, al-Mu'azzâm Tûrân Shâh brought his army to occupy the town, which gave shelter to refugees from Ra'ka and Bâlîs fleeing before the Khârażmîs. In 637/1239-40, the latter, crossing the Euphrates once more, routed the troops of Halâb and marched against Manbîdî on Thursday 20 Rabî' II/8 November 1240, the population took refuge within the fortifications, but the town was taken by assault three days later and burnt. The Khârażmîs massacred a great many of the inhabitants before re-crossing the Euphrates. Al-Malîk al-Manûsir retrieved the town. In Djumâdî I 640/November 1242, on their way from Ka'fât Dî'llâb, al-Malîk al-Manûsir and al-Malîk al-Mu'azzaf stopped at Manbîdî before reaching Halâb.

When the Mongols of Hûlûgî [q. v.] crossed the Euphrates in their turn, in the course of their headlong invasion of the West, having taken Bâlîs in Dhu 'l-Hijjâdî 657/November-December 1259, they turned towards the north and sacked Manbîdî; and then attacked Tell Bâshîr before returning to their base at al-Rûhâ.

With the arrival of the Mamlûk sultans, the post of Dju'âr of Manbîdî, which had been occupied by Awadh al-Dîn b. Shâms al-Dîn Abu 'l-Abd al-Âlah Muhammad b. Ma'hâmîd al-Isâhâbî (616-88/1219-89).

In the treaty which the sultan Kalâwûn concluded with Leo of Armenia on 1 Rabî' II 684/6 June 1281, Manbîdî is mentioned among the "Egyptian" towns. According to Ibn al-Shâhâna, it contributed to the sultan's divan a sum of approximately 500,000 dirhams per year, based on various levies of the region of the Syrian Upper Euphrates. It is known from al-Kalkashandî (1418), that the region was dependent then upon the nâbîb of Halâb and that its governor was a djûndî, mu'azzâm of the halâb [q. v.], appointed by tawqî karîm and enjoying an ikât[-]. In Dhu 'l-Hijjâdî 721/November 1231, the place became the objective of the Turkomân amîr Mintâshî, who came to attack it; the siege lasted several days, and finally Manbîdî was taken and burnt, and a large section of the population massacred. A few weeks later, the amîr of al-Rûhâ joined battle with Mintâshî, who was defeated, taken prisoner and sent to Qâlîbân, vicerey of Halâb (early 722/late 1321).

In 748/1347, a major plague of locusts infested the region, which, the following year was to be smitten by a serious outbreak of the Black Death. In this period, the town had as its wâli the poet and historian 'Umar b. Mu'azzîfâl al-Ma'ârîfî Zayn al-Dîn al-Wardî, author of a sequel to the chronicle of Abu 'l-İfîdî. In the 8th/14th century, following changes to the road network, Manbîdî played no further part in the postal system (barîdî). Ibn Batûtâ did not pass this way, and the mail between Halâb and the Euphrates, routed further to the south, crossed the river opposite Ka'fât Dî'llâb.

At the beginning of the 9th/15th century, Manbîdî, like many other places, suffered great damage as a result of the invasion of the Timûrî Lang. However, in
the middle of this century, according to Ibn al-Shihna of Halab (in his al-Durr al-muntakhab), it was contributing 40,000 dinars in annual taxation to the sultan’s treasury, a fact which testifies to a degree of economic activity. For his part, the Egyptian Khallîl al-Zâhîrî, in his survey of the province of Halab in the Zubdat kalâb al-mamâlik (mid-9th/15th century), makes no mention of Manbîjī.

In 922/1516, Syria passed under the authority of the Ottoman sultans; the re-organisation of the eastern provinces of the empire and changes in the road network placed Manbîjī on the periphery of the major commercial processes.

In 1784 Volney visited the pashâlîkh of Halab, and wrote: ‘‘Two days’ travel to the north-east of Aleppo is the small town of Manbîjī, formerly renowned under the name of Bambîce and Hierapolis. There remains no trace of the temple of that great goddess, whose cult is described by Lucian.

For the 19th century, two important sources of evidence are worthy of mention, those of Chesney and of Yanovski. In his account of an exploration of the valley of the Euphrates, Chesney provides valuable information concerning the state of Manbîjī at the beginning of the century. He refers to the town and the castle, which were then called Kara Mambuche or Bûyûk Manbîjī, and mentions remains of surrounding walls, square Arab towers and a trench which marked the contours of Muslim city. He describes four large cisterns, a fine sarcophagus and the sparse ruins of the acropolis, the remains of two temples, in the smaller of which were an enclosure and the traces of seven columns. In the larger, which could be that of Atarges, there are, he mentions specifically, traces of massive architecture: eleven arches alongside a paved court, in which there lie the shafts of columns and lotus-shaped capitals. Slightly to the west of the defensive walls there is a necropolis containing many Turkish tombs as well as some which are pagan, Salûdîk and Syriac, the last-named bearing inscriptions with illegible characters. Two roads leave this site, leading to two bridges of boats (qerpâz). Towards Sâdûr, there are the remnants of a kanâbî, partially abandoned, which has supplied Manbîjī with water perhaps since the Assyro-Chaldean period.

To the east of the town there is an aqueduct carrying water from the hills of the Djabal Dana Tağh situated 7 miles to the south-south-east. Two miles to the south is the encampment of the Banû Sâdîb Bedouins, whose herds roam the pasture-lands stretching from Bâlîs to the Sâdûr.

Some years later, J. Yanovski and J. David note that ‘‘as throughout the pashâlîkh of Aleppo, subterranean water-courses abound in the territory of Manbîjī, relayed by communication channels and thousands of reservoirs’’. In this region, Yanovski stresses the contrast between ‘‘the natural magnificence and the human squalor’’. From Manbîjī to the southern limits of the land of Halab, the author describes ‘‘massive plains, which although laid out in the form of fertile steppes, already resemble desert and which are variegated only by a series of low hills with derelict citadels on their summits’’. Yanovski also speaks of ‘‘once luxuriant prairies ruined by the disorderly encampments of nomadic tribes’’.

As for the remaining vestiges of the ancient Manbîjī at the beginning of the 20th century, according to Baedeker (French edition, 1912, 411), ‘‘the extensive ruins of the ancient town are barely visible above the surface of the ground; however, it is possible to recognise the contours of a theatre and of a stadium’’. The Guide Bleu (1932 edition, 165) states for its part: ‘‘besides the perimeter wall, nothing is visible of the remains of the ancient town, the ruins of which have been used as a stone quarry of centuries’’. In the first half of the century, there still existed there a large pool, still stocked with carp similar of those which had been dedicated in Antiquity to the cult of Atargatis. This was, in fact, an ancient sacred lake which, like its equivalent at Marathus (Amrît) on the Syrian coast, was originally flanked by a rectangular stone wall, and in the centre of which there rose an altar of marble, (muâlîbû). In the middle of the 20th century, all that remained of it was a deep unwalled depression without water, the dried-up sacred pool being used as a playground, while its spring supplied a bathing pool from which water was also drawn off to irrigate gardens. Of the successive ramparts surrounded by a broad trench which, since Antiquity had protected the town, there remained nothing but a circular earth embankment and a few vestiges on the north-west side.

Since the 16th century, Manbîjī had been incorporated into Ottoman Turkey. At the beginning of the 20th century it was a regional centre of a kâdî of the vilayet of Halab, joined to the latter since 1913 by a telegraph cable. The region was then inhabited by groups of Kurdish and arabised Turkish families, among whom there were settled, after the Treaty of San Stefano put an end to the Russo-Turkish war of 1877-8, a number of Circassians, Hanafî Muslims [see Çandarlı]. In 1915, at the time of the Ottoman offensive against eastern Turkey, the Circassians were obliged, as a precautionary measure, to join their kînsmen established at Khânazîr, 50 km to the south-east of Halab at the northern limit of the Syrian desert.

In 1921, after the imposition of French authority in the Levant, Manbîjī was incorporated into the third region of the provincial government of Halab.

In 1924, the agricultural zone of Manbîjī was part of the sandjak of Halab; later, it was to contribute one of the seven mintakas of the mubâfaâs of Halab. In this region, in the first half of the 20th century, there existed a tripartite association between the owner of the land, the owner of the irrigation equipment and the farmer, the supplier of water being linked to the exploitation of the land. In this period, irrigation was still operated by the system of kanâbî. Since before 1914, Manbîjī had been an important staging-post for the convoys of humped cattle which, coming from al-Mawâṣîl, made a halt there, which explains the presence in the town, from this period onwards, of a veterinary surgeon who inspected the beasts before they set out for Halab by way of Bâb. In the region of Manbîjī itself, there was livestock, comprising in 1924, according to Ch. Parvie, 386 oxen, 414 calves and 4,182 cows, which made the town an important centre of dairy production. There were also herds of sheep and goats.

In 1930, Manbîjī, where there existed a police station and a magistrat’s court, was incorporated into the kâdî of the Djabal Sama‘ân, which was dependent on Halab. Two years later, the population of the town numbered 2,000, including 800 Circassians and 100 Armenians. In 1945, a census counted 4,653 inhabitants, including the population of the regional centre of the kâdî. According to the official statistics of the Syrian Arab Republic (1982), the population of the town was estimated in 1960 at 8,577, in 1970 at 14,635 (the mintaka or district then numbered 102,730), and in 1981 at 30,844. The significant demographic growth of the region in the course of the last decade is due to electrification made possible by the barrage of Tabkâ on the Euphrates, to the im-

3. Western works: Volney, Narrative, 213; 4. Thakan, Thakan, Fdrs-ndma, (before 510/1116), but only in the com- position Mandistan (cf. below).

The name. As a rule in Persia, sections of a river are called after the districts through which they flow. Mānd is the name of the last stretch near its mouth. The name seems to appear for the first time in the Fārs-nama (before 510/1116), but only in the com- position Māndistān (cf. below).

The old name of the river is usually transcribed in Arabic characters Sakkān (al-Istakhri, 120; Ibn Hawkal, 191; al-Idrīsī, tr. Jaubert, i, 401), but the orthography varies: Thakan, Fārs-nama, GMS, 152; Nuzhat al-kalīb, 134; Zakkān or Zakkān, Nuzhat al- kalīb, 217, Siyārān, Dījān-namā, 247; cf. also Saybān in Hasan Fāsāt.

The identification of the Sakkān with the Şuţān was mentioned in the Periplus of Nearchus (Arrian, Indica, xxviii, 8); this generally refers to the identity of the Sittakos with the Sittagagus (Sitāgagus) mentioned by Pliny, Nat. Hist., vi, 26, as also usually admitted (Weissbach, 1927), but Herfeld (1907) relying on the existence of another river, the Shādkhān (= Sittagagus?), has suggested doubts about the identifi- cation of the Sittakos with the Sittagagus. Now ac- cording to al-Iṣṭakhri, 119, the Shādkhān flows into the Persian Gulf at Dasht al-Dastakēn (north of Būghir)? This Shādkhān must be identified with the river Shāpur. The Fārs-nama, ed. Le Strange, 163, mentions Rūbdīlī-Sittagān ("the banks of the S."), as a station on the road from Shīrāz to Tawwādī. From this fact and especially from the name, Sittagān seems to have applied to the left bank tributary of the Shāpur. Pliny, who follows Onoresciti, adds that by the Sittagagus one reaches Pasargad in 7 days. Whatever be the identity of the Sittagagus, the ex- signation in this statement is evident (especially in the direction of the sea to Pasargad) and the waters of Pasargad (Māḥṣād-i Murgāb) do not flow into the Persian Gulf. But there is nothing to prove the ab- solute impossibility of using the Sakkān as a sub- sidiary means of transport in the season of floods (the winter). According to Arrian, Nearchus found at the mouth of the Sakkān large quantities of corn which Alexander had brought there for his army. Al- Iṣṭakhri, 99, places the Sakkān among the rivers of

Mānndīšt, a district of Fārs which are navigable at need (al-anhār al-khār al-lā'i tamāl al-sufla va'dīi ughrīyat fi-hā).
Another question is the phonetic identity of the names Sītakos (Sitoganus?) and Sakkān. According to the course of the village of Sakk (Nuzhat al-kulub: Zakkān) destroyed from a supposed genitive "Sītakos (Sitakān): Sīto-
gan-us is a mistake for Sītagan-us; lastly, the peculiarity of the Arabic script could explain the change of Sītakān to Sakkān. Here we may add that Hasan Fasaṭ ʿāli gives one of the stretches of the river the strangely written form Saykān ("Sītakān"). Al-
Iṣṭakhrī, however, derives the name of the river from the village of Shīkaft, which separates it from the valley of the
river Shapur. It follows this direction (ca. 100 miles)
to the end of the Asmangird mountains around which it makes a bend and turns south (70 miles). It then meets the parallel ranges which run along the Persian Gulf and continues its winding course to the sea in a westerly direction (140 miles).
The Sakkān (Mānndī) and its tributaries drain and irrigate a considerable area (the Kūh-i Mānndī and the Kūh-i Darang). Al-Iṣṭakhrī says that its waters contribute the largest share to the fertility of Fārs (akhan ʿimārāt).
The sources of the river (Kān-i Zand, Čihišāmga and Surkh-rag) rise in the mountains of Kūh-i Nār and Kūh-i Marra-yi Shīkaft to the northwest, and west of Shīrāz. These streams unite before Kūh-i Zāyān in the district of Māsārm on the great Shīrāz-Karrūn-Būghrī road. Al-Iṣṭakhrī, 120, places the sources of the Sakkān near the village of Shāḥshāfri (?), in the district of Ruwaydīyān (?). In the same author, 130, Kūn al-Asad on the Sakkān corresponds to the modern Kūn-i Zāyān. The Fārs-nāma (and the Nuzhat al-kulub) places the sources of the Sakkān near the village of Catriya (?). Under the Turkish name of Kara ağha, i.e. "[the river of the elm]", the combined streams flow through the districts of Māsārm ( = Kūh-i Marra-yi Shīkaft), Sīyāḵ (al-Iṣṭakhrī, 120: Siyāḵ and Kāwār. In this last district, Rivadāneyra, iii, 81, going from Shīrāz to Fūrahūzābād, crossed the river by a "substantial bridge". It is in the district of Kāwār that Hasan Fasaṭ ʿāli gives the name of the river Saykān. In Kāwār (Hasan Fasaṭ ʿāli) there used to be the barrage of Band-i Bahman, where a subterranean channel (kānāt) part of the water was led into reservoirs (ūnāt) and then to the fields. In the bulāk of Kīhāf (al-Iṣṭakhrī, 105: Kābr̄, which must be distinguished from the district of the same name in the kāra of Iṣṭakhr, the river turns south. Aucher-Eloy, who crossed the river on the road from Fūrahūzābād to Dārāmūn (Dāhrūm) calls it "Tengui Tachka" (= Tāng-i Khākh-i?) and speaks of its "beautiful valley". Rivadāneyra continues his journey from Fūrahūzābād to Dārāmūn crossed the river by a ford between the villages of Tādwan and "Assun-Dscherd" (Asmangird?). He also admires the pleasant and flourishing aspect of Kīhāf. Below the latter, the river enters the bulāk of Simkhān where, near the village of Sarkal, it receives on its left bank, the brackish (šīr) river of Dāhrough, and then flows through the ravine of Kāzān, and waters the bulāk of Kīr-wa-Kāzān. Al-
Battūja, ii, 241: Kūndjibāl = Kūndj + Bāl). In the district of Dīz-gūh (Dīz-gūh-i Shīkaft) the river has two tributaries: near the village of Gābri, the Dār al-
Mīzān, and two farsākh lower, that of Dihram. The Dār al-Mīzān comes from the left (east) side of the bulāk of Asīr. The Dihram, much more important, comes from the right side after watering the historic district of Fīrūzābād (the ancient Ġur, capital of Ardashīr-Khurra; cf. the details in Le Strange, 236, and al-
Fūrahūzābād). Al-Iṣṭakhrī, 121, makes two tributary come from Dārdjān (of Siyāḵ) and water first Shīnayghān and then Ġur (in place of the name of the river Tīrza, al-Iṣṭakhrī, 99, 121, one should probably read Barūzā; cf. the Fārs-nāma, 117-118: Hakīm Barūzā was the sage who dried up the Lake of Ġur).
After Dīz-gūh, the river enters the district of Sanā- wa-Shumbā of the bulāk of Dāhūth, and near the village of Bāghān receives on the right bank the river Ġaniz which comes from the district of Tāsūj-i Daftāt. Finally, near the village of Dūmānlū the river enters the coast district of Mānndīstān and receives the name of Mānndī. It flows into the sea near the village of Ziyārāt, halfway between the old harbours of Naḵgārām (to the north and Sirāḵ (to the south). Mānndīstān. The district forms part of the bulāk of Daftāt (which is to be distinguished from Daftāstān to the north of Daftāt up to Būghrī). Daftāt (36 × 18 farsākh) is composed of 4 districts: 1. Bardstān, the part of the coast in which is the port of Dayyar. 2. Mānndīstān in the coast to the north of Bardstān and the two banks of the river Mānndī. 3. Sanā and Shumbara on the river above Mānndīstān. 4. Tāsūj-i Daftāt, a very narrow valley (12 × ½ farsākh), watered by the Ġaniz and surrounding Sanā and Shumbara from the bulāk Arba-a (on the lower course of the river of Fīrūzābād).
The whole of the bulāk belongs to the torrid zone (garmiy) of Fārs. Mānndīstān (12 × 5 farsākh) includes lands so flat that the current of the river is imperceptible and the water cannot be used for irrigation. Agriculture (wheat, barley, palm-trees) is dependent on the winter floods. The district has 40 villages. The capital of the district and of the bulāk is Kātī. There used to be two rival families in Mānndīstān: the Shāykhīyān and the Hāḏēḏjān. During the disturbances under Ġurī rule (1722-9) the Hāḏēḏj Raʾīs Djamāl exterminated the Shāykhīyān and founded a little dynasty of hereditary governors, who were able to annex the district of Bardstān through matrimonial alliances. One of his descendents, Muḥammad Kān (d. at Būghīr in 1298/1881), was noted as a poet under the pen-name of Daftāt.
Hasan Fasaṭ ʿāli explains the name Mānndīstān by a popular etymology: "the place where the water flows slowly (vaʿamānda)". Names in -stan are common in Fārs (Lārīstān, Bardstān), but even if such a formation was possible in a river-name, the element Mānd would still be a puzzle. It is curious that Hasan Fasaṭ ʿāli sometimes writes it Mānd (read Mānndī) and sometimes Mūnd (read Mūnndī). It might be suggested as a
pure hypothesis that there is a connection with the people Mnd (cf. Med) of which there might have been a colony in Mandinsit.
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MANDA, an island off the coast of Kenya. It lies in approximately 2° 12' s, 41° E, on the east side of Lamu Island [q.v.] in the Lamu Archipelago. There is a small modern settlement at Takwa Milinga, near the ruined walled town of Manda, which gives the island its name. It was finally destroyed by Fumo Luti, Sultan of Pate, in 1086. Its sole mention in Arabic literature is as a Mandan, in the 11th century. It has been widely mentioned as an island of the east coast of Kenya by various authors, including [see kilwa], as one of the settlements at which a son of the founder was set up; the Arabic form presumably represents the Swahili Manda Kuu, or Great Manda, recorded by A. Voelktzow. Al-Idrīsi’s reference M.l.n.d. more probably refers to Malindi [q.v.]. According to the traditional Ḥabari za Pate (“History of Pate”), it was founded earlier than Pate, by which it was conquered later. However, it was of sufficient importance to pay tribute to the Portuguese separately from Pate, and it was its failure to do so that led to reprisals by the Portuguese in 1569, when many houses and some 2,000 palm trees were destroyed. In 1637 it was required to demolish its defensive walls.

H.N. Chittick carried out excavations at the site between 1967 and 1982. (These have been entirely filled in, and there is scarcely anything to be seen, other than the remains of two mosques.) There are massive stone walls on the western and northern sides abutting on the shore, and the remains of later walls on the south-west and south-east of the site. These walls are distinguished by Chittick as mega-walls and maxi-walls: the mega-walls are of blocks of stone weighing up to 4 tons each. The stone used, in both cases, is coral, quarried from a nearby reef which can still be identified. The walls provided stability for the sand dunes, so that houses could be built on the resulting terraces. These constructions are similar to ones observed by the writer at Šijhr in South Yemen. The houses were built of coral, but also used brick. Very similar bricks have been found at Šijhr, Ṣūma, and were probably brought from there as ships’ ballast unloaded here in order to take on cargoes of mangrove timber. Certain houses have brick cisterns, and one, with a sunken courtyard, is similar to one known in Sirāf. Po contra, the lay-out of the houses, however, is compared by M.C. Horton to types known from the Red Sea. Glazed and unglazed imported Islamic pottery, in which the earliest period of the site can be paralleled closely in the Whitehouse’s excavations at Sirāf [q.v.], and some was certainly made in the Sirāf vicinities. It need not be concluded, however, that Manda was a colony of Sirāf. Rather, its connections with the Red Sea, and also with Šihr, suggest that it served both the Red Sea and the Persian Gulf as a trading port, already in existence in the mid-8th century, busied chiefly in the ivory and mangrove trades, in a region in which they abound naturally. A curiosity is an arcade building with open sides, probably of the 13th-14th centuries, and most likely to have been a covered market, albeit it has been fancifully described as a “kiosk”. There is a Friday mosque and another mosque, of 14th-15th century date. Only six coins have been found, two of them Ḥāfīzīd, and apparently from Sicilian mints, an indication of the red-sea prosperity in this region. For the architecture of the mosque, see Chittick, ed. of Archiv d. Orientforschung. (The plate published by Chittick is illegible.) There is no trace of there having been a local currency. At Takwa there is a well-preserved Friday Mosque and quite a number of houses in what was a walled town of some 12½ acres. The mosque appears to be of the late 15th or early 16th century, and was cleared by J.S. Kirkman. Per contra, the pillar that rises above the roof of the mihāla is not of religious significance. Examination of the side walls discloses stumps of what were a series of pillars that originally provided an open clerestory below the roof, a feature still perpetuated in domestic architecture on Pate Island. A curiosity in the mosque ablutions is the decoration of the cistern with three plates: the latter author, the pillar that rises above the roof of the mihāla is not of religious significance. Examination of the side walls discloses stumps of what were a series of pillars that originally provided an open clerestory below the roof, a feature still perpetuated in domestic architecture on Pate Island. A curiosity in the mosque ablutions is the decoration of the cistern with three plates: that in the place of honour in the centre is of Portuguese manufacture, and bears the Cross that is the emblem of the Portuguese Order of Christ. Outside the walls an inscription on a pillar tomb is read by Kirkman (1846) that the tomb of Shaykh Ahmad Mansūr b. Ahmad or “Shaykh Fakīhī Mansūr”, honouring it with an annual pilgrimage from Shola on Lamu Island. The Friday Mosque also enjoys the reputation of being a place of sanctuary. The inability to read the inscription can be taken as an indication of the local level of literacy in Arabic.


Mandates. The mandate (Arabic Manda, Turkish mandatı, from the French) was essentially a system of trusteeship, instituted by the League of Nations after the end of the First World War, for the
administration of certain territories detached from the vanquished states, chiefly the Ottoman and German Empires. The concept of the mandate has been variously understood as either a new world order or, contrariwise, merely as a façade for neo-colonialism, with other interpretations ranging between these two extremes. Essentially, the option of establishing mandates in conquered territories was largely intended to defer (if not quite resolve) three foci or conflict: (1) Among the Powers themselves, particularly the victorious Allies, regarding domination of areas formerly administered by the vanquished — according to their respective global and regional interests and in consideration of secret agreements drawn up during the war years. (2) Between each Mandatory Power and the populations of the to-be-mandated territories — whose elites had become at least partially suffused with assertive patriotism — in an attempt to find methods of fulfilling promises expressed during the war. (3) Among rival sectors within each of these populations, some of which rejected mutual accommodation.

The mandate was not only a response to the real or potential threat of the above conflicts, but also a compromise between the desire of the victors — chiefly France and Great Britain — to maintain their hold on certain areas and the determination of People's Commissaries in Paris, such as the latter mooted separately by Khalide Edlb [q. v.].

The mandate was not only a response to the real or potential threat of the above conflicts, but also a compromise between the desire of the victors — chiefly France and Great Britain — to maintain their hold on certain areas and the determination of People's Commissaries in Paris, such as the latter mooted separately by Khalide Edlb [q. v.].

From a legal point of view, the appointment of a Mandatory took the form of an agreement between the League of Nations and the respective Power, in which the latter was enjoined to promote the interests of the population in the mandated territory and prepare it for self-rule, under the control of the international body — a new conception in political science. The Mandatory had to report annually to the League of Nations’ Permanent Mandates Commission, whose Constitution was approved by the League’s Council in December 1920. The Commission was first appointed in February 1921 and formally supervised the application of the mandates. This Commission, numbering at first nine members (the number subsequently varied), comprised a majority of representatives from countries other than the Mandatory. It usually met in Geneva twice a year, diligently examining reports from the Mandates and petitions by the local population, generally insisting upon the presence of representative officials of the Mandatory for cross-examination. Consequently, the commission’s functions were simultaneous control of and collaboration with each of the Mandatories. It was hampered, however, by the lack of direct contact with people in the Mandated territories and by an absence of any power other than that of relaying observations to the Council of the League of Nations, whose duties included overall observance of the system and its modification where required. In addition, the International Court of Justice at the Hague served as a court of appeals, in certain cases, for the people of the mandated territories.

On a practical basis, the Mandatory thus had considerable latitude in its day-to-day governing and even in much of its decision-making. Nevertheless, there remained certain basic juridical differences between mandates and colonies. The Mandatory lacked exclusive rights and possessed merely a delegated — and consequently limited — authority; hence it was not the sovereign power of the mandated territory.
nor even its protector, in an international sense. Rather, it constituted merely a trustee for... (commander of the Free French forces which entered Syria, together with the British, in June 1941), in September 1941.

The mandates offered differing degrees of autonomy to the local populations — to ʻIrak the most, to Palestine the least, and to Syria an intermediate degree — appropriate to the level of homogeneity of the population (assuming that too much autonomy might be unsuitable for a heterogeneous population). The case of ʻIrak is rather special, however, on other grounds as well. In 1921, even before final approval of the mandate, the British, who had already assumed effective control, invited Faysal b. Husayn (who had been ejected from Syria by the French) to reign over ʻIrak under their aegis, assisting him in setting up the institutions of government [see FAYSAL I]. True to their conception of the mandate, the British created directors' posts at the top level of every Ministerial office and appointed advisers in various administrative departments, as well as local judges. In 1921, an ʻIrakí army was set up, in 1923, a Constituent Assembly was elected, which met in March of the following year and approved ʻIrak's constitution of July 1924. The assembly also approved the October 1922 British-ʻIrakí Treaty which, without explicitly supplanting the Mandate, constituted official legal recognition by Great Britain of ʻIrak's sovereignty, provided the former offered binding advice in international and financial matters. Great Britain indeed successfully represented and defended ʻIrak's interests in the delicate negotiations held with Turkey since 1925 concerning the area of Mawsil [g.o.] which the League of Nations eventually allotted to ʻIrak. Although the 1922 Treaty did not mention the mandate at all, it was nonetheless approved by the Council of the League of Nations on 27 September 1924, as the instrument of mandate.

These moves only satisfied the ʻIrakí nationalists for a brief while, however. Largely due to their pressures, a new British-ʻIrakí treaty was signed in 1930, one which practically terminated the mandate; Great Britain reserved for itself certain rights, largely in the military domain, for another twenty-five years. The League of Nations, however, was the only institution which could terminate a mandate officially — and this was the first time the issue had arisen. Thus the Permanent Mandates Commission set up five pre-requisites for ending a mandate: a settled government and administration capable of running all public services; ability to maintain territorial integrity and political independence; capability of keeping internal peace and order; adequate financial resources for governmental requirements; and a legal and judicial system affording regular and equal justice to all. The Commission had some doubts about the suitability of conditions in ʻIrak for ending the mandate, primarily those relating to the judicial system and minority rights. After lengthy debates, however, in autumn 1932 the Permanent Mandates Commission voted to recommend termination of the mandate for ʻIrak to the Council of the League of Nations. The Council approved and in October 1932 admitted ʻIrak to the League of Nations (the first Arab state to join); thus the 1930 Treaty came into force and the mandate ended definitively. All formal restrictions on ʻIrak as a sovereign state were abrogated, although Great Britain did exercise its rights to intervene in crucial state and security matters until the end of the Second World War.

Syria and Lebanon. The French mandate in Syria and Lebanon, also imposed in 1922, continued to exist for a much shorter period than that of ʻIrak, ending only in 1945. The Mandatory was charged with framing an organic law for Syria and Lebanon within three years and then to lead them into developing as independent states. It was further enjoined to levy taxes, develop natural resources, and establish judicial and educational systems, as well as military forces, these last to be eventually handed over to the local people. All this was conditional on the Mandatory's promoting the well-being of the population and refraining from granting monopolies and concessions to its own nationals to the detriment of the local people or those of those states. The French in Syria accordingly allowed Arab Syrians and Lebanese to staff the administration — although it was headed (in ʻIrak) at its highest echelons by advisers delegated by the Mandatory. The French had a parallel organisation of their own, led by the High Commissioner; furthermore, they not only managed foreign and military affairs themselves, but often intervened in internal matters as well, through their officials. As with the British in ʻIrak, the French in Syria and Lebanon found Francophile Arabs willing to cooperate with them, simultaneously incurring the hostility of the nationalists.

On the whole, the Mandatory had greater success in Lebanon than in Syria. In the former, a representative council was prompted to prepare an Organic Law, in 1925, which was adopted by the Mandatory in the same year; in the following year, Lebanon became a republic with its own constitution, president and government — supervised by the Mandatory (as in ʻIrak). In Syria, however, a serious uprising (called a "revolt" by the nationalists and an "insurrection" by the French) occurred in the Druze region 1926-7, probably brought about by a combination of local grievances and patriotic aspirations; this uprising spread and the Mandatory forces put it down strongly. An attempt to set up a Constituent Assembly, 1926, to prepare a constitution, foundered largely because of tensions between the above groups. In 1930, the assembly was dissolved and the French authorities unilaterally proclaimed a constitution, with the proviso that it could not contradict the responsibilities entailed in the Mandate. In principle, it resembled the Organic Law in ʻIrak, although it was republican rather than monarchical in intent and comprised variations for Syria's different units. An assembly was elected two years later and, in 1936, a French-Syrian treaty was agreed upon. This would have recognised Syria's sovereign independence (in three years' time), while allowing France to maintain its military forces there. However, the Government and Parliament in France did not ratify the treaty and Syria reverted to Mandatory rule, with the French High Commissioner increasing his authority.

All this exasperated the nationalists who, although divided among themselves, were antagonised by the French division of the mandated territory into separate units and by the changes repeatedly introduced. The nationalists were particularly irritated by what they interpreted as the Mandatory Power's actions to increase autonomy in Druze and 'Alawi districts, carve out a "Great Lebanon" and hand over the sultan of Alexandretta (Tartus) to Turkey. Even the declaration of General Gouraud (commander of the Free French forces which entered Syria, together with the British, in June 1941), in September 1941,
that the French mandate had ended hardly convinced the Syrian nationalists, as France insisted on a "predominant position" there. Only at the end of the war, in 1918, did France recognize Syria's independence, thus ending the mandate (the League of Nations had been inactive during the war and was considered defunct, for practical purposes; hence it had no part in this decision).

The mandate in Lebanon developed along parallel although not identical lines. As early as August 1930, the French carved out a "Great Lebanon" which did away with the area's former Christian hegemony and turned Lebanon into an even more complicated mosaic of religious communities. The division of the main official positions, as well as the composition of the elected representative assemblies since 1926, have reflected and institutionalised this complexity. The 1926 Constitution accorded a high degree of home rule to the Lebanese, while granting France important decision-making privileges. A Franco-Lebanese treaty, similar to the Franco-Syrian one of 1936, was drawn up during the same year, but likewise failed to obtain ratification in France. Nevertheless, the difference between Lebanon and Mandatory France led to less violence in Lebanon than in Syria; Lebanon's independence (and termination of the mandate), attained in 1943, demanded fewer struggles that did Syria's.

Palestine and Transjordan. The mandate for Palestine was sui generis in several respects. Unlike the drafts of the mandates for 'Irak and for Syria and Lebanon, the text of the mandate for Palestine did not charge the Mandatory with drafting an organic law, but rather with promoting political, administrative and economic conditions to ensure the establishment of a national home for the Jewish people, while protecting the civil and religious rights of the rest of the population. The Balfour Declaration of 2 November 1917 was inserted into the preamble of this text and certain privileges were granted to the Jews, sc. the formation of an official Jewish Agency to represent them as well as provisions concerning land settlement, Palestinian nationality, the establishment and operation of public works, services and utilities, the development of national resources and the recognition of Hebrew as an official language (along with English and Arabic).

Considering the terms of the mandate and, even more so, the increasing rivalries between Arabs and Jews in Palestine, the British authorities found it difficult to accommodate communities; many official measures antagonised one community, or the other, or both. One of the first such British decisions was to separate Transjordan from Palestine, in 1922, and endow it with a separate administration (to be headed, however, by the same High Commissioner). Relations between the Mandatory and Transjordan were then formalised, in 1928, by a treaty and a Constitutional Law, both patterned on British-'Irak ones and confirmed by the Permanent Mandates Commission.

In both Palestine and Transjordan, the British instituted an administration essentially differing from the colonial ones they had established elsewhere. Its legal authority was based on The Palestine Order in Council, 1922, providing the British administration in Palestine with executive, legislative and judicial powers. The administration was led by the High Commissioner, assisted by a Chief Secretary and other British heads of various departments. Some of the middle-rank positions and most of the lower ones were staffed by local Arabs and Jews — one of their few and highly competitive meeting grounds. All British efforts to establish joint Arab-Jewish bodies, such as a Legislative Council, were doomed to failure. Even when reluctance was overcome, mutually acceptable terms could not be agreed upon: the Arabs wanted such bodies to reflect their statistical majority, while the Jews wished guarantees that they would not be voted down on every single issue. In consequence, both Arabs and Jews in Palestine developed their own separate systems for self-rule, the latter enjoying greater success in virtually developing "a state within a state" in such domains as education, self-defence, elections, trade unions, religious, social and cultural affairs. Many of these were taken care of within an "Assembly of Israel" (Knéset 'Ivriyya al-'alūd), led by the Mufti al-Hādjdj Amin al-Husaynī (q.v. in Suppl.), which succeeded in co-opting a number of Christian Arabs as well.

The 1920-1 and 1929 flare-ups, directed mostly against the Jews, culminated in a large-scale Arab uprising which continued sporadically during 1936-9, against both the Jews and the British. Each was followed by British Commissions of Inquiry, which resulted in official White Papers duly laid before both the British Parliament and the Permanent Mandates Commission. The Royal Commission headed by Lord Peel proposed the partition of Palestine, but this was rejected by both Arabs and Jews. The 1939 White Paper limited Jewish immigration and restricted land sales to Jews, thus appeasing the Palestinian Arabs during the Second World War. After the war, however, it was the Palestinian Jews who acted against the 1939 White Paper policy: in steps initiated by the Jewish Agency and the National Council, they smuggled in Jewish immigrants from amongst the survivors of the Nazi Holocaust, while small groups, disobeying the above bodies, physically attacked British officials and soldiers in Palestine. When neither strong military reprisals nor additional commissions proved to be of any avail, the British, undergoing a process of decolonisation in any case, bowed to Jewish wishes and world opinion. American pressure played a particularly prominent role in this respect, as did the United Nations, before which the issue had been brought in 1947 (and which had decided on partition). Thus the British terminated the mandate for Palestine on 15 May 1948. They had already granted Transjordan formal independence by a treaty concluded in March 1946 and amended in March 1948 in Transjordan's favour (equalising relations, although, in practice, Great Britain remained the new state's preferred ally).

Conclusion: The mandate system was far from a signal success; nor was it a total failure, however. First of all, it succeeded in providing a formula, acceptable to both idealistic statesmen and Realpolitik partisans, for dividing the spoils of the First World War; and, secondly, it represented a modus operandi for the victorious Allies, chiefly Great Britain and France, to maintain their interests in the Middle East without blantly contradicting their mutual agreements during the war and their promises to Arabs, Jews and others. On the other hand, it failed to provide either a solution to tensions between local nationalists and the respective Mandatories, or a permanently satisfactory modus vivendi among the various local population groups within each of the mandates. It was nationalist pressure, escalating into violence, which hastened termination of the physical presence of the
Mandatories in 'Irak, Syria and Lebanon, Palestine and Transjordan. The process itself was part of the new world order following the Second World War, one which witnessed decolonization and the founding of numerous new states, not unrelated to the political, military and economic relinquishing of Great Power status by the British and French. The tensions between Arabs and Kurds, Sunnis and Shi'is in 'Irak, various ethnic and religious communities in Syria and Lebanon, Arabs and Jews in Palestine, or Bedouins and other groups in Transjordan, erupted into violence or even war, were among the more unfortunate aspects of the unresolved legacies of the mandates. It may be that the Mandatories had neither the time nor the opportunity required to tackle these tensions and to set up a lasting accommodation. They were too busy with forging unitary countries and nations in the mandated territories, which had been disparate units in the sprawling Ottoman Empire. Although the Mandatories' fostering of local culture was tempered by a desire to export their own civilisation, they did succeed in encouraging education, setting up a more impartial judiciary, instilling law and order, promoting a national economy, establishing a more adequate taxation system, improving agriculture and irrigation and assisting with public health, roads and communications — all of which led to significant advances towards modernisation.
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MANDATES — MANDE


MANDE, a term which simultaneously possesses geographical, political and ethnic connotations. Mandel is a region situated between the upper Niger to the East, Beledougou to the North and the upper Bak hoy to the West. Mandel is also applied, however, to the whole of an enormous ethnic family comprising according to some West A and tradeable forms (Dogon, Bambara, Malinke in particular), more than forty population groups currently inhabiting the Republics of Guinea, the Ivory Coast, Ghana, Mali, Upper Volta, Niger and even Nigeria (see D. Zahan, Aperçu sur la pensée théologique des Dogon, in Cahiers Internationaux de Sociologie, xi [1949], 113-33; S. de Ganay, Notes sur la théodicée bambara, in RHR, cxxv [1949], 212-13; G. Dieterlen, Essai sur la religion bambara, Paris 1951, 13; the same, Mythe et organisation sociale au Soudan français, in Journal de la Société des Africanistes, xxv/1-2 [1955], 40-2).

More precisely, Mandel designates the “motherland” of one of the ethnic groups which originated there, the Mandingo. According to dialectal variants, the latter pronounce the term Mandé or Manding, while the Bambara of the West African traditions (Dogon, Bambara, Malinke in particular), more than forty population groups currently inhabiting the Republics of Guinea, the Ivory Coast, Ghana, Mali, Upper Volta, Niger and even Nigeria (see D. Zahan, Aperçu sur la pensée théologique des Dogon, in Cahiers Internationaux de Sociologie, xi [1949], 113-33; S. de Ganay, Notes sur la théodicée bambara, in RHR, cxxv [1949], 212-13; G. Dieterlen, Essai sur la religion bambara, Paris 1951, 13; the same, Mythe et organisation sociale au Soudan français, in Journal de la Société des Africanistes, xxv/1-2 [1955], 40-2).

This phonetic rendering illustrates the uncertain etymology of the morpheme, Mâdè could signify either "child" (d) of the mother (m), i.e. uterine issue or "child (d) of the master of the soil (mâ)". There are in addition (cf. S. M. Delafosse, La Langue mandingue et ses dialects (Malinké, Bambara, Dioula), Blabl. de l'ENLOV,
Paris 1929, i, 11). There is no basis for deciding in favour of either of these hypotheses.

In the current state of knowledge, little is known of the early history of the Mande. The first written information on this subject derives from Arab and Berber sources, it being understood that the first scholars to transmit in writing their knowledge of sub-Saharan Africa lived in North Africa and were directly or indirectly in contact with the negroes of the Sudan of their period. Among the latter, the Mandingos were, doubtless from an early period, the suppliers of gold (the *tibr* of the Arab authors) and of men ("immigrants") to the Italian, Portuguese and Spanish merchants who acquired it in North Africa through the intermediary of local traders. But it is logical to suppose that the tracks crossing the Sahara and bearing this precious metal towards the Mediterranean did not become "trade routes" until after the conquest of North Africa by the Arabs. Furthermore, it was subsequent to this invasion that there appeared the first written testimonies relating to the Mande.

The earliest in date, known today, is given by al-Ya'kūbi (d. 284/897) in his *Ta'rikh*, 26: "There is also another kingdom called Mallal, which is at war with the sovereign of Kānim (Kanem). Their king is called Mayusi (Mai Wasi?)" (cf. J.M. Cuqo, *Recherches sur les sources arabes concernant l'Afrique Occidentale du VIIIe au XVe siècle*, Naples-Rome 1970, 22). If to these, there is added an item from al-Bakrī (K. al-Masdlik wa l-ilmamālik, tr. de Siane, 1965, 333, quoted by Cuqo, *op. cit.*, 102-3), mentioning the conversion to Islam of a kingdom of Mallal (ca. 442/1050) with the aim of putting an end to the drought which was devastating his country, then in a passage from al-İdrīsī (548/1154) on the subject of Mallal, "a small town without walls (*Opus geographicum*, 1, Naples-Rome 1970, 22; Cuqo, *op. cit.* 132), the sensation of "historicity" may perhaps be reassuring, but our knowledge relating to Mande gains nothing in substance. It is not until the beginning of the 13th century, and again with recourse to the oral tradition relayed by the minstrels, that a "history" is discovered in which Mande becomes a kind of stage, upon which actors, half-real and half-mystical, play a role in events of interest and significance.

At this period there was in Mande a certain Nārē-Famaghan, who was only one of forty or more Manding minstrels all of whom bore the title of *manṣa* (chief). He had twelve sons, his potential successors, of whom the youngest, Soundiata (the Mari-Diata of Ibn Ǧīḥālīn) was to have a historic destiny: it was he who was soon to found the empire of Mali. Meanwhile, Mande was tributary to the neighbouring kingdom of Sosso.

This destiny was, in reality, dependent on three factors: (a) the decline of the neighbouring empire to the north, Ghānā, threatened by the king of Sosso, as well as by Arabo-Berbers descending from the north who were ultimately to destroy it (469/1076-7); (b) the lack of unity in Mande, where each minstrel was master of his own territory; and (c) the victory of Soundiata over his rival Soumangourou Kantë, king of Sosso. This last factor constitutes a remarkable example of the oral history of Mande. The narration of the events which took place in the confrontation between the two protagonists takes the form of an epic account in which the real, the miraculous, the serious and the comic are mingled in an apparently inextricable manner; but where a guiding thread is detectable throughout. The story-tellers have seized with relish on these events and, in general, accord little importance to the other two factors.

The plot of the account in question may be sum-

Bagayogo, Sinayogo, Sinaba, Kantë; the shoemakers: Kamare, Garanké; the descendants of slaves and slaves themselves (SCOA, *L'Empire du Mali*, 1970, 413).

Originally, however, the number of Manding clans was smaller. The memories of the story-tellers mention twelve of them, as having constituted the nucleus of what was later to become the Mande "world", the difference (between this number and 34) consisting of new elements coming in from the exterior, either from the empire of Ghānā, or from Sosso and Mande, in fact; attracted these "immigrants" and they would now be called, for two reasons: first, the gold of Bouré, with all that this metal offered in terms of opportunity for work and wealth, and second, the paganism of the animist religion which was seen as virgin territory for Islamic missionary effort. The first of these attractions was more of a lure to the inhabitants of Sosso, almost all of whom practised the extraction and casting of iron; the second appealed to the native of the kingdom of Ghānā, among whom Islam was already beginning to be implanted on a wide scale and who were seeking, at the same time, to migrate towards the south, as a result of increasingly frequent droughts.

It is evident that available knowledge concerning Mande before the foundation of the empire represents a collection of fragmented elements. If to these, there is added an item from al-Bakrī (K. al-Masdlik wa l-ilmamālik, tr. de Siane, 1965, 333, quoted by Cuqo, *op. cit.*, 102-3), mentioning the conversion to Islam of a kingdom of Mallal (ca. 442/1050) with the aim of putting an end to the drought which was devastating his country, then in a passage from al-İdrīsī (548/1154) on the subject of Mallal, "a small town without walls (*Opus geographicum*, 1, Naples-Rome 1970, 22; Cuqo, *op. cit.* 132), the sensation of "historicity" may perhaps be reassuring, but our knowledge relating to Mande gains nothing in substance. It is not until the beginning of the 13th century, and again with recourse to the oral tradition relayed by the minstrels, that a "history" is discovered in which Mande becomes a kind of stage, upon which actors, half-real and half-mystical, play a role in events of interest and significance.

At this period there was in Mande a certain Nārē-Famaghan, who was only one of forty or more Manding minstrels all of whom bore the title of *manṣa* (chief). He had twelve sons, his potential successors, of whom the youngest, Soundiata (the Mari-Diata of Ibn Ǧīḥālīn) was to have a historic destiny: it was he who was soon to found the empire of Mali. Meanwhile, Mande was tributary to the neighbouring kingdom of Sosso.

This destiny was, in reality, dependent on three factors: (a) the decline of the neighbouring empire to the north, Ghānā, threatened by the king of Sosso, as well as by Arabo-Berbers descending from the north who were ultimately to destroy it (469/1076-7); (b) the lack of unity in Mande, where each minstrel was master of his own territory; and (c) the victory of Soundiata over his rival Soumangourou Kantë, king of Sosso. This last factor constitutes a remarkable example of the oral history of Mande. The narration of the events which took place in the confrontation between the two protagonists takes the form of an epic account in which the real, the miraculous, the serious and the comic are mingled in an apparently inextricable manner; but where a guiding thread is detectable throughout. The story-tellers have seized with relish on these events and, in general, accord little importance to the other two factors.

The plot of the account in question may be sum-

Encyclopaedia of Islam, VI 26
marised in the following manner. Soumangourou, king of Sosso and suzerain of Mande, massacres the eleven sons of Soundiata. The latter is spared only on account of his disability, which renders him inoffensive in the eyes of his suzerain. His disability is significant and makes him the opposite of his rival, the blacksmith of Sosso, the archetypal ‘man of action’, dressed in garments of iron; he has crippled legs, as a result of which he lives for seventeen years in a hole in the ground, only his head and shoulders being visible.

But Soundiata is cured of his infirmity in an equally significant manner: with the aid of two enormous bars of iron (used by him successively), of which the first becomes his bow and the second his royal sceptre, he hoists himself out of his ‘hole’, permanently cured, takes to arms, rallies his warriors and goes to fight Soumangourou in a decisive battle, at Krina. The latter escapes from his pursuer only by being blocked by a slab of stone immediately after the entry of the unlucky hero. Traditionists and historians agree in making these events coincide with the foundation of the Manding empire, ca. 1235, and the dispersion of the blackssmiths across West Africa, subsequent to the destruction of their ‘empire’.

It has not been possible to include all the details of the account of the first half of the 13th century, written in Malinké of the Malinké historiographers. The elements of the account supplied here have the purpose only of giving an impression of the structure of the narrative and an ‘introduction’ to its eventual interpretation.

This structure and its interpretation have as their starting point the idea that the status of the hunter-cultivator is superior to that of the blacksmith; but this superiority only emerges and becomes evident from the moment that the first masters the products of the technology of iron possessed by the second. Soundiata is in subjection to Soumangourou until the day that he takes possession of arms, of which the raw material has been supplied to him by his rival, the blacksmith. This could, conceivably, be translated into more modern terms as an assertion that strategy and skill in the manipulation of arms (traits characteristic of the hunter-cultivator) represent a knowledge more profound than that which concerns metallurgy and the science of the armourer. The story summarised above also refers, undoubtedly, to the type of knowledge acquired through initiation. The blacksmith is, on account of his skill, a ‘natural’ and it could be said, initiated being. The hunter-cultivator, on the other hand, acquires this knowledge only after a long period of initiation corresponding to a ‘death’. Soundiata remains ‘buried’ for seventeen years, and emerges from his ‘hole’ to conquer. Soumangourou, on the contrary, is the archetype of life and strength, but, beaten, he descends into bowels of the earth. One comes out of the earth to defeat his adversary, the other enters the earth, vanquished by his enemy. This gives an explanation not only of the dispersal of blacksmiths across Africa, but especially of their place in society.

Soundiata, rich in exploits and in wisdom, occupies a position of eminence in the memory of Malinké story-tellers. He has no equal in the history of Mande other than in the person of one of his successors at the beginning of the 8th/14th century, Mansa Mūsā [q.v.], whose reign marked the highest point of the Manding empire. In his time, this extended from Gao to the estuary of the Gambia, and from Oualata (in the north) to the jungles of Guinea. But Mansa Mūsā owes his place of honour in the work of Arab historians, particularly in that of al-Umari (Masāḥīk al-ṣafi fi mamalik al-ṣamār, quoted by Cuoq, op. cit., 275-9), to the pilgrimage which he made to Mecca and to the fact which he observed during the journey.

This sovereign dominated the whole of the 9th/14th century in West Africa. Even Europe was aware of him and he was featured on the Catalan maps of Dulcert (1339) and of Cresques (1375). Ibn Batūṭa (iv, 367-48), who passed through Mande in 753/1352-3, was unable to make the acquaintance of the Manding emperor who died ca. 1337, but his journey coincided with the last years of prosperity of the great empire. From about the year 1380 onwards, this empire entered upon a period of decadence concerning which Ibn Khalidīn gives some interesting information (cf. Cuoq, op. cit., 339-50). The 15th century marked the beginning of the death-throes of Mande, harassed by the Touareg, the Songhai and the Mossi; the second half of the 17th century saw its disappearance. In 1670, Mande, as a political entity, was reduced, under the onslaught of the Bambara kings of Segou, to the small province from which it had originated, in the region of the Upper Niger; it had survived for approximately three and a half centuries.

Situated in a zone of commercial contacts between North Africa and Black Africa, Mande had, on account of its rich gold deposits, throughout its history, a considerable influence on the commerce and transformations of its immediate neighbours as well as of the Arabo-Berber tribes of the Mediterranean coast. In view of the facts, it is quite astonishing that this great kingdom, born out of the victory of strategy over technology, could have lasted so long. This would not, in the opinion of the present writer, have been possible had not those who presided over the affairs of the country, as well as the people themselves, been particularly conscious of the values which permit the realisation of human potential. The initiatic societies of the Malinkés, so closely linked to the monarchy, are instructive in regard to the ‘spiritual’ preoccupations of the kings of Mande. Such concerns are not rare in African history, but in this case they take on a particular dimension in view of the zone of insecurity in which the Manding empire was located from the very beginning of its existence.


MANDIL, normalised mandil, from Latin/Greek mánīthē, -um, ium, entered Arabic speech in pre-Islamic times, presumably through Aramaic, and has remained in use to this day. Its principal meanings were those of handkerchief, napkin, and towel. Mandil was, however, understood generally as ‘piece of cloth’ and used for many other purposes, such as covering or carrying something or serving, attached to the body, as an untailored part of dress. Numerous other words were available in Islamic languages as synonyms of mandil in both its specific and its generalised meanings. Arabic thus had
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many uses of mandils are attested, for instance: covering the face to conceal crying (al-‘Uyun, Dīgāl, Hyderabad 1374-80/1954-61, i, 364; al-Djawbarī, 23, speaking of a trained monkey); wiping off tears (Ta‘īla Baghdādī, xi, 155) or sweat (al-Šābūrī, Rusūm dīr al-buqadd, Baghdādī 1383/1964, 75, using shustadja), wrapping the body around the flame of a candle spread by the wind’s blowing (Diyā‘ al-Dīn Ibn al-‘Aṣ̄īr, as quoted by al-‘Uyun, 1, 81). Most, if not all, of the uses of mandil were metaphorically used to indicate low status, commonness, and abuse (al-Tawhīdī, al-madīn, ed. Weipert, Beirut 1980, 126 f.). All this shows that the mandil was always an object that engaged the human fancy.


Bibliography: The few selected references in the article are meant to be in addition to those in F. Rosenthal, Four essays on art and literature in Islam, Leiden 1971, 63-99. Fundamental earlier studies are R. B. Sergeant, Material for a history of Islamic textiles, in Ars Islamica, ix-xvi (1942-51), repr. as Islamic textiles, Beirut 1972, and A. Steiger and H.-E. Keller, Lat. Mantellum, in Vox Romana, xv/1 (1956), 103-54, where mandil is followed in its forms and uses through the European languages and Arabic. More recently, Geniza studies have enriched our knowledge of the use of mandils, cf. the publications by S. D. Goitein and, especially, Y. K. Stulman, for instance, The wardrobe of a Jewish bride in Medieval Egypt, in Studies in marriage customs, iv (1974), 297-304. See alsoLIBAS.
MANDIL, AWWALD or BANU, a chiefly family of the Maghrawa [q.v.], prominent in what is now western Algeria in the 7th-8th/13th-14th centuries, taking its name from Mandil, grandson of Abu Nás, son of the Banu Khzarran rulers of Tripoli (391-540/1000-1 to 1145-6) and descendants of the 10th-century Spanish Umayyad Maghrawi chief, Khzarran b. Falfil.

Abû Nás, whose forbear from Tripoli had made his way to kin in the Chelif [Shalaf] basin and finally established himself among the local Maghrawa, had received an 'ideâ' from the Almohads for his services to the Almohad ruler. He had come to Mardin with the Hafsid, and, when in the field against Tlemcen (772/1370). Taking to the mountains of the Banu Bu Sa'd, he won Maghrawa support and garnered the rewards of loyalty to the Almohads.

On his death, he was succeeded by Mandil, the elder of two sons, whose expansionism won him the Ouarsenis (Wansharis), Madina (al-Madiyya) and the fertile Mitidja (Matldja) plain, which he devastated with unsparing pro-Almohad zeal. Subsequently he lost Mitidja itself [see BALUYDA] to Yahyâ, the last of the Banu Ghaniya [q.v.], and around 623/1226 Yahyâ had him killed. Mandil was the founder of the strongholds of Marât on the Rif (Wâdi Rahyû), a tributary of the Chelif.

Mandil's eldest son, al-'Abbâs, was accepted by his brothers as the new chief. As such, he looked to his father's example, but in fact lost all Mandil's gains to his rivals, the Banû Tuglîn, and fell back with his tribe on their heartlands in the lower Chelif. There he remained for a time as ruler of a modest principality.

A change came with the intervention of the Hafsid [q.v. in the Central Maghrib following the repudiation of Almohad authority by the 'Abd al-Wâdid [q.v.] Yahgharmânûn, de facto ruler of Tlemcen. Tribal appeals to the Hafsid Abu '1-Baka, the Hafsid ruler of Tlemcen, but, finding the 'Abd al-Wâdids Yaghamrasan, a strong and internecine quarrel.

Peace between Tlemcen and Fâs came in 749/1348 he took over Miliana, Tenes, and Brechk and Cherchell and re-established his stronghold of Marât on the Rif (Wâdi Rahyû), a tributary of the Chelif. From Muhammad's murder to Thabit's death the family of the family's history is its involvement with Tlemcen, ending with its defeat at Kairouan (al-Sanhadja, on the other, collapsed a few years later with the death of Rashid in a heated personal quarrel with a new chief of his allies, the Sanhadja (between 709 and 711/1309 and 1311; date unclear). Dismayed at Rashid's death, the Maghrawa left their Chelif heartlands, and many took refuge in places as far apart as Andalusia and Ifrikiya. Rashid's young son, 'Ali, found safety with his aunt in Fas, the sultan's wife, and the Awlad Mandil migrated to Marinhid soil and married into Marinhid tribes.

'Ali b. Rashid grew up at court as a Marinhid by adoption and, in adult life, took part in the sultan Abu 'l-Hasan's ambitious campaigns that toppled Tlemcen, but on the sultan's defeat at Kairouan (al-Kayrawân) in 749/1348 he took over Miliana, Tenes, Brechek and Cherchell and re-established his ancestral principality. He requested, but was refused, Marinhid recognition in return for support against 'Abd al-Wâdids resurgence. 'Ali's subsequent reliance on the 'Abd al-Wâdids to respect his principality proved misplaced, and brought him to disaster and suicide (752/1351-2). His young son, Hamza, was taken to Fâs and, like 'Ali, was reared as a Marinhid.

As an adult, Hamza deserted the Marinhids on the grounds of an alleged injustice when in the field against Tlemcen (772/1370). Taking to the mountains of the Banû Bû Sa'd, he won Maghrawa support and
held out till a vast Marinid army terrified his allies into surrender. With few followers he next established himself among the Arab tribe of Husayan, then in revolt against the Marinids with 'Abd al-Wadid backing them. The tribal leader of Titteri' suggests that the tribe's 'ibn Tliari was his stronghold. His subsequent failure to rally the Banu Bu Sadiid drew him into a rash exploit at Timzughat (Timzughat), north-west of Miliana, which ended in disaster. Both he and his friends were captured, and the Husayan fled to the Titteri mountains from their plain below. From the fortress they made their last stand—an event actually witnessed by Ibn Khaludin. Hamza and his friends were executed, and early in 1372 their headless corpses were crucified outside Miliana. Thereafter the Awlad Mandil disappear from history.


MANDIL [see MANDJANIK]

MANDINGO [see MANDANIK]

MANDANIK (A., ultimately from Greek >p¡jatovaskon, via Aramaic, cf. Fraenkel, Die aramäische Fremdworteir, 243, passing into Spanish as almancon, cf. Bourdavid, Glossaire, 69; manajamk, a general term for any kind of stone-throwing siege-engine. The expressions mandanik and arraida [q.v.] are both used for this kind of machine, and although the arraida may have been the smaller of the two, their presence often seems to be interchangeable. Mandanik occurs more frequently than arraida, but their point of origin is vague. The question of the point of origin of the counterweight trebuchet has not yet been resolved. The trebuchet originated in China no later than the 4th century B.C. and was in common use in Chinese armies from that time onwards (J. Needham, China's trebuchets, manned and counterweighted, in Lynn White Festschrift, Humana civilitas, i [1976], 107-53). It consisted of a beam, composed of a single spar, or of several spars bound together, which was supported on a fulcrum on top of a timber tower. The tower was often provided with wheels, to assist in the placement and aiming of the weapon. The beams were from 5.60 to 8.40 m. in length, with diameters at the extremities of 12.5 and 7 cm. At the narrower end was a copper "nest", attached to the beam by iron wires, thus forming a short sling. The missile, which could weigh up to 60 kg., was placed in the sling. At the other end of the beam there was a special attachment to which a number of ropes were attached. A team of men, ranging in number from 40 to 250 or more, pulled in unison on these ropes to discharge the missile, to distances of up to 150 metres (D.R. Hill, Trebuchets, in Viator, iv [1973], 99-114). Although the range of these machines was less than that of the classical weapons, the greater weight of the missiles made them much more effective against fortifications. The traction trebuchet was diffused from China, through the Turkish areas, to the Middle East during the 1st/7th century. At the siege of Mecca in 64/683 there was a mandanik called Umm Farasa ("Mother of the hair"). This description may well have been derived from the appearance of the ropes hanging down from the end of the beam. A poet added his own description: "When the rope [signifying the missile] is looped tightly in a 'stallion' (al-Tabari, i, 426). At the siege of Daybul in Sind in 92/711-12, the Muslims had a siege-machine called al-A'ris ("The Bride"). It was operated by 500 men, and was under the control of a skilled operator who took charge of the aiming and shooting (al-Bâdhûri, Fâlîh, 437). There was a battery of machines at the siege of Baghdad in 261/875-6: men were assigned to every mandanik and arraida, and pulled on ropes to discharge the missiles (al-Tabari, i, 1551 f.). The counterweight trebuchet, which came into use at the end of the 6th/12th century, was a much heavier machine. It consisted of a heavy wooden beam resting on a fulcrum, which was supported on a massive timber tower. The beam, typically about 20 m. long, was divided by the fulcrum in the ratio of 5:1 or 6:1. At the end of the short arm, the box containing the counterweight was suspended, and filled with lead, iron or stones; the total weight was from 10 to 30 tonnes. A long sling—about as long as the beam itself—was attached to the end of the long arm, with a pouch to contain the missile. The trebuchet was spanned by a winch, whose rope was attached to the long arm at about the mid-point. When the release mechanism was pulled, the beam rotated and the sling accelerated to a greater velocity than that of the beam. The missile was released when the end of one of the ropes slipped from a hook, at an instant when the combined effect of the sling's velocity and the angle of discharge gave maximum range to the missile. Ranges were of the order of 300 m., and the missiles could be very heavy. During the 8th/14th century sieges of Tlemcen, the mandanik was capable of bombarding the town with balls made of marble, some of which have been found there, the largest with a circumference of 2 m. and weighing 230 kg. (see nijska, ii, for characteristics of both kinds of trebuchet, see Hill, op. cit., passim).
MANDJANIK — MANDU

written a few years earlier than this, Murdā b. ‘Ali devotes a section to trebuchets, all except one of the traction type. The exception is called a ‘Persian’ manajamk, and although the passage is obscure, it is possible that this was a counterweight machine (C]. Cahen, Un traité d’armurerie composé pour Saladin, in BEO, xii [1947-8], 16-18). On present data, we can only locate the origin of the counterweight trebuchet somewhere in Mediterranean Christendom or western Islam, towards the end of the 6th/12th century. Its spread thereafter was very rapid, both in Europe and in the Muslim world. The first report we have of its use in Islam refers to the siege of Hims in 646/1248, where the machine in question is referred to as a mandjanik maghibi, a western or a North African trebuchet (Abu ‘l-Fida°, Mukhtasar tažrik al-bajjar, in RHC, Historiens orientaux, i, 1872, 125). Counterweight trebuchets were used in great numbers by the Muslims at the siege of ‘Akka in 690/1291 (al-Makrizi, K. al-Suluk, ed. Quatremère, Histoire des sultans Mamelouks, Paris 1837-42, ii, 125). At least certainly, the counterweight trebuchet was introduced to China by the Muslims. Two Muslim engineers, ‘Alā’ al-Dīn and Ismā‘īl, are honoured by a biography in the official history of the Yuan dynasty. They constructed the machines for Kubilai for the siege of Fan-ch'eng towards the end of A.D. 1272. Thus the counterweight trebuchets acquired the name of ‘‘Muslim’’ machines, by which they were long afterwards known (Needham, op. cit., 114).

Bibliography: In addition to the works mentioned in the text, see K. Huuri, Zur Geschichte des Mittelalterlichen Geschützwerks aus orientalischen Quellen, Helsinki 1941; information about the construction of traction trebuchets is to be found in Abu ‘Abd Allāh al-Khārazmī, Mafatih al-‘ulum, ed. van Vloten, 247-9. (D. R. Hill)

AL-MANDIJUR, Abu ‘l-‘ABBAS AHMAD b. ‘ALI AL-MINASSI AL-FASII, a learned Moroccian scholar and teacher, from a family originally from Meknès, born in Fās 926/1520 and died there 16 Dhu ’l-Ka‘d/dal 18 October 1537. Endowed with vast learning and a great power of verbal expressiveness, he spent his life teaching, with the methods in use at the time. He was a master of Islamic topics, in particular, theology and law, and was considered one of the greatest masters of his age at the Karawiyyīn [q. v.]. Between 987 and 993/1579-85, he stayed frequently for periods in Marrakesh, where his most eminent disciple was the sultan al-Mansūr al-Dhahabī [q. v.].

He was the author of commentaries and glosses on well-known and esteemed works of theology and law (see Lévi-Provençal, Charfa, 91), of which various manuscripts are extant (see Hajji, Activité intellectuelle, 164-77, passim), but above all he has left behind a Fabras [q. v.] of great documentary interest which has not however yet been made the object of a critical edition. It was written in Radjaq 989/August 1581 at the request of al-Mansūr, who wished to get from his master a general uṣūla [q. v.] theoretically authorising him to teach all the topics studied under his direction and further containing the names of his own masters, with biographical notices and items of information of a literary nature. Several manuscripts of al-Mandijur’s Fabras exist (see Hajji, op. cit., 27, no. 72), which was written in two versions, a long and a short one, according to the author’s own practice.

Independently of the sultan, this teacher oversaw the intellectual formation of several pupils, who themselves left on less distinguished pupils, subsequently who filled the office of kāfī in various Moroccan towns, unlike their master who, despite his

great learning, piety and exalted protection and patronage, never exercised any religious office at all because of his distant Jewish ancestry [see Mayyara]; he was even barred from leading the prayer when he had been thus designated by al-Mansūr (al-Ifrānī, Nuzhat al-hādī, 155).


MANDU, fortress and town of Central India.

1. History. Once the fortress-capital of Mālwā [q. v.] and now a village 34 km. south of Dhar in Madhya Pradesh, in lat. 22° 21’ N and long. 75° 26’ E. The first rulers took full advantage of a natural outcrop of the Vindhya range, looking over the Nimar plain to the south. A deep and jagged ravine, the Kakra Khoh, isolates it on the sides. The plateau, well-supplied with lakes and springs, stretches unevenly over 5 km. and more from north to south, and 6 to 7 km. from east to west, at an average altitude of 600 m. with the remains of the inner fort. The first rulers took full advantage of a natural outcrop of the Vindhya range, looking over the Nimar plain to the south. A deep and jagged ravine, the Kakra Khoh, isolates it on the sides. The plateau, well-supplied with lakes and springs, stretches unevenly over 5 km. and more from north to south, and 6 to 7 km. from east to west, at an average altitude of 600 m. with the remains of the inner fort. Songadh as one of the more prominent landmarks to the west. Mandapaka is mentioned on an inscription found at Pratapgadh in Rajasthan and dated to the equivalent of 946 A.D. Mandapada-durar appears on a copper-plate grant of Jayavamadeva dated 1261 A.D. Thus Mandu could be a corruption of Mandapada or even of Mandava.

In the early Islamic days of the subcontinent, the Paramāra king Bhoja delected Mahmūd, the Ghaznavid sultan [q. v.], from the area. Itūmūn himself did not reach as far as Māndu in his conquests, but Dājlal al-Dīn Khaḍhīj sacked the neighbouring lands in 1293, and the fort fell to ‘‘Alā’ al-Dīn Khaḍhīj’s general A‘īn al-Mulk in 1303. Thereafter, the local governors ruled from Dāhār, where Mahmūd Shāh Tughlūk took refuge from the chaos engendered by Timūr’s onslaught; after his return to Dīlī in 804/1401, Dilawar Khān Gīrī proclaimed himself independent, and at his death in 808/1405, his eldest son Alp Khān ascended the throne of Mālwā under the name of Huḥang Shāh, and moved the capital to Māndū. On his coins and until the end of the century, Shāḥdābād, the ‘‘city of joy’’, appears as the name for the new capital. Although much involved in warfare with the rulers of Gudjarat, Dājūnpur, Dīlī, Utrīs and the Dakhān, he fully restored and strengthened the ancient fortifications protecting the access to the Middle course of the Nirmān, and to rival with his neighbours. After his death, the cruelty of his own son led the son of his trusted relative and vezār Malik Mughūt to accept the throne in 839/1436 under the name of Mahmūd I Khaḍhīj [q. v.]. During the 36 years of his reign, the fame of Māndu
spread abroad as far as Cairo as well as to Samarkand; scholars and holy men called at the capital, sometimes on their way to the Bahmani court of Shams al-Din Muhammad III at Bidar [q.v.]. The buildings of his reign reflect the ever-expanding size of his realm; besides palaces and hospitals, Mahmud ordered the start of Hujjat Shah’s tomb in 843/1439, his own madrasa and victory tower in 846/1443 after his victories over Chitor (Citawr), and the completion of the Djami Masqjid in 858/1454. In 871/1467 the lunar calendar replaced the solar one. Under the generous rule of sultan Shams al-Din, the town of Mandu was further enhanced, one may imagine, by buildings to fit his desire “to open the door of peace and rest, and pleasure and enjoyment on me and those depending on me” after the “34 years at the stirrups” of his father. His large and somewhat eccentric harem never deterred him from his religious duties and from a sober life, unlike his son Nasir al-Din (906-16/1500-10), who was a dossimaniac, although for a time a sound ruler, a lover of the arts and a great builder of palaces such as the so-called Baz Bahadur palace dated 914/1508. During the troubled reign of his son Mahmud II, Muslim and Hindu nobles were rivals for power at court, especially Mēdīnī Rāy [q.v.]. Notwithstanding its architectural highlights, its rule came to a brutal end in 937/1531, when Mandu-fell to Bahadur Shah of Gudjarat and the smith was taken prisoner, with his seven sons, and later killed. In 941/1534, the Mughal Humāyūn [q.v.] broke into the fort near the Tārāpur gate, but not before Bahadur Shah had been lowered with horses from the inner fort of Songāfrh down into the deep Kakra Koh. Two years later Malik Khān, an officer of the defunct Khāldjī retinue, seized Mandu and ruled for 6 years under the name of Kādir Shāh until he was murdered in 949/1542 to Shir Shāh Sūr, who replaced him by his relative Shujāʾ Khān as governor of Māwā. In 963/1555 his son Bāz Bahadur seized power, although unable to assert himself for long; when Akbar’s general Adham Khān overran Māndu in 968/1560, Bāz Bahadur escaped while his favourite Rupmatī, of poetical fame, chose poison rather than servitude. He managed to recapture Mandu in 979/1570, which date is rubbied on a tomb. In 987/1578 the latter first visited the fort in 991/1573; further visits were connected with expeditions to the Dakhan. Two inscriptions dated 1008/1600 and 1009/1601 recall the hospitality given by his governor Shah Būdhān Khān in his palace now called Nil Kanth. On Akbar’s order, the southern Tārāpur darvāza was re-orientated to the west in 1014/1605 and Mahmūd Khāldjī’s tomb was roughly repaired at the same time. Dājāngīr [q.v.], according to his memoirs, spent seven months in Māndu during the rainy season in 1026/1617; buildings were restored and the whole court enjoyed hunting and feasting; his birthday celebrations took place in Bāz Bahadur’s garden next to his palace with the future Shah Dājāhn and Sir Thomas Roe in attendance. Four years later, the young prince spent another rainy season there and held a conference to induce reconciliation between two Jain factions. Awrangzīb [q.v.] is represented in Māndu by only one inscription on the northern ‘Alamgīr darvāza dated 1079/1668-9. After his death 1118/1707, a rapid deterioration of the empire lead to the supremacy of Marāhā [q.v.] power. In 1734 A.D. Pēghwā Bādgī Rao was appointed governor of Mālwā. His deputy Anand Rāo Pūr and his descendants ruled thereafter from Dārā. Māndu reverted to its first vocation of a hunting ground until basic restoration was started early this century; it has continued to this day.

2. Architecture. As in Gudjarat, Dājāhnpur and Bīdar [q.v.] throughout the 9th/15th century, the newly-independent state of Mālwā competed not only on the battlefield but also in setting up an imposing new capital. It was imperative to modernise the walls and the ten complex gates and to make good use of the expanses of water and springs, as well as to plan the town along a north-south axis with the new Dājāhnī Masqjid sited at the central east-west crossing. As in Dārā, the master-builders at first drew on the Gudjarat tradition by adapting Hindu proportions and style to the Mālwā Khān Dājāhnī (808/1405-6) measuring about 37 by 45 m., and the Malik Mughul Dājāhnī (835/1432), about 42 by 46 m. In both cases, spoils from temples were used to implement an Arab mosque plan, with three domes over the prayer hall in the later building. The Dājāhnī Masqjid, built of red ochre sandstone like the rest of Māndu, was completed by the mid-9th/15th century to include the revered marble tomb of Hujjat Shah. An inscription dated 975/1563 recalls the reverential visit of four master builders of the Mughal court. An exulting plinth emphasises the 85m façade of the mosque, with its eastern domed entrance of metropolitan quality. A similar dome over the mihrāb rests on competent corner arches. A total 150 smaller domes line the subn. Opposite, the one-time madrasa (Ashrafiyya Mahall) of Mahmūd T Khāldjī, with its tower of victory once seven storeys high, was changed into a marble-lined imposing tomb, with impressive inscriptions, before his death; but it soon became derelict. A large number of lesser tombs are scattered along the approach road to Māndu and across the plateau.

Always on aplinth and at most times following a square plan, the domed chamber usually belongs to a complex including a prayer hall also on a plinth, and a tank, as with the Dārā Khān mausoleum (10th/16th century). Geometric bands of glazed tiles enhance the base of drums inside domes, as in the Dājāhnī Masqjid, as well as outside some of the tombs; they are chiefly turquoise and white, of mediocre quality when compared with those on buildings in Bīdar. Stone carving on elegant projecting windows, arched walls and qalālds are far more successful.

In some architectural traditions a wall is strung between palaces and water expanses: the Dājāhnī (“ship”) Mahall, the broad buttressing outer walls (at an angle of 77° from the horizontal) contain an imposing audience hall with five double and one single-pointed arches. By the north wall of the royal enclosure, a large palace complex once dominated the Mūdż∩ Talāo, including a special well, the Champa bādolī, with adjacent underground rooms for the summer. Further afield, the Uḍjala (bright) bādolī and the Andherī (dark) bādolī recall the elaborate wells of Gudjarat and Radjasthan. Both the Gadā (beggar) Shah’s shop and house hint at a later audience hall and palace. Beyond the large Sāgar Talāo to the south, the so-called Bāz Bahadur palace overlooks the waters of the Riwā Kund. Once a complex of barracks, the so-called Rupmatī pavilions dominate the whole scene. The last important palace to be built was the Nil Kanth (“blue throat”); it faces westward on the edge of the cliff by a spring. At present it is used as a Hindu temple.

3. Painting. As in architecture, painting in manuscripts for the court evolved along original lines, but drew on two main sources, relating to neighbouring
states. A Jain minister of the Paramara king Jayasimha founded in Mandapa-durga one of his six *jhana-bhandaras* ("storage of knowledge"), a specifically Jain library, in 1263; the books always contained an important pictorial element. The *Mandua kalpa-sutra* of 1439 illustrates the continuity in production. On the other hand, illustrated Islamic texts of the time blend this traditional draughtsmanship and vivid colours with the conventions from the 9th/10th century schools of Shîrâz and Harât, to produce a recognisable Mâlîwâ style; the few manuscripts discovered so far relate to the early part of the 10th/11th century: the *Nâmas-namâ* (a book of delicacies), (Ethê 2775, India Office Library), the *Mîrâf al-fusâli* (a Persian glossary of rare words), (BL Or. 3299), the *Buṣâtã of Sa'di* dedicated to Nâsir al-Dîn before 916/1510 (National Museum of India, New Delhi, no. 48.6/4), *"Aqfâ`ib al-sânã* (a Persian translation of al-Dżâzâri’s book on the knowledge of mechanical devices [see al-Dżâzâri and Ḥîyal in Suppl.]) (BL Or. 1371).

**Bibliography**
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**MANDÜB (a.)** "meritorious and recommended action", term of Islamic law; see *gaʿirî*.

**MANDÜR, MUHAMMAD B. ABD AL-ḤAMĪD MŪṣĀ (1907-65),** the *ghâyîh of modern Egyptian and Arab literary critics*, was born in Kafr Mandûr, near Minyâ al-Kamh, in Egypt’s Sharqiyya Province, to a rather wealthy family. His semi-literate father was a devout and tolerant Muslim who belonged to the Nakshbandi dervish order. Mandûr learned many *kurânic* verses from his father, and his religious upbringing in the vanguard of opposition to the government of Sidki Pasha and the British. Mandûr was discharged after only three months, and for a short while he contented himself with publishing a few articles and teaching at the newly-founded (1944) evening Institute of Drama. In 1945 he was appointed Editor-in-Chief of the evening newspaper *al-Wâfd al-Misrî*, which, with the assistance of some rebellious avant-garde writers, he gradually transformed into a daily revolutionary manifesto against the British and their Egyptian collaborators. Despite his socialist writings and his leadership of the liberal progressive wing within the Wafd party, Mandûr was never a communist; he remained a nationalist politician and his vehement opposition to the Sidki-Bevin Treaty brought him imprisonment twenty times in 1945 and 1946, and cost him the closing of his own six-months-old newspaper, *al-Beʿâbî* ("Resurrection"), as well as eleven other newspaper and magazines. With the fall of Sidki’s cabinet, Mandûr assumed the editorship of the new Wafd newspaper, *Saʿūd al-Ummâ* ("The voice of the Nation"), where he pursued his political struggle against "colonialism and Western exploitation of Egypt’s national resources". Mandûr operated a successful law office from 1948 to 1954, and at the same time continued to write and edit the newspaper *Saʿūd al-Ummâ*. He was elected to the Egyptian parliament in 1950, and served on several parliamentary committees. In 1953 he embarked on yet another teaching and writing career at the Arab League Institute’s of Higher Arabic Studies, and continued until some time before his death in 1965.

Mandûr’s copious œuvre consists of specialised and general books treating one or several related subjects or literary genres; translations of diverse works, mostly from French into Arabic; book reviews; hundreds of political and literary articles; some elementary attempts at poetry; and one screenplay.

Despite his prominence as a journalist, political activist and translator, Mandûr’s reputation is principally that of eminent literary critic, surpassing in
intellectual vigour and critical insight his teacher Taha Husayn, but without his fame and versatility. His literary works encompass three basic fields: criticism, theoretical and practical; poetry and poets; and theatre, in both its prose and verse forms. Most notable and enduring of his critical books are Fi 'l-mizān ad-dādīlīt ("In the new balance"), in which Mandur expounded his theory of al-shīr al-mahmūs ("whispered poetry"), inspired by the title of Mikhail Nu‘ayma’s [q.v.] poetry collection Hams al-dīvān, n.d. ("The whispering of eyelids"); and al-Nakd al-manḥādījīt 'ind al-'Arāb ("Methodical criticism among the Arabs"), 1946. Some other books in this category are: Fi 'l-adāb wa 'l-nakd ("On literature and criticism"), 1949; al-Adāb wa-madhdhibuhihī ("Literature and its schools"), 1958; and al-Adāb wa-funūnihī ("Literature and its genres"), 1963. Mandur’s major works on poetry and poems comprised a theoretical work on poetry, Fann al-shīr ("The art of poetry"), 1960, and a renowned series of critical studies on Syro-American poets, Egyptian modernist poets, and the poets of the vers libre movement. His principal works on the theatre include al-Masrah ("The theatre"), 1959; al-Kāsīṣkhātīya wa 'l-ṣīṣtī al-fānsīyya li 'l-dīmām ("Classicism and the artistic roots of drama"), n.d.; and applied studies of the verse plays of Ahmad Shawki (d. 1932) and the prose theatre of Tawfik al-Hakim (b. 1908).

The most distinguished of Mandur’s translations are the two acclaimed critical treatises which greatly influenced his early critical thought and which punctuated his critical writings throughout his career: Georges Duhamel’s Dfence des lettres (1943) and Gustave Larson’s La Méthode de l’histoire littéraire (1946), which he appended to the fifth edition of al-Nakd al-manḥādījīt ‘ind al-‘Arāb. The other translated works encompass a whole range of literary disciplines, from Flaubert’s Madame Bovary to E.A. Poe’s The Raven.

His political and ideological writings comprise one major book, al-Dimṣakṣrīyya al-ṣiyāsīyya ("Political democracy"), 1952; and innumerable articles, some of which were published in two books (Dīwān al-adab al-ishtirākī, Cairo 1965; and more recent editions of Dīwān al-adab al-ishtirākī, Cairo n.d., and Beirut 1967; and Khayri ‘Azzī, Udbāh ‘alāṣi wāṣir al-nidāl al-ṣiyāṣī, Cairo 1970). Works published posthumously, such as Kitāb al-lam tanggar, Cairo n.d.; and more recent editions of Mandur’s work, feature representative lists of his publications.

Bibliography: Mandur wrote upwards of thirty books and hundreds of articles and book reviews, the majority of which remain uncollected. In 1964, he granted an elaborate and informative interview which was published in Fu‘ād Dawwār’s book ‘Ashrat udbāh yaiyathaddāthīn, Cairo 1965. Another interview was published in the Lebanese literary journal al-Adāb (January 1961), by Fārāk Shīḥbēh. Scores of articles about his life and critical writings have been written after his death in such major Arabic literary journals as al-Adāb, al-Ṭalī‘a, and al-Majālāt. The most detailed and penetrating expositions of Mandur’s criticism in English are presented by D. Semah in his book, Four Egyptian literary critics, Leiden 1974, and in his Muhammad Mandur and “New Poetry”, in JAL, ii (1971). Major Arabic studies of Mandur include Henri Riyād’s Muhammad Mandur, Rā‘īd al-adāb al-ṣīḥṣāfīkhī, Khar- toum 1965 and Beirut 1967; and Khayri ‘Azzī, Udbāh ‘alāṣi wāṣir al-nidāl al-ṣiyāṣī, Cairo 1970. Works published posthumously, such as Kitāb al-lam tanggar, Cairo n.d.; and more recent editions of Mandur’s work, feature representative lists of his publications.

(Mansour Ajami)

MANER, a former town, now no bigger than a village, 22 miles/32 km. west of Patnā [q.v.] in Bihār state, India, by the junction of the rivers Sōn and Ganges (it was reported to be at the junction in 1722, 3 miles/5 km. south of it by 1812, 7 miles/10 km. south by 1907); it had therefore some strategic and mercantile advantage, and was one of the earliest and most important sites of Muslim colonisation in this part of the world.

By Mughal times, it had become the chief town of a pargana of some 80,000 bighas [see Misāma 2, India] in the sāba of Bihār (Aṣn-i Akbari, tr. Jarrett, Calcutta 1891, ii, 151, 153). A copperplate grant from a Hindu
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1. Malik Mughlth Djami\textsuperscript{c}, 835/1432, east façade.

2. Malik Mughlth Djami\textsuperscript{c}, Kibla riwaks and sahn.

2. Malik Mughlth Djami\textsuperscript{c}, Kibla riwaks and sahn.
3. Hüshang Şâh’s tomb, started 843/1439.

The king of Kanawjd (ed. and tr. P. R. Sharma, in JBORS, ii/4 [1916]) of 1126 A.D. requires that the tomb chamber which also has finely carved stone screen openings. A local tradition asserts that the stone was brought from Gundjar; certainly, features of Gundjar tomb design are apparent here [see further MUGHAL. Architecture.]. West of the mausoleum is a small mosque with curvilinear roof, centrally situated between stone verandahs running along the entire western wall of the enclosure; inscription dated 1028/1619, quoting Qur'an, III, 97-8. An undergrowth of shrubbery in the south-west corner is identified as the tilla of Shâh Dâwal. A fine entrance gate, in a more conventional Mughal style, bears two chronograms of 1022/1614-15 and 1032/1622-3. Other minor buildings around the tank are in grave disrepair. The earliest inscription of Maner, 798/1395-6, records the reconstruction of an older mosque, now disappeared. The Djamii mosque of Maner, itself undistinguished, bears two records of renovations, of 1103/1691-2 and 1283/1866 (the last on a marble slab carved in Medina), both mosques thus testifying to a vigorous Muslim population over the centuries; but the grounds around the Maner tank are also the scene of a devoutly Islamic fair on the urs of Ghâzâlî Miyan [q.v.].


J. BURTON-PAGE

MANF, Memphis, the capital of the Egyptian Old Kingdom, situated on the west bank of the Nile opposite modern Hulwan [q.v.] about twelve miles south of Fustat [q.v.], plays a pivotal rôle in mediaeval Arab geographical and historical writing on Egypt. Al-Kaâgândârî (Shâh al-aâbâ, iii, 316, 6-8; German tr. P. Wüstenfeld, Die Geographie und Verwaltung in Ägypten, Göttingen 1879, 41) presents the climate (— the third) and the geographic coordinates of Manf. The Muslims knew about the great antiquity (madina ... azâliyya; K. al-Istibâr fi 'âdadār al-amâr, Alexandria 1958, 83, French tr. 68) of the formerly huge city (cf. Ibn Zûlân, quoted by al-Âzawdî, Âhâr al-bîlîd wa-âlîhâr al-âmâr, Beirut 1939/1979, 274). The great scholar and most prominent medieval authority on Manf, 'Abd al-Latif al-Râghahî (al-Fadâa te 'l-Imârî, in Kamal Hafûth Zand ed., The eastern key, London 1965, 136-7) speaks of over 4,000

MANER — MANF

which stands the square sandstone mausoleum of Makhdûm Shâh Yahya (in-
years, a surprisingly exact estimate. Manf was destroyed when 'Amr b. al-As conquered Egypt and presented itself to mediaeval visitors in ruins (Abu al-Asarya, c. 695-700). The city of Manf in pre-Islamic and in Islamic Egypt—numbered thirty (e.g. al-Nuwayri, Nikayat al-arab, xxv, 4, 8 ff.).

The seventeenth-century Turkish traveller Evliya Celebi (Sehaybatname, x, 11, 18) vacillates, in his interpretation, between a Coptic (Menf — a bride) and an Heb emergency ("place of purity").

The mediaeval authors (e.g. al-Dimashki, 232) merge the Arabicised authority of his prestigious informants, was the first of many subsequent authors to connect the Arabicised form Manf with Coptic ma'uf (authoritative reading in Ibn Dukmak, 130) as the original name, sometimes confused (Ibn Hawkal, as cited by Abu Dja'far al-Idrisi) with the forms Maf (Ibn al-Zayyat, 7, 6-7) and, more correctly, Manuf al-Kalsh, accepted by mediaeval visitors in ruins (kharb, 231-2; and the tables in J. Maspero and G. Wiet, Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de l'Égypte, Cairo 1919, 173-84, and A. Grohmann, Studien zur historischen Geographie und Verwaltung des frühmittelalterlichen Ägypten, Vienna 1959, appendix ii). Many, though certainly not all, mediaeval authors (e.g. al-Dimashki, 232) merge the cities of Manf and of Wasi'maustm into one. A papyrus of 137/570 explicitly mentions the kāna Manf (Grohmann, 140b).

The city Manf in pre-Islamic and in Islamic Egypt—numbered thirty (e.g. al-Nuwayri, Nikayat al-arab, xxv, 4, 8 ff.).

The Nile posed a constant threat to the fields and pastures around Manf in pre-Islamic and in Islamic times; Ibn 'Abd al-Hakam (Futūḥ Muf wa-akbārahā, 6,8) speaks of the canal of Manf as one of the seven khulūd of Egypt; for al-Wakid, e.g. Ibn Dukmak, 130, offers as an alternative the city of Menuf = a bride) and an
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The Nile posed a constant threat to the fields and pastures around Manf in pre-Islamic and in Islamic times; Ibn 'Abd al-Hakam (Futūḥ Muf wa-akbārahā, 6,8) speaks of the canal of Manf as one of the seven khulūd of Egypt; for al-Wakid, e.g. Ibn Dukmak, 130, offers as an alternative the city of Menuf = a bride) and an

The explicit and implicit information on Pharaonic Egypt given in the Kur‘ân and in the stories of the prophets was the indispensable repertory for mediaseval Muslim reports on the history of the country in pre-Islamic times. The ubiquitous archaological remains of Pharaonic period were eagerly identified with items familiar from the sacred text and the commentaries. In a similar fashion, Manf was given its well-defined and prominent place within salvation history. The reports of traditionists such as Ibn Lahi‘a (q.v.), recorded by early historians like Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakâm and ‘Umar al-Kindî, remained the main corpus of information on Manf well into the modern period. Even in the 19th century the truths of the կիսայ անհյա? were not easily superseded by the results of enlightened empirical and historical research. ‘Ali Mu‘âammad al-‘Adawi’s lengthy chapter on ‘Ibn Idrîs was introduced and, so to speak, legitimated by a long verbatim quotation from al-Mâkrisî’s Khitat, i.e. by an intrinsically Islamic text. Only then does there follow what European scholarship has found out about the factual history of the city (see his al-Khitat al-Tawfîkiyya al-dajidda, xvii, 2-8).

Three verses of the Kur‘ân are interpreted as referring to the city of Manf: iv, 115, “And he [= Mûsâ] entered the city at a time of carelessness of its folk” (cf. also ‘Umar al-Kindî, Fadâ‘îl Miṣr, ed. Ibrâhîm Ahmad al-‘Adawi and ‘Ali Mu‘âammad ‘Umar, Cairo–Beirut 1391/1971, 25); xxvii, 21, “So he [= Mûsâ] escaped from thence, fearing, vigilant”; and xliii, 51, “Isn’t mine the sovereignty (mulk) he [= Musa] escaped from thence, fearing, vigilant”; cf. Ibn ‘Abd al-Latif) and made it a place of public venera-

The dominant Islamic stereotype associated with Manf is its role as the seat of Pharaoh’s troops in the Red Sea (al-Rau’d al-mîsri, 551a, cf. the footnote of the editor). According to ‘Abd al-‘Ali, at the end of the 10th/16th century, whenrousing the city and the country. Al-Mâkrisî, in his chapter on Manf (fol. 35a), both writing in the Ayyubid era, Musa took refuge in the neighbouring hamlet of Dunûh/Dunmiyya/Dunuwayh. This place remained sacred to the Jews, who erected a synagogue there (‘Abd al-Halîm; the Jews were banished to Ayn Shams, as one source maintains (Abû Dja‘far al-‘Idrisî, fol. 57a). ‘Al-Himyari goes so far as to claim, with rule over Egypt after the demise of Pharaoh’s troops in the Red Sea together with the soldiers of the country provided the “historical” nucleus for the hen-precked predicament of the Egyptian male, to be encountered among non-Egyptian writers from the days of Herodotus to the time when Musa ‘Ali, in 1582, had the ‘Adwan and ‘Umar take an important part to play in this context. The main temple (birâ‘î barbî [q.v.] of Manf, with its four doors, built by the valiant Queen Dalûkâ, had an apotropiac func-

The women’s régime established in Egypt after the Pharaoh of Moses had perished in the Red Sea with the soldiers of the country provided the “historical” nucleus for the hen-precked predicament of the Egyptian male, to be encountered among non-Egyptian writers from the days of Herodotus to the time when Musa ‘Ali, in 1582, had the ‘Adwan and ‘Umar take an important part to play in this context. The main temple (birâ‘î barbî [q.v.] of Manf, with its four doors, built by the valiant Queen Dalûkâ, had an apotropiac func-

As we have seen in the case of Manf’s epithet “capital city of the Egyptian kings”, historical
veracity and pious legend are inevitably and inex-
tricably mixed. Some of the miraculous buildings of
the Manf of the magicians may well have had their
origins in contemporaneous Pharaonic building
activity. Thus we hear of sophisticated gears (al-
darad` al-
mudjawaṣṣa, al-Khitat, iii, 28) engineered to lift water to
the highest buildings on Manf in early postdiluvian
times. Manf is—truly or falsely?—mentioned as the
location of Egypt's first Nilometer [see MIKYAS], (al-
to the highest buildings on Manf in early postdiluvian
version in al-Kazwim, 265, who cites al-Kuda
i, and
muajawafa, al-Khitat, Mas
Murudl
Thus we hear of sophisticated gears
(al-darad` al-
dary function—in such cases as Joseph's abode or
Ayn
Queen Daluka. Of equally indeterminable historicity
built as the second and third ones much later by
Kanz,'i, his departure could immediately be signalled to the
identify them and to differentiate between their legen-
tions available to us, though it is not always easy to
the granite monuments) in the ruins of Manf (see Abu
us that Yusuf erected it, together with the Pyramids,
and to Manf seems to have been the minimum pro-
belonging to the Pyramids). A visit to the Pyramids
rendered as "temple" than "church"—in Manf. It
wielded as "church"—in Manf. It
often closely connected with the adjacent Pyramids
(sc. of Sakkara, Būṣir and Dīža), Egypt's greatest
wūqāba (Abū Sāliḥ, 200; Abu Djafar al-Idrīsī, fol.
34a, speaking of Manf as the "settlement" [kūyām]
belonging to the Pyramids). A visit to the Pyramids
and to Manf seems to have been the minimum pro-
gramme for visitors to the area who were interested in
Pharaonic archaeology (cf. Abu Djafar al-Idrīsī, 45a,
on the envoy of Frederick II to the court of al-Malik
al-Kāmil). In striking unanimity, most authors men-
tion the prevalence of the indelible green colour (sc.
of the granite monuments) in the ruins of Manf (see Abu
'l-Fidā', 117).

Certain monuments are singled out in the descrip-
tions available to us, though it is not always easy to
identify them and to differentiate between their legen-
dary function—in such cases as Joseph's abode or
Pharaoh's palace—and the archaeological reality as
seen and recorded by the authors. Therefore the de-
tailed scholarly observations of 'Abd al-Laṭfī al-
Baghdādi are of particular value. One building, not
mentioned by 'Abd al-Laṭfī, is the magnificent,
monolithic, so-called "bishop's church" (kānūn al-
šūkāf); Abu Hamīd al-Kudīs (150) lists it even as the
first among the 'adaja'ib of Egypt. It is not all clear
whether this church, the church "spread with mats"
mentioned by Abū Sāliḥ (200), and, thirdly, the
monolithic Dār Fir'awn, with its many halls, rooms
and roofs, about which an 'Allid authority reports
figures of awe (al-istibāb, 83; Yākūt, v, 214a; al-Ḥimyari,
55a; al-Nuwayri, 159; Ibn al-Ilmān, iii, 367), all
mean the same building or not.

There was certainly one other kānūn—since we
have to do with Pharaonic buildings, rather to be
rendered as "temple" than "church"—in Manf. It
was noted for its small size, for which a hieroglyphic
inscription, deciphered by 'Uṯmān b. Sāliḥ (d.
217/832), the "sage of Egypt" and one of Ibn 'Abd
al-Hakam's main authorities, gives a very convincing
explanation: building with granite on a large
scale was just too expensive ('Uṯmar al-Kindi, Fadā'il,
52, quoting 'Ibrāhīm b. Munkīd b. Khāwālīnī; modi-
fied in Yākūt, v, 214a-b, quoted by al-Kazwīnī, 274-
5, and Abū Hamīd al-Kudīs, 70). This temple was
allegedly erected on the spot where the irate young
Mūsā, at Satan's instigation, had killed an Egyptian
(al-nafaḍ al-θulūs) [1], cf. Tab. Kalkashandī, XV, 15]. Again
we have to do with the problem of identification. Is this
the famous monolithic green chapel that was
located within the precinct of the great temple of Manf
and is described in detail by 'Abd al-Laṭfī (138-9),
Kalkashandī (iii, 316, 19-317.3) and al-Makrizī (al-
Khitat, iii, 28)? Its weight was legendary (ibid.). Both
from the inside and the outside it was covered with a mass
of hieroglyphic inscriptions (al-kalam al-būhāsī, al-kalam
al-būhāsī, al-bībānī); as evidence of the
factual. It broke into pieces; its power was legendary (ibid.). The
funeral of this building had already been destroyed in his days by some, as he
complains, foolish treasure-hunter (loc. cit.). Sultan
Hasan, Abu Djafar al-Idrīsī (fol. 42a). The image
of the amir Shaykhu, tried to transport the church to
Cairo after the year 750/1350. It broke into pieces;
Shaykhu had them polished and re-used them as sills
and thresholds in his ēnānakāh and his Friday mosque
in the vicinity of the mosque of Ibn Tūlin south of the
Fatimid city of Cairo (al-Khitat, iii, 29; al-
Kalkashandī, iii, 317, 1-3; see the still important com-
ments by Silvestre de Sacy, Relation de l'Egypte par Abd-
allāh ibn al-Muqaddas, Paris 1810, 248, n. 65; G.
Wiet, L'Égypte de Muradī, Paris 1953, 93, n. 2; U.
Haarmann, Die Sphinx. Synkretistische Volksreligion im
spätmittelalterlichen Islamischen Ägypten, in Saccellum, xxix
(1978), 377). They can still be seen in our time.
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harmonious proportions of the huge human statues of limestone and red granite, one of which undoubtedly represents Isis with the child Horus (154-5). Al- Kalkashandi (iii, 316, 16-18) notes: 18 of 20 cubits length each which lie precipitated in the mud as being made of "white granite". Al-Maqrizi (al-Khatib, iii, 28) attributes them (or two other, similar, monuments) to Potiphar. One of the two statues could well be identical with the monument mentioned by Abu Sallih (199) with the surprising name of Abu '1- Hawl (see Haarmann, Die Sphinx, 373) and with the famous statue of Ramses II that was transported from Manf to the Cairo railway station at the Bâb al- Hadid in this century.

Bibliography: (in addition to the works quoted in the article): Else Pitecemer, Beschreibung Aegyptens im Mittelalter aus den geographischen Werken der Araber, Leipzig 1903, 129-36; L'Egypte de Murtadi, 90-3 (both works containing German or, alternatively, French translations of the passages referring to Manf in Abu Hamid al-Kayal-al-Gharnâti, 'Abd al-La'îf al-Baghdàdi, al-Maqrizi's al-Khatib and al-Kalkashandi); Maspero-Wiet, Matériaux, 200.

(U. Haarmann)

AL-MANFALÌTU, MUSTAFA LUTFI (1293-1343/1876-1924), Egyptian writer and poet.

Born in al-Manfalut (Upper Egypt), then going to live in Cairo, al-Manfalûti never attended any teaching institutions except al-Azhar. He later composed poems which appeared in the press; one was published in 1904 by Farah Antûn's magazine al-Qâmi'a. By the very traditional character of his art, he belongs among the great Egyptian poets of the age. Like them, he cultivated the still flourishing genre of occasional poetry. His composition of epic poems cannot even be regarded as original, since Khalil Murudad, Ahmad Shawkî and Hâfiz Ibrahim had distinguished themselves in this field. (He left no diwan, but only an anthology, Mukhtârdt al-Manfaluti, 1912, in which some prose texts accompany several poems.) Finally, his true originality derived from his doctrinal commitment, and from its quite unexpected literary corollary. His Islamic faith appears strong in the face of any test. For him, Islam is not an old system of values in which he will seek refuge, but a dynamic religion whose constantly renewed force should animate the faithful, allowing them to view the future with optimism. He also believes that everything capable of fostering this dynamism should be encouraged. Thus he took the side of the great reformist Muhammad 'Abd ul-Hamid (q. v.) and even went to prison for supporting him against the Khedive. His support for the companion of al-'Afgâni is often evident in his poems, but being as he is above all a moraliser, he found a more convenient form in which to express himself in the collection of essays in the shape of edifying stories which he published in the weekly al-Mu'allûd under the title of al-Nâzarât ("Sketches"). Death, misfortune and tears, represent the essential ingredients of these narratives. At times, destiny, cruel and unjust, begets pure and defenceless beings. But often it is the evolution of society which brings on catastrophes; at the end of the last century and beginning of the present one, the rash Egyptians have repudiated their sound traditions and turned their back on the wise precepts of Islam in order to imitate blindly the European example. This is the message to be drawn from al-Manfalûti's fables. We must believe that the content and form of these works may be used in the education of the public of the period, since they were reprinted in three volumes in 1910, 1912 and 1920. But in 1915 our author published another collection with the evocative title al-'Abârât ("Tears"). The dominant tone remains one of pathos, but it is to be noted that the series are of two kinds. Only six of them are the original work of al-Manfalûti, while the eight others have been translated by him from French or—in one case—from American English. For, paradoxically, despite his admonitions against the Western life style, he admired the literature which it produced. Chateaubriand and Alexandre Dumas the Younger are translated here, and later it was to be the turn of Alphonse Karr (Sous l'ombre des tulipes) ["In the shade of the palm trees"], 1919), Bernardin de Saint-Pierre (Paul et Virginie) and François Coppée (Pour la couronne) ["For the crown"], 1920). Are we not to suppose that this pitiful picture of disasters, to which vernal, unshared or impossible love leads, constitutes the most eloquent condemnation of the society which attaches such importance to this sentiment? Furthermore, one of the three original stories in al- 'Aharât, entitled al-Hâlât ("The Veil") shows how a young Egyptian, returned from Europe where he has studied, brings on his own misfortune by allowing his wife to spend time in the company of his best friend. However, this interpretation is not always justified. It is clear that the narrator is little concerned to explain the avalanche of misfortunes which befall his heroes. His main concern is to place them in a desperate situation, which he knows how to turn to the best advantage in order to move his readers. For here we have an artist who excelled in appealing to the emotions. The instrument that he used was the Arabic language, on which he played to perfection because he kept it in the register which suited him best: ample periods, sonorities balanced with majesty and the theatrical expression of powerful feelings. All his contemporaries and even some of his successors bore witness to the quality of his style, which they regarded as enchanting. But, quite obviously, the conclusions that they reached could be diametrically opposed.

The novelist Mahmûd Taymûr (q. v.), in the preface of one of his first collections (al-Sharây' Sayyîd al-Abî, 1926), believed that the subjects and characters imagined by al-Manfalûti lacked consistency, but he did not cease to admire his style. Moreover, the 1921 publication of his two-volume work, entitled Mu'assasât, contributed to winning a public for it. In fact, this well-known foreign genre became acclimatised on Arab soil. It did so in the first place thanks to the quality of its language, although some Syro-Lebanese
and Egyptian translators of the period wrote in very mediocre Arabic. It must be noted that, never having put anything above Platonic love (al-hubb al-^udhri), i.e. the pure love which made the Hassāni tribe of the Banū 'Uthmān famous from the 2nd/8th century onwards. Furthermore, the kind of story which he preferred is sensational and popular. He believed that, like himself, his compatriots might have a passion for the unhappy love stories in Europe, while they also might have a passion for the life stories of those who had died or had been driven mad by love, of whom Arab collective memory had preserved the remembrance. It is significant that the modernist al-Māzini had mentioned, in the above-mentioned work, what a danger al-Manfalūti’s literature presented for lovers of bad novels, those who put nothing above debased by foreign idioms. Also, his supposed translations. Thus it is to be understood that they were, and translated works might be closely related. The work and the land of the Khazar in the north (Djahan-nama, ed. Yu. Borshcevskiy, Moscow 1960, fol. 5b). In another place (fol. 17a) he of the word. He believed that, like himself, his compatriots might have a passion for the unhappy love stories in Europe, while they also might have a passion for the life stories of those who had died or had been driven mad by love, of whom Arab collective memory had preserved the remembrance. It is significant that the modernist al-Māzini had mentioned, in the above-mentioned work, what a danger al-Manfalūti’s literature presented for lovers of bad novels, those who put nothing above debased by foreign idioms. Also, his supposed translations. Thus it is to be understood that they were, and translated works might be closely related. The work and the land of the Khazar in the north (Djahan-nama, ed. Yu. Borshcevskiy, Moscow 1960, fol. 5b). In another place (fol. 17a) he
explains Mankishlagh as a name of a tribe (kawm) of Turks who left their former place because of an enmity between them and the Oguz and came to live in the region of Siyāh-Kuh near the Caspian Sea, where they found springs and pastures (cf. the account of al-Iṣṭākhrī-al-Balkhi above); they were called the "People of Mankishlagh" (ahl-i Mankishlagh), and their ruler was called khān. Immediately after this, speaking about the Turkic tribe (kawm) Yəzif which lived in the Balkhān mountains, Bakrān adds that two other tribes, one from Mankishlagh and the second from Khūrāsān, joined the Yəzif, after which the latter became numerous and strong, and at the time of writing (almūn) they consisted of three parts: the Yəzif proper, those of Mankishlagh (Mankishlagh) and of Fāra.

As one can conclude from all accounts cited above, Mangishlak became inhabited by some Turkic (apparently Oguz) tribe of tribes about the first half of the 4th/10th century, and the migration of these Turks to Mangishlak was connected with the internal strife in the Oguz confederation. The Mangishlak Turks were apparently hostile to the Oghuz tribes involved in the Saldjuk movement, and they were considered pagan as late as in the middle of the 6th/12th century; in the early 7th/13th century they (or at least a part of them) were included into the Yəzif group of the Kharaṣmaglaks, which later became numerous and strong, and at the time of writing (almūn) they consisted of three parts: the Yəzif proper, those of Mankishlagh (Mankishlagh) and of Fāra.

The accounts of written sources are to some extent corroborated by the Turkmen genealogical tradition as rendered by Abu ʿl-Ḡāzāʾī (Ṣadżara-yi Tarākīmī, ed. Kononov, text, 61-2), which also connects the migration of the Oguz to Mangishlak with the great disturbances in the d of the Oguz in the time of All Khān and Shāh Malik (Oguz rulers, contemporaries of the first Saldjuk). It is to this time that the Turkmen tradition relates the migration to Mangishlak of all those tribes which were also later found on the peninsula, as attested in other sources. The most numerous among these tribes was the Sālor [q. v.], which in the 10th/16th century was divided into the "inner" (iṭṭī) Sālor, who lived on the coast, and the "outer" (lujkī) Sālor, who lived farther to the east, on the road from the coast to Kharaṣmaglak (see Bartol'd, Sočinennya, viii, 148). The "outer Sālor" was, in fact, a group of tribes affiliated with the Salar proper, and it was found also in the Balkhān and Khūrāsān; among them the tribe Ersarī [q. v. in Suppl.] lived partly on Mangishlak. Other tribes mentioned in Ṣadżara-yi Tarākīmī as those who came there with the Sālor included the Ṣawdaw [q. v.] and Igdīr, which remained on the peninsula also later.

According to the Turkmen tradition, in the middle of the 8th/14th century Mangishlak belonged to the Golden Horde, together with the Balkhān and the northern part of Kharaṣmaglak (see Abu ʿl-Ḡāzāʾī, Ṣadżara-yi Tarākīmī, ed. Kononov, text, 72). Nothing is known about the region in Timūrid times. The available sources only clearly indicate that after the Mongol conquest, Mangishlak remained for several centuries one of the main regions inhabited by the Turkmen, together with the Balkhān and the western part of the Kārakūm desert (see Yu. Bregel, in C.A., xxv/1-2 [1981], 20-2). With the conquest of Kharaṣmaglak by the Uzbeks in the early 10th/16th century, the ʿArabshāhī Khāns subdued also the Turkmen tribes of Mangishlak, which were divided between the Uzbek sultans as part of their appanages (see Abu ʿl-Ḡāzāʾī, Ṣadżara-yi Turk, ed. Desmaisons, text, 201, 202, 206; tr., 216, 220). In the 11th/17th century, however, the Turkmen of Mangishlak seemed to be mostly independent, and the region sometimes served as a refuge for the Uzbek sultans, who fled from Kharaṣmaglak during internal strife there. Via Mangishlak there ran a trade route from the Volga basin to Kharaṣmaglak. Goods were unloaded in the Kabaklī landing-place on the Buzāzi peninsula and taken to Kharaṣmaglak by caravans through the plateau of ʿUst-Yurt. The route became especially important after the conquest of Aṣṭrakhan [q. v.] by the Russians (1556). Turkmen also profited from this trade, supplying camels and protection to the caravans, extorting presents from the merchants and occasionally plundering them. Mangishlak also served as the starting point of a sea-route to Shīrāz [q. v.], in the late 10th/16th and early 11th/17th centuries used by Central Asian merchants and pilgrims to Mecca wishing to avoid travel through Shiʿī Iran (see Abu ʿl-Ḡāzāʾī, Ṣadżara-yi Turk, ed. Desmaisons, text, 257, 273; tr., 275, 294). In 1558 the first English traveller to Central Asia, Anthony Jenkinson, passed through Mangishlak (see Purchase his Pilgrimes, xii, Glasgow 1696, 10-13).

Both the Turkmen tribes on Mangishlak and the trade caravans were endangered by the raids from the north of the Mangīt [q. v.], or Nogays, in the 10th/16th century and of the Kalmuk [q. v.] in the 11th/17th century. The Kalmuk raids in 1620s and 1630s caused the transfer of the landing-place from the Kabaklī Bay to the Karagan Bay, near the Sari-Taš Mountain, farther to the south (see A. Čułošnikov, in Material po istorii Uzbekskoy, Tadžikskoy i Turkmenskoj SSR, pt. 1, Leningrad 1932, 74-6, and the map attached to the book). Already the Mangīt raids forced a part of the Turkmen to leave Mangishlak. Another cause of emigration was, apparently, the growing desiccation of the steppe which began at the same time (see Yu. Bregel, in Suppl., text, 72). Later, the Kalmuk pressure had the same effect. In the middle of the 11th/17th century, the Ersarī tribe totally abandoned Mangishlak, together with a part of the Sālor; another part of the Sālor probably remained there till the early 12th/18th century. The Kalmuks under Ayuka (1670-1724), or as early as the reign of Punčak-Mončak (1667-70) deported parts of the tribes of the ʿCawdaw and Igdīr as well as a part of the tribe of the Sojinnadji to the Volga basin (from where they moved to the Caucasus). In the first half of the 12th/18th century, most of the remaining ʿCawdaw and Igdīr migrated to Kharaṣmaglak, and in the early 19th century several groups of the same tribes migrated via the Volga to their tribesmen in the Caucasus; but Mangishlak was finally abandoned by the Turkmen only in 1840s (a small section of the ʿCawdaw has continued to dwell near the Caspian shore till the present time). The Turkmen were replaced on Mangishlak by the Kazaks, who belonged to the clan Aday of the Bayull tribe (of the Little Horde). There seems to be no historical evidence of the time of this migration; Kazak legends relate this movement to the middle or the second half of the 12th/18th century. Assertion of some modern Kazak scholars trying to connect the Aday with the ancient Daha, and thus trying to prove that the Kazaks were the most ancient inhabitants of Mangishlak, are totally unfounded. For the Aday, Mangishlak was the
region of their winter pastures, their summer pastures being about 600 miles from there to the north.

As early as the 1670s, the khan of Khiwa, Anusha, asked the Russian government to build a fortress on Mangushlak to protect the trade route between Russia and Central Asia; but the first Russian attempt at establishing a permanent position on the peninsula was made only under Peter the Great, when three fortresses were built near the Caspian coast by the ill-fated expedition of Bekovit-Cerkassky (1716); the fortresses were abandoned the next year. During the 18th/19th and early 20th centuries a number of Russian expeditions studied Mangushlak, and in 1834 the Russians founded a fortress on the southern shore of the Mertviy Kultuk Bay, named Novo-Aleksandrovskoye, with a permanent garrison. The establishment of Russian power on the Mangushlak shore was one of the reasons of tensions between her and the Khanate of Khiwa which led to the unsuccessful Russian military campaign of 1839-40. Mangushlak remained a bone of contention between Russia and Khiwa for another decade, both sides trying to use against one another the Aday Kazaks, but neither actually extending its sovereignty over the peninsula until in 1846 the Russians built a fortress on Cape Tüp-Karagan, named first Novo-Petrovskoye and then in 1859 renamed Fort Aleksandrovskiy. But the final incorporation of Mangushlak into the Russian Empire occurred only after the occupation of the Krasnovodsk region in 1869 and the submission of Khiwa in 1873. According to the imperial decree of 1870, the district (pristavstvo) of Mangushlak was subordinated to the Russian viceroy of Caucasus, and after the Russian conquest of Turkmensia in 1881 this district was incorporated, as an oblast', in the newly-organised 'Transcaspian region (Zakaspiyskaya oblast')... After the revolution of 1917, Mangushlak (except for its southernmost part around the Kara-Boghaz Bay) was separated from the land of the Turkmens and included in the republic of Kazakhstan. Since 1973 it has formed a separate Mangushlak region (oblast') of Kazakhstan, including also a part of the Ust-Yurt Plateau, with an area of 100,000 square miles and its centre at Shevchenko (built only in 1965), where until 1964 Aktau; the population of the oblast' was 256,000 in 1978, of which the population of Shevchenko was almost a half (110,000 in 1979); 92% of the inhabitants of the oblast' live in cities (see Sovetskii Entsiklopedicheski slovar', Moscow 1980, 1522). The present economic and strategic importance of Mangushlak is determined by its mineral riches, especially petroleum and natural gas (discovered in 1961) and uranium; details about the uranium mines are kept secret by official Soviet sources, but this uranium is used, apparently, by the atomic power station in Shevcenko. #Bibliography: In addition to the works mentioned in the text, see S. P. Polyakov, Etimologiya istochnogo Siroo-Zapadnoy Turkmensia v sredneye vekta, Moscow 1973; R. Karutz, Under Kizyn and Turkmen, Aus dem Leben der Steppe, Leipzig 1911; V. V. Vostrov, M. S. Mukanov, Rodoplemennoy sostan i rasseleminy kazakhskoy (koms XIX - naclalo XX v.), Alma-Ata 1968, 248-54; M. S. Tursunova, Iz istorii kazakhskoy Mangushlaka v pervoy polovine XIX veka, in Vol'nost': istorii Kazakhstan XIX - naclalo XX v., Alta-Ata 1961, 173-202; M. S. Tursunova, Kazakhi Mangushlaka vo storiy polovine XIX veka, Alma-Ata 1977. On the present geographical conditions, see V. Ya. Gerasimenko, Poluostrvo sakro-
the Mangit tribe joined the Uzbek confederacy restored by Shâyâbânî Kân [see SHAYBANIDS] and participated in his conquest of Transoxania; the Mangits in the troops of Shâyâbânî Kân are mentioned in the Shâyâbânî-nâm by Muhammad Sâdî [ed. Vâlmîry, Budapest 1885, 272, 276]. Yet the bulk of the Mangit confederacy still remained between the Volga and the Emba rivers for another century, until they were driven from this territory by the Kalmucks [q.v.] in the 1620s. After this, the greater part of the confederacy moved to Northern Caucasus, where they have been known only as the Nogays (about the Mangit as one of the tribal units of the Caucasian Nogays, cf. N. G. Volkova, op. cit., 80-3), while another part migrated to the Khânate of Khiwa, where they first established themselves in the Amû-Darya delta. Abu 'l-Ghâzâlî mentions the Mangits only outside Khârâzûm, in their old territory, and as distinct from the Uzbeks (see Shâhârâ-yi Turk, ed. Desmaisons, text, 212-13, 230, 267, 270, 290, tr., 228-9, 246-7, 286, 289, 311). If the name of the tribe Abu 'l-Ghâzâlî is said to have divided all the Uzbek tribes of Khârâzûm into four groups, one of which was formed by the tribes Mangit and Nukuz (Mu'nîs, Firdaws al-ikbâl, ms. of the Lenîngrad Branch of the Institute of Oriental Studies, C-571, fol. 65b). Probably, the migration of the Mangits and other Turkic groups of the Mangit ulû to Khârâzûm happened in the reign of Abu 'l-Ghâzû (1215-74), or it was this movement that caused the redistribution of the Uzbek tribes and their territories in the khânate.

In Khârâzûm, the Mangit tribe contended for power with the tribe of Kongrat [see KUNGRAT]; the historian of the Kongrat dynasty Mu'nîs [q.v.] traced this rivalry back to the time of Nokay Noyan (see Firdaws al-ikbâl, ms. cit., fol. 94b). At the end of the 17th and the 18th centuries, the Mangit who inhabited the central part of the Amû-Darya delta (Alâr) with the fortresses Mangit-kalâ and Şâh-Temir, together with several other Uzbek tribes of the same region, had their local rulers who did not recognise the authority of the khân of Khiwa. In their struggle with the Kongrats, the Mangits of Khârâzûm were supported by their tribesmen in Transoxania, whose chiefs formed a new dynasty in Bukhara in the middle of the 18th century [see MANGITS]. After some success in 1740s (when two chiefs of the Mangit, Artûk İnak and then his brother Kuruz Bek, were the actual rulers of the khânate), the Mangits were finally overcome by the Kongrat and lost any political importance in Khârâzûm. Since the beginning of the 19th century, they have inhabited mainly a region to the south of the Amû-Darya delta, where the town Mangit was founded in 1215/1800 (see Mu'nîs, Firdaws al-ikbâl, ms. cit., fol. 156b) on a canal of the same name (Mangit-arnâ).

In Transoxania, the Mangits were much more numerous and powerful than in Khârâzûm; their main territory was the oasis of Karhî [q.v.]. According to the Gaziska Daryâ basin, but a greater number of them lived also in the oasis of Bukhârâ, as well as near Samarkand and Katta-Kurgân. It is not clear, whether they all were descendants of the Mangits who came with Shâyâbânî Kân, or whether some of them arrived later, as in Khârâzûm (and, probably, through Khârâzûm), with the dissolution of the Mangit ulû (cf. above). According to statistical data of 1923, the total number of the Mangits in Transoxania was 99,200 (of whom 44,000 were near Bukhârâ and 31,000 in the region of Karhî); and in Khârâzûm 16,000 (ibid., 1925). There is no record of the Mangits there after 1620s. The Karakalpak s [q.v.] also include the Mangit as one of their major tribal subvisions (see T. A. Zhadanko, Ocherki istoricheskoy etnografii Karakalpakov, Moscow-Leningrad 1950, 123-4; Dokumenty arxhiiv, Khiva, po istorii i etnografii karakalpakov, ed. Yu. Bregel, Moscow 1967, 91-100). This migration back to the 15th-16th centuries, when the Karakalpak were apparently included in the ulus of the ulus. Bibliography: In addition to the works mentioned in the text, see M. G. Safargaliev, Raspod Zolotoy Ord, Saransk 1960, 225-31; M. Kafali, Altin Orda Hanol'linin kanûlûs ve yükselî devletleri, Istanbul 1976, 2, 132; A. D. Grebenkin, Uzbeks, in Russkiye Turkestan. Sbornik izdanniy po povodu Politekhnicheskoye obshchego, i, Moscow 1872, 87-9; Territoriya i naselenie Bukhârâ i Khorezma, Tashkent 1926, pt. 1. Bukhârâ (Material' po rayonovaniyu Sredney Azii, i), 183-6; pt. 2. Khorezm (Material'..., 2), 98; G. P. Snesarev, in Khuzaysitennoye kul'turnoye traditsi, narodov Sredney Azii i Kazakhstana, Moscow 1975, 63.

MANGITS, a Turkish dynasty which reigned in Bukhârâ [q.v.] from 1166/1753 to 1339/1920.

It was founded by the chiefs of the Uzbek tribe Mangit [q.v.], which was dominant in the central regions of Transoxania after the Uzbek conquest of the 16th century. Khudâyâr Bîy, the grandfather of the sovereigns of the dynasty Muhammad Rahîm, became an ataul [q.v. in Suppl.] in 1162/1714 under the Djiânîd khan Abu 'l-Fayd (Tâ'khî 'Abû 'l-Fayd-Khanî, Russ. tr. A. A. Semenov, 3). His son Muhammad Hakîm Bîy was appointed to the same post in 1134/1722 (ibid., 67), and he became an all-powerful minister of Abu 'l-Fayd Khan. He was instrumental in securing the peaceful surrender of Abu 'l-Fayd Khan to Nâdir Shâh in 1135/1740 and therefore enjoyed special favour of the latter, and began to style himself amir-i kâbir. His son Muhammad Rahîm Bîy served as the head of a detachment of Bukhârian troops with the army of Nâdir Shâh. After the death of Muhammad Hakim Ataîlî in 1156/1743 and the subsequent disturbances in the country, Muhammad Rahîm was sent by Nâdir Shâh to Bukhârâ with Iranian troops to restore order. Having firmly established his authority in Bukhârâ, he ordered Abu 'l-Fayd Khan to be killed several days after the assassination of Nâdir Shâh in Mayhâd in 1160/1747. During the first years of his actual rule, he enthroned puppet khanhs (the first of whom, 'Abd al-Mu'în, the son of Abu 'l-Fayd, was killed as early as 1161/1748), officially remaining only an ataul; but after 1166/1753 he apparently reigned alone with the same title, and in 1170/1756 he was proclaimed khan. After his death in 1172/1758, his uncle and successor Dînîyîl Bîy A'tailî (1172-99/1758-85; according to some sources, the correct name was Dânîyâr; however, the coins give Dînîyîl again enthroned puppet khanhs, grandsons of Abu 'l-Fayd. Only Dînîyîl's son Shâh Murâd (nicknamed 'Amîr-i Ma'sîmîn', 1199-1215/1780-1800) finally deposed the Dînîyîls and acceded the throne himself. The latest known silver coin with the name of the last Dînîyîl khan Abu 'l-Ghâzû is dated 1203/1788-9 (see Davidović, Istorija monetnogo dela, 51-2; Burnaševa, Moneti [I], 120). However, Shâh Murâd did not adopt the title khan, and instead of this called himself amîr, as did all his successors. Shâh Murâd ascribed this title even to his father Dînîyîl on the coins which he minted in the name of the latter. The implied meaning was that of amîr al-ma'mînî (this title actually appears on the coins of amîr Haydar, 1215-42/1800-26), which had to
show that the Mangit rulers considered themselves Muslim kings par excellence and not continuators of the decline of power of the Uzbek tribal chiefs, with a parallel strengthening of the central government in Bukhara. The Mangits could achieve this because of the support which they received from the urban population as well as because of the creation of a small standing army. The tribal aristocracy was finally smashed by the seventh ruler of the dynasty, Naṣr Allāh (1242-77/1282-70), who in a relentless struggle against the nomadic state tradition. Muslim kings par excellence and not continuators of

Despite the incessant wars with their neighbors and some military successes, the most important of which were the conquest of Marw by Shāh Murād in 1204/1789-90 and the temporary capture of Khokand in 1258/1842, the Mangits were unable to impose their authority on all the territories which had been included into the Khānate of Bukhara under the previous dynasties. The regions to the south of the Amīr-Daryā in Afghan Turkestan were lost already under Shāh Murād, and Marw passed under the control of Khiwa in 1258/1842; the principality of Shahār-i Khwāzor was a bone of contention between the Khānate of Bukhara and the Keneges tribe, until 1272/1855-6; the principality of Shahr-i Sabz remained independent, under hostile chiefs of the Keneges tribe, until 1272/1855-6; the principality of Ura-Tiibe was a bone of contention between the Khānate of Bukhara and Khokand, but mostly was either independent or under Khokand rule; and the mountain principalities of the Pāmir also remained mostly independent until the Russian conquest.

Under Naṣr Allāh's son, amīr Muẓaffar al-Dīn (1277-1302/1860-83), the Khānate of Bukhārā was defeated by the Russians and in 1285/1868 lost its independence. Samarqand and its province were annexed by Russia; the Khanate was slighted by establishing, with Russian help, his firm control over the mountainous regions in the upper Zaraşfān valley (1870); in 1895 principalities of the Western Pāmir were also annexed by Bukhārā. The Mangits retained their throne as the vassals of the Russian Empire. 

1. A port on the southwestern coast of the Kāhilāwīf peninsula, in lat. 21° 28' N. and long. 70° 25' 20' N. and long. 70° 31' E. and 44 miles/70 km. to the northeast of Kotah city. Here there took place on 1 October 1821 the battle between two rival Rajput powers, that of the Maharao Kishor Singh of Kotah and that of the Maharao of Baroda. British troops, which resulted in a decisive victory for Zālim Sing and the retreat of the Maharao to Baroda.

2. A town in the former British Indian territory of Rajputana, within the native state of Kotah, in lat. 25° 20' N. and long. 70° 31' E. and 44 miles/70 km. to the northeast of Kotah city. Here there took place on 1 October 1821 the battle between two rival Rajput powers, that of the Maharao Kāhilāwīf Singh of Kotah and that of the aged regent of Kotah, the kāhilāwīf, Zālim Singh (1740-1826), the latter aided by British troops, which resulted in a decisive victory for Zālim Sing and the retreat of the Maharao to Baroda.

 Bibliography : Imperial gazetteer of India2, xvii, 180.

 Bibliography : J. Tod, Annals and antiquities of Rajast' han, Madras 1880, ii, 5-43; Imperial gazetteer of Indiain India2, xvii, 180-1. (C. E. Bosworth)
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throughout the whole of the khan's reign. When in 670/1271-2 an embassy on the way to Egypt was captured by a Frankish ship from Marseilles, the ambassadors and all their goods had to be released on the sultan's demand. When in 680/April 1280 an Egyptian embassy left for the Golden Horde, the path of Berke remained unobstructed. Under Mangu-Timur, the name and the nickname of Mangu-Timur, see P. Pelliot, Notes sur l'histoire de la Horde d'Or, Paris 1949, 58-62. (W. BARTHOLD - [YU. BREGEL])

**Mâni** (<A. *manâ*), a form of Turkish popular poetry.

The mani, is most unusually, a piece of poetry made up of heptasyllabic verses rhymed on the pattern *a a b a c a d a e* or *b a c a*...

The term mani is used to denote this form and these poetical genres in Anatolia, amongst the Turkish-speaking Balkan peoples, amongst the Crimean Tatars, in Ahdarbaydjan and amongst the Gagauz of Bessarabia, sometimes with variant forms: in Anatolia, *mâni* at Denizli and *mânî* at Urfa; in Ahdarbaydjan, *mahnî*; and in the Crimea, *mânî*. Other terms are also used to denote poetic pieces with the same thematic and formal characteristics: *bayârî* in the two parts of Ahdarbaydjan and in the Ahdarî-influenced provinces of eastern Anatolia; *beyrut* at Urfa and Dîyarbakir; *döb* amongst the Crimean and Kazan Tatars, and *döb* amongst the Mâhîs.

On the basis of their themes and the circumstances
in which they are cited or sung, manis can be classified as follows:

1. Manis about foretelling the future and divination recited at the festival of hidrelle [see ḳumr-ṭiyās], on the occasion of other festivities and on winter evenings by womenfolk;

2. Work manis recited by women in the course of communal activities, such as the preparation of provisions for the winter, fruit-gathering, hay-making, etc. On the occasion of the latter two types of activity, manis are addressed to passers-by, who are required to reply in the same fashion in order to avoid mockery by the womenfolk;

3. Declamatory manis, sung by boys and girls at the time of certain festivals and excursions into the countryside;

4. Manis of the watchmen of town quarters sung during the nights of Ramadan;

5. Manis of certain itinerant sellers of sweetmeats and delicacies who sing out to announce their appearance in the streets;

6. Manis of cafés in the tradition of old Istanbul;

7. Manis of letters, inserted as sentimental messages in letters exchanged between relatives, friends or couples; and

8. Manis of certain sāḥiṣ [q.v.] or reciters and story-tellers, who they improvise and insert between the strophes of the poems which make up the sung part of their prose narratives (see P.N. Boratav, Halk hikayeleri ve halk hikayeçiliği, Ankara 1946, 239-42, 291).

Concerning the origin of the mani, one may suggest as a hypothesis an adaptation of the model of the rubā‘ī to the heptasyllabic and octosyllabic metres peculiar to the Turkish languages; a first stage in this process of adaptation of would be the tayyāb, another type of quatrain peculiar to Turkish classical poetry, composed in the ṣarîd metre and rhymed according to the same schema as the rubā‘ī and mani.

**Bibliography:** For publication up to 1964, see Boratav, Littinature orale, in PTP, ii, Wiesbaden 1963-5, 107-13, 126-7, idem, art. Māni in IA. For more recent publications, see Hikmet Dizdaroğlu, Halk hikayeleri ve halk hikayeçiliği, Tehran 1344/1965, 14-21; Ismail Hakkı Acar, Zara folkloru, Sivas 1975, 47-55 (83 manı texts); Ferruh Arsanur, Gaziantep folkloru, Istanbul 1962, 302-13 (131 texts); M. Hassan Gökca, Mânîlerimiz, Istanbul 1970 (2,796 texts); Hayriye Süleymanova and Emil Boic, Redop manâlneri, Sofia, 1st ed. 1962, 2nd ed. 1965 (2,000 texts classified in themes); Ata Terzibaşı, Kerkük horeat ve manâlneri, Istanbul 1975 (2,490 texts). For the subject in general, studies and collections of texts, see also the following bibliographical works: Türk folklor ve etnografya bibliyası, iii, Ankara 1971, 1973, 1975; East Boyağız, Mânî üzerine for bibliyografa dememesi, in Türk folklor araştırmaları, no. 204 (July 1971); Tuncer Gülenson, Anadolu ve Rumeli ağaçları bibliyası, Ankara 1981.

(P. N. Boratav)

MĀNĪ b. FĀTĪKH or FĀTIKH, the form found in mediaeval Islamic sources (e.g. al-Mas‘ūdī, Muridī, ii 164, 167-8, vii, 12-16, vii, 293, = §§ 589, 594, 2705-7, 3447) for the founder of the dualist religion of Manicheism, Mani son of Fātīk, born in southern Persia in the 1st century B.C. and martyred under the Sassanid Bahram I in 214, 276 or 277, and whose faith spread from the Persian empire in the 7th century as far as Central Asia, eastern Turkestan (where after 762 it was the chief religion of the Uyghur Turks [q.v.]) and northern China. In Islamic sources, the adherents of Manicheism appear as the Manâniyya (Mānâniyya), as in the important section on them in al-Nadirî’s Fihrist, ed. Riḍâ Taḏdâdud, Tehran 1530/1971, 391-402, tr. Dodge, ii, 773-805, and in al-Khârâzmi’s Mafātith al-sūriy, 37, where both forms are however registered.

Although Manicheism was in the early Islamic centuries largely pushed into Central Asia (thus the Hudud al-sūr, tr. Minorsky, 113, 113.25, mentions a ‘‘convent of the Manichaens’’, ḵānqâh-i Mānî, in Samarkand in 982, with a manâniyya or audiitore) and beyond, it had an important part in the general phenomenon of zandaka ‘‘heresy, unbelief’’ in early ‘Ābâbîd ‘Irâk, for a general consideration of this, see zindik, and meanwhile, Spuler, Iran, 206-9.


**MANISA** [see MAGHNISA].

**MANOHAR, MANOHARGARH, a fortress on a lofty rock, some 2,500 feet/770 m. high, in lat. 16° N. and long. 74° 1’ E., in the Western Ghats range of peninsular India. Formerly in the southernmost part of the British Indian province of Bombay, it is now just within the southwestern corner of the Maharashtra state of the Indian Union.

**Bibliography:** Imperial gazetteer of India?, xvii, 200. (Ed.)

**MANSĀ MūSĀ, king (mansa) of Mali (712-38/1312-37).**

He was apparently the grandson of Abū Bākhr (Manding Bori), who was the brother of Mārī Jāta (Sunjata), the legendary hero credited with the establishment of Mali in the 14th century [q.v.] as a powerful empire. Mansā Mūsā reigned at the pinnacle of Mali’s prosperity, and is remembered in the Arabic sources as a pious and virtuous sovereign. Following the example of several earlier Malian rulers, and having appointed his son Maghā (Muhammad) to rule in his absence, he made a pilgrimage to Mecca in 1324 that made a profound impression on the Egyptians and was chronicled by Arab writers. According to the 17th-century Timbuktu chronicles Tārīkh al-Sūdān and Tārīkh al-Fāṭiḥāh, whose authors relied extensively on oral sources, Mansā Mūsā was accompanied by an entourage of thousands, including his favourite wife, Inārī Konte, and he travelled via Timbuktu, where he caused to be built one of several mosques constructed during his journey. In Cairo, he flooded the market with so much gold that its value fell throughout Egypt. One of al-‘Umārī’s informants, Ibn Amīr Ḥājīb, was often in the company of Mansā Mūsā when he was in Egypt, and among the things told him by Mansā Mūsā himself was that he came to power when his predecessor (Muhammad, of a different branch of the same family) appointed him deputy before leaving on a sea-going expedition, from which he never returned, to discover the limits of the Atlantic Ocean. While on pilgrimage, Mansā Mūsā also met the Andalusian poet and architect Abū Iṣḥāq Ibrāhīm al-Sāhilī, who accompanied him back to Mali where, ac-
According to Ibn Khaldun's friend Khadidja, Abu Ishak constructed for the mansa an elaborately decorated domed building that may have been the first of its kind in that country. Also accompanying Mansa Musa were four *ghuruf* from Kunnyah who settled in Mali with their families. Upon his return, Mansa Mūsā continued his policy of diplomatically furthering the interests of Mali in the greater Islamic world by corresponding with the sultan at Cairo, sending *'ulama'* to study in Fās, and exchanging embassies and gifts with the Marinid ruler of the Maghrib, Abu 'l-Hassan. Al-'Umarī claims that Mansa Mūsā had returned to Mali from his pilgrimage with the intention of handing over his sovereignty to his successor, with the stipulation of returning to Mecca to live near the sanctuary; but he died before he could carry out his plan.

Viewed from the local African perspective, Mansa Mūsā and his pilgrimage engendered a western Sudanic oral tradition, the hero of which is Makanta Jigi (Fajigi), "Father of hope who went to Mecca". As an oral record of the local Timunic expectation placed on Mansa Mūsā's pilgrimage by his subjects and their descendants, the Fajigi legend reveals attitudes that helped make it possible for an accommodation between indigenous religious practices and Islam to be achieved. The basic narrative line of the legendary oral account tells how Mansa Mūsā/Fajigi was motivated to make the pilgrimage because he was responsible for a regrettable incident involving his mother Gongo (Kankan), possibly resulting in her death. Making a pilgrimage to Mecca, he acquires the most important of the spiritually powerful altars (*boliv*) used in traditional Manding religious ritual, including those of the prestigious Komo society. As Fajigi returns through the land of the Manding, he distributes some of the altars, as well as various potions and amulets to people who help him. When he reaches the rivers of Mali, he uses a magic canoe to transport the altars. The canoe encounters rough waters and some of the cargo falls into the water, which varies according to the informant, the canoe sinks to the bottom of a lake or river where it remains to this day, itself a powerful altar that receives regular offerings. The most significant feature of this legend is the paradoxical claim that the *mansa* was most famous for his devotion to Islam was at the same time the one who provided his subjects with the essential paraphernalia of the ancestral non-Islamic Manding religion. Thus, from the traditional non-Muslim point of view, Mansa Mūsā and his pilgrimage emerge, not as examples of faithful Islamic endeavor but as a source of traditional Manding religious continuity. Cavalrymen were identified in muster rolls by name and physical appearance; horses by description and imperial brands. Special *du-asbah suwdr* rank obliged the mansabdār to employ men two, rather than merely one, to meet the muster [see further دژگری at *tasriḥa* in Suppl.].

Most *mansabdārs* obtained payment for their fixed *dhāt* and *suwdr* ranks in the form of salary assignments known as *dājīs* [q. v.]. Under this arrangement, the empire transferred to the mansabdār the right of collection of its share of the land tax from a specified area—a village or portion thereof, or a *pargana* [q. v.], or portion thereof—in an amount equivalent to his pay claim. Assignment of a *dājī* ordinarily did not convey with it any administrative rights or responsibilities in the area assigned. Many lesser-ranked *mansabdārs* were paid directly in cash from the provincial or central treasuries. The *mansabdār* system formally expressed the uniformity and cohesiveness and discipline of the Mughal administrative and military elites. Mansabdārs were the instruments of imperial unification and expansion. The honorific ranking system tied all the
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nobles and lesser mansabdars to the person and the preference of the emperor. All ... to 10 dinars (fine) (cf. Becker, Beiträge zur Gesch. Agyptens, 104). In the texts of such passports (cf. Becker, Papyr. Schott-Reinhardts, i, 40, 11) however, we have, so far as I can see, not the word mansabdur but only kuttab.

Manshur seems also to have a quite general meaning of “pass” and is always told in the Mughal empire, in particular for the various diplomas of appointment, including mansabdars.

Between 1119/1707 and 1136/1724 discipline and the integrity of the mansabdari system began to deteriorate. Ranks rapidly became inflated and, if not meaningless, were very much distorted. By the late Mughal period, for which we have very full sources. The increasingly complicated system of the administration brought a minute distinction between and special names for the various diplomas of appointment, edicts, etc., and the term mansabdur was henceforth used exclusively of the grants of appointment or of the edict on the equation of taxation and lunar years (taba'il al-sinn) which is quoted from the Mansabdadi of the Khadi al-Fidai for the year 586/1191-2. On the references see, not the word mansabdur but only kuttab. In the chancellery in the name of the mandshir henceforth used exclusively of the grants of appointment, including mansabdars.

Under the Ayyubids also, mansabdur had quite a general meaning. Thus among the examples of Fatimid documents given by al-Kalkashandi, x, 457-52, there are several which in their texts are described as mansabdur. Among these are for example, appointments to the supervision of inhabitants (mash'aratul-manadur al-bahiriya), of the poll-tax (mugharafatul-igdawi), to a professorship (tadrist), etc. A grant of an appanage could also be called manshar at this time, as in al-Kalkashandi, xiii, 131 [see Ibn Qalaf, in Suppl.] from the Fātimid Wasiyāl al-bayān of ‘Ali b. Khalaf, and the regulation that the manšātīr must not have an address (‘unwān) and that in place of this, the head of the Diwan must write the date with his own hand, seems to be first found in Ibn al-Ṣ añafi, Kāmil Dīwan al-Rasā‘ī, 113 - al-Kalkashandi, xii, 199.

Under the Ayyubids also, mansabdur had quite a general meaning. Thus in ibid., xi, 49 f., "a marshall of the nobles" (nakib al-‘alghir) is appointed by a manshar, and in 51 f., governors (wulāf) of different provinces. In the text of it, the name manshardur is given to the edict on the equation of taxation and lunar years (taba'il al-sinn) which is quoted from the Mansabdadi of the Khadi al-Fidai for the year 586/1191-2. Among the references see, not the word mansabdur but only kuttab. In the chancellery in the name of the mandshir henceforth used exclusively of the grants of appointment, including mansabdars.

The term manshur became limited and specialised in the Mamluk period, for which we have very full sources. The increasingly complicated system of the administration brought a minute distinction between and special names for the various diplomas of appointment, edicts, etc., and the term manshur was henceforth used exclusively of the grants of appanages. These manshurār were always written in Cairo in the chancellery (dīwan al-rūgha) in the name of the sultan; only in exceptional cases might they be in the name of the al-nāb b al-kāfi (see al-Kalkashandi, iv, 16; xii, 157). According to the very full description in al-Kalkashandi, xii, 32 f., and al-MaknzT, ii, 211, the procedure in granting a fief was as follows: if a fief became vacant (mahāl) in a provincial town, e.g. in Damascus, the governor there (nāb b) proposed a new holder and had a document (rukūn, also called mishār or manshur ‘a’ drawn up about his proposal by the inspector of the army (nāzir al-dīwan) and the Khalkahān, xiv, 190, 51). In a provincial town (al-dīwan al-dīwan) of his town. This document was then sent by courier (barid) or pigeon post (‘ulā’ adhanib al-hamām) to the government (al-abwāb al-sharifa) in Cairo. Here it was
received by the postmaster (dawaddr), later by the private secretary (kdtib al-sirr = sahib diwdn ... course of extensive travels or through embassies and presentations.

Although nothing is known of the painter’s origins, many rules were laid down for the wording to be used; the text is to be shorter and less florid than in the other appointments and there are none of the usual rules about service (wasayā); an original "virgin" (mubākārat al-inštā) is recommended as the finest form of a manshīr. Special formulae are further required for grants of appanages which were concerned with renewal (tashtid), addition (iyadāt) or substitution (al-ustād). A regular signature of the sultan, such as is usual on appointments as confirmation (mustānad), is not found on the manṣūrār; instead of this, the sultan writes formulae like "God is my hope" (Allāh amalī), "God is my protector" (Allāh waṣīyya), "God is sufficient for me" (Allāh ḥabībī). "To God belongs the rule" (al-mulk li ilāhī), or "God alone has grace" (al-ʿināma li waṣīyya). Occasionally, the manṣūrār for the highest ranks (mukaddamu l-uluf and mukaddamu l-ṭablikhd) had a tughrā [q. a.] at the top. The tughrās were prepared by a special official beforehand and gummed on to the finished diplomas. In al-Kalkashandī, xiii, 165 ff., the tughrās of al-Nāṣir Muḥammad b. ʿAlāwīn (693-741 AH = 1294-1343 AD) are reproduced and described; they differ considerably from the better-known form of the tughrā of the Ottoman sultans. After ʿAlī ʿAbd al-Salām of the Mughal studio, achieving the distinction of being the only artist who made his reputation by nature painting. His progress is interesting as he was one of few painters whose fortune was improved by changes in the atelier when the amateur naturalist and aesthete Džahāngīr (1014-17/1605-27 [q. a.]) succeeded his father Akbar [q. e.] as emperor. His evolution demonstrates the fact that the Mughal artist was demanded realistic renderings of a very high standard from his artists. The completed manṣūrār was then taken back by a courier from Cairo to the town concerned, e.g. Damascus, and handed over to the tenant of the appanage. The inspector of the army there (tāṣkīr al-din), however, first entered it in his register, for he had to keep a roll of the holders of fiefs in his province. al-Kalkashandī, xiii, 167-99, gives as examples of manṣūrār no fewer than 26 texts, beginning with one drawn up by Muḥyī l-Dīn b. ʿAbd al-Zahir in the reign of Kālāwūn for the latter’s son al-Nāṣir Muḥammad, which for its remarkable beauty he calls a regular tughrā l-manshurī. The other texts are of the appanages and military ranks, as well as for sons of amirs (waṣīd al-umrār) and for amirs of the Arabs, Turkomans and Kurds. In the Ottoman Empire, certain patents of appoint-
Mansur was working in Akbar’s studio by about 988/1580, when he co-operated as a colourist for many natural history vignettes from the now dispersed earliest Babur-nama manuscript (E. Smart, Paintings from the Baburnama, Ph.D. diss., London University 1977, 327). Since his last dated painting is a work of 1033/1624 (see A. Das, Ustad Mansur, in Lalit Kala, xvii), it can be ascertained that Mansur was probably one of those recruits who began grining pigments and colouring designs during his teenage years. The memoirs of the Mughal dynasty’s founder Babur [q. v.] that record the strange flora and fauna of his adopted country were among the few early outlets for Mansur’s talent; he definitely contributed to three of the four copies of this manuscript and probably also to the remaining volume (now in Baltimore and Moscow) which no longer has artist attributions (Smart, loc. cit.). Mansur’s greatest achievement for the 16th century Mughal manuscripts is the colouring of a scene filled with animals which shows Akbar hunting in a kamarg; this is one of the most spirited miniatures in the Akbar-nama manuscript (998-1003/1590-5), intended to be a uniquely powerful and impressive volume glorifying the dynastic position of the reigning sovereign. Although Mansur did not produce the design, much of the painting’s impact can be attributed to him and indicates that he probably attracted some attention in the studio by this time.

The animal paintings of the four Babur-namas are quite precise, but the challenge of anatomical studies on a small scale was perhaps not significant; a larger picture done about 998/1590 of two birds (rosy pastures, sturnus roseus Linnaeus) arranged in front of an imaginary landscape shows the limitations of Akbar’s studio and (E. Kuhnel and T. Goetze, Indian book painting, London 1926, pl. 10). It is clear that in this period Mansur uneasily applied flesh and feathers over a lumpish inner structure without the kind of anatomical knowledge that he had derived from observation of European paintings by about 1021/1612. Mansur was not a draughtsman; he acquired modelling skills with more difficulty than some other artists, and throughout his career there are indications in his work that he was forced to master formulae concerning structure. He does produce a few free and imaginative studies of animals poised in motion, such as that of a chameleon on a branch (S. C. Welch, Indian drawings and painted sketches, New York 1976, no. 15), but his greatest innate skill seems to be in transcribing patterns or textures. In this 10th/16th century compositions of birds, however, he does not render textures with as much illusionistic ability as he later did under the influence of Renaissance art.

Mansur did both the design and colouring of four political and courtly scenes for the first portion of an Akbar-nama begun in 1912/1603. Such commissions indicate that artists were expected to be versatile during the Akbari period in order to maintain their places in the studio; these compositions, which were the most usual types in an era devoted to historical illustration, were expected to be within the scope of all painters. Mansur is just able to manage the figural groups competently. The painter was apparently inconsistent in his ability to render figures, perhaps succeeding in revealing character only when he felt particular interest in his subjects. Of two portraits done in ca. 1000/1595, one of a turkeycock (E. Smart) reveals an easy, jocular individual, while the other of a prince on a throne demonstrates the artist’s decorative talent (vina player in Welch, Art of Mughal India, New York 1963, no. 18; prince on throne, private collection, Hyderabad). Since an ornate portrait of Djahangir seated on a low throne is inscribed to both Mansur and his fellow artist Manohar, who was primarily a portraitist, it is probable that Mansur contributed the details of costume and throne which are as intricately as his later bird pictures (A. Ivanova et alii, Albom indyskikh i persidskikh miniatuir, Moscow 1962, pl. 17).

Djahangir began his commissions of hunting and probably animal subjects while still a prince; it is possible that the pictures of rosy pastures mounted in an extensive manuskpr for album prepared for Djahangir had also been commissioned by him before 1008/1600. No specific evidence, however, remains to show how Mansur’s special association with the emperor developed. By the time of Djahangir’s accession, Mansur had commenced signing pictures Ustad Mansur or Mansur Nakkiaj (N. Titiev, Miniatures from Persian manuscripts, London 1977, 3), but despite this assertion of mastery there were many other painters, some younger than Mansur, who were more prominent and who had undoubtedly attracted the emperor’s attention (e.g. Manohar, Abu ‘l-Hasan and Bughndas). There are only a few pictures which stylistically appear to have been done early in Djahangir’s reign because of the combination of delicate drawing and tentative modelling. These compositions may indicate that Mansur’s green chameleon, creeping along a leafy branch and his portrait of a Himalayan blue-throated barbet (S. C. Clarke, Indian drawings, London 1922, pl. 15). The latter composition has very sensitive details, but the bird is awkwardly posed, indicating an early date. By 1021/1612, Mansur had acquired a much more scientific knowledge. In that year, Djahangir records that he received several exotic creatures, including a turkeycock, which he ordered to be painted together in a special durburr scene by an unspecified artist (Djahangir, The Tuzuk-i-Jahangiri, or Memoirs of Jahangir, tr. A. Rogers, ed. H. Beveridge, repr. New Delhi 1968, i, 215-17). A single portrait of the rare turkey which has crisp, very sophisticated, decorative details was probably painted by Mansur in this same year and demonstrates the evolution of his mature abilities (Clarke, pl. 15).

Both this composition and that of the barbet deserve attention because they are inscribed with Mansur’s title Nadir al-A‘yr (“Wonder of the age”) which was given to him by the emperor at some indeterminate date. Though such an inscription may have been placed on these miniatures—which are here presumed to be early—at any time, it is worth noting the doubtful possibility that such a tribute had been awarded by ca. 1021/1612. The most reasonable assessment, however, seems to be that the encomium was given after this date because the painter has left a large body of consistent work which is slightly more advanced and complex than the turkeycock; it therefore seems logical to assume that it is this corpus which would have won such singular praise from Djahangir. When in 1027/1618 Djahangir himself mentions the title in his diary, it is clear from the context that he had bestowed it some time previously, perhaps in ca. 1024/1615 (Tuzuk, ii, 20). In the diary, the emperor begins with a discussion of Abu ‘l-Hasan, whom he had also selected for the reception of a similar title and whom he ascerts to be his best painter. An implicit comparison of the two artists is made by the emperor as the foremost in two artistic categories; it is apparent from the passage that Djahangir’s appreciation of natural history drawing was profound and that he had elevated the subject by his interest in it.
Of the five artists mentioned by name in Djahangir's memoirs (Abu '1-Hasan, Aka Rida, Bishndas, ... completely abandoned by al-Mansur and he even embellished it with a number of palaces. The Hammadid kingdom had there-

Kashmiri flowers were originally placed together in a pears on the reverse is not positioned as those of the India and Pakistan, London 1947, pi. 139). A picture of the fur of the animal done in small slurred brush florican may imply. Tulips and Butterfly (Aligarh University) published survivor from the Kashmiri flower group that Mansur attributed painting of a nilgai is a much softer study with tributary, majestic and coldly intense qualities of study done for Shah Djahan is known by inscription. Most of the painter's work were mounted in the great book of their own very similar to the other albums that were mainly portraits. In the composition of tulips, Mansur has blended the colour of the blooms very subtly to express their delicate, waxy quality which he then contrasts with the powdery wings of a butterfly. Clearly, by the end of his career he was interested in the nature of substances and in how the imagination reacts to sensation.

Other paintings by Mansur not previously mentioned include early work in the Dhâmsâl-tawârikh, Tehran; the Khamsa of Dihlawi (fol. iv), Baltimore, and Djahangir's Muraqqâ' gulshan (fol. 53a), Tehran. Additional flowers and birds include an iris and narcissus (Y. Godard, Un album de portraits des princes timourides de l'Inde, in Ahtâr-î-Îrân, ii (1937), nos. 80 and 81 (fig. 113), godfinch (M.A. Alvi and A. Rahman, Jahanger the naturalist, New Delhi 1968, pl. XVIIA), falcon (R. Krishnadass, Mughal miniatures, New Delhi 1955, pl. IV) and pheasant (G. Marteau and H. Vever, Miniatures persanes, Paris 1932, no. 259, pl. CLXXVII). Unfortunately, because of Mansur's reputation, most unsigned flower and bird paintings done in the first half of the 11th/17th century have been ascribed to him without stylistic consideration. Mansur's work is quite bold, his compositions are generally simple with few objects, and the atmosphere is often somewhat static, so that it is to great extent possible to distinguish his mannerisms from those of other painters. Not only have inferior unrelated miniatures been attributed to him, but deliberate copies of Mansur's work were done by admiring artists of the 12th/18th and 13th/19th centuries. In a few instances, since it was customary for Djahangir to ask several artists to paint the same subject or to request an artist to produce more than one version of a miniature, there are two or more excellent pictures from Djahangir's reign that should be equally appreciated; these include another version of the turkeycock, probably by Mansur, and two others of the cheer pheasant—one perhaps by Mansur's fellow artist Payag. Since Djahangir's memoirs show that Mansur produced a vast number of paintings that have disappeared, what is known of his output should be evaluated as an accurate but limited indication of his abilities. It is clearly unfortunate that such a large percentage of his work should have been lost.

Bibliography (in addition to references given in the article): T. Ahmad, Nadir u l'Asr Mansur, in Indo-Iranica, xxv (1972), 51-5; Beach, The Grand Moghal 137-43; Das, Lalit Kala, xvii, 32-9, xix, 40; Djahangir, Twuz, ii, 20-1, 107-8, 145, 157. (LINDA Y. LEACH)
Al-Mansūr had in the first place to quell the revolt of one of his uncles, Balbūr, the governor of Constantine. He sent against him another Emīlī, Abū Yaknī. The latter after his victory was given the governorship of Constantine, but shortly after, he in his turn, together with his brother, who had been given the governorship of Bōne, rebelled. These risings over which Al-Mansūr, thanks to his energy, was triumphant, brought to the side of the rebels of the Hammādīd family the Zīrīds of al-Mahdīyya, who wished to get back some power in Barbyrī, the Almoravids of the Maghrib, who wished to extend towards the east, and the Bedouins, who were, always ready to join in the feuds of their powerful neighbours.

Al-Mansūr was, on the other hand, led to oppose the advance of the Almoravids who were, somewhat curiously, allied with the traditional opposition of the Zanātā [q.v.]. With the probable object of disarming the opposition, al-Nāṣr and al-Mansūr had married two sisters of Mūḥākūk, the chief of the Banū Wāmānū, at that time the most powerful of the Zanātā group. This alliance did not hinder the time-honoured feud from breaking out again. It became more acute when Al-Mansūr murdered his wife, the sister of Mūḥākūk. The latter then asked for support from the Almoravids.

From Tlemcen, where they had been installed for more than twenty years, the Almoravids had, after many attempts, endeavoured to expand towards the east at the expense of their brethren of the same race, the Sanhadja Banū Hammad. Al-Mansūr had twice reduced them to impotence. It was at this time that the Almoravids, driven by the Wāmānū chief into an alliance with the Almoravids of Tlemcen. The alliance formed in this way was a great blow to the Hammādīd kingdom. Algiers was besieged for two days; Ashīr was taken.

The fall of the latter fortress, the oldest stronghold of the family, was bitterly resented by al-Mansūr. He got together an army of 20,000 men, composed of Sanhadjas of the skin of Mūḥākūk I, Al-Mansūr marched against Tlemcen, met the governor Tāḥīn b. Tin-‘aμer to the north-east of the town and put him to flight. Tlemcen was spared at the supplication of Tāḥīn’s wife, who invoked the ties of relationship uniting them with the Sanhadja [496/1102].

After the defeat of the Almoravids, al-Mansūr severely punished the Zanātā and the rebel tribes of the Bougie district, whom he forced to flee into the mountains of Kabylia.

Thus al-Mansūr seems on the eve of his death (498/1105) to have thoroughly re-established the power of the Hammādīd. According to a tradition, which is not above suspicion, recorded by Ibn Khaldūn, the two capitals owed very important buildings to him: Bougie, the Palace of the Star and the Palace of Salvation; the Ka‘a, the government palace and the Kasr al-Mannār, the beautiful donjon of which is still in part extant.

Bibliography: Ibn Khaldūn, Hist. des Berbères, i, 227-8; tr. de Slane, ii, 51-5; Ibn al-‘Aǧīr, x, 110; tr. E. Fagnan, Annales de Maghreb et de l’Espagne, 448; E. Mercier, Hist. de l’Afrique septentrionale, ii, 53-5; L. de Beylie, La Kalaa des Beni Hammad, 38 ff., 99 ff. (doubtful traditions relating to the mosque of Bougie which was enlarged by al-Mansūr); G. Marçais, Manuel d’art musulman, i, 105, 121-3, 129-30. (G. Marçais)

Al-Mansūr, Abū Dī‘afar Abū ʿAbd Allāh b. Muḥammad b. ʿAlī, the second of ʿAbbasid caliphs, reigned 136-58/754-75. He was born in ca. 90-4/709-13 at al-Ḥumayma [q.v.] to the east of the Jordan, where the ʿAbbasid family were living. His mother, Sallāma, was a Berber slave girl. In 127-9/744-6 he joined the unsuccessful revolt of the Tālibīd ʿAbd Allāh b. Muḥāwīya [q.v.] against the Umayyads in western Iran. He then returned to al-Ḥumayma and took no part in the early stages of the ʿAbbasid revolution, coming to al-Ḳūṭh with his brother Abū ʾI-ʿAbbās (soon to be the caliph al-Saffah) as the ʿAbbasid armies were approaching from the east. After the establishment of his brother as caliph, he was sent to conduct the siege of Wāsīṭ where the last Umayyad governor of ʿIrāk, Yazīd b. ʿUmar b. Hubayra [see Ibn HUBAYRA], was holding out. There he made contact with Khurāsānī generals, including al-Ḥasan b. Kaḫṭāba, who was to be one of his most loyal supporters. He also tried to reach an agreement with Ibn Hubayra but was thwarted by Abū Muslim, who demanded that the Umayyad leader be executed.

After the fall of Wāsīṭ, he was appointed governor of al-Ḥijjāz and Armenia, where he succeeded in winning the loyalty of some of the most important Umayyad generals, including Ishākh b. Muslim al-ʿUkayfī. When al-Saffah died in Dhu ’l-Ḥijjah 136/June 754, he had already considerable political experience and had attracted a powerful body of supporters.

His brother designated Abū Dī‘afar as his heir, to be succeeded in turn by his nephew ʿIsa b. Mūṣā, the governor of al-Ḳūṭh; Abū Dī‘afar, who was on the haddījī with Abū Muslim at the time, quickly returned to take control. However, until the defeat of the ʿAlīd rebellions of 145/762-3, he faced a series of challenges to his caliphate.

The first threat came from his uncle ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAllī, who at the time of al-Saffah’s death was preparing to attack the Byzantine Empire with a large army of Syrians and Khurāsānīs, and he decided to use this force to make a bid for the caliphate. Al-Mansūr was obliged to seek the support of Abū Muslim, who, against his better judgment, was persuaded to lead a large Khurāsānī army against the rebel, and Abū Allāh’s army, by this time composed almost exclusively of Syrians, was defeated near Niṣībīn in Qumādā II 137/November 754. Abū Allāh spent the rest of his life in disgrace in ʿIrāk, but the caliph typically, was careful to be reconciled to the Syrian leaders who had supported him.

The defeat of the rebels left al-Mansūr free to deal with Abū Muslim [q.v.]. Tension between the two men had been growing since the death of Ibn Hubayra, and a visit by al-Mansūr to Abū Muslim’s court at Marw before he became caliph had convinced him that Abū Muslim was too powerful to be allowed to survive. The conflict was not simply about personalities, but concerned the whole direction of the caliphate: Abū Muslim wished that eastern Iran should be effectively independent, under his rule, and that its revenues should be assigned to his Khurāsānī supporters, while al-Mansūr insisted that the caliph should appoint governors and collect taxes from the area. The presence of Abū Muslim in ʿIrāk made him vulnerable, and he was murdered at al-Ḥadāʾ in the caliph’s presence (Shaḥbān 137/February 755). His murder was followed by disturbances in Iran, notably the strongly anti-Muslim revolt of Sunbāḥīh, but in the end, al-Mansūr asserted his control over Khurāsān.

The last major challenge which al-Mansūr faced was the threat of an ʿAlīd uprising which eventually broke out in Radjab 145/September 762 in Medina, led by Muḥammad b. ʿAbd Allāh [q.v.]. Attempts to
spread the revolt to Syria and Egypt failed, whilst al-Kūfah, the traditional centre of Alid support, was easily defeated and killed by an 'Abbasid force led by 'Īsā b. Mūsā (Ramaḍān 145/November 762).

Shortly before Muhammad's death, his brother Ibrāhīm led a rising in al-Ṭabarānī which attracted widespread support in the city. Having taken over the town, he began to march on al-Kūfah, but was met by 'Abd al-Malik and Hishām, and he was defeated and killed at Bābkhamrā after a fierce battle (Dhū 'Iqāda 145/February 763).

The failure of the revolt left al-Mansūr free to consolidate his rule in comparative peace. He was a political planner of great skill and had a clear vision of the development of the caliphate. His policy was to establish a centralised, largely secular state, based on a reliable, salaried army and an efficient revenue-gathering system. His models were the great Umayyad rulers 'Abd al-Malik and Hishām, and he rejected the demands of those groups like the Rāwandiyya [q.v.] who launched a short-lived but dangerous revolt in 141/758-9 and who wanted to assume a more messianic role.

His main support came from the Khurāsānīyah, who forced the army which overthrew the Umayyads and who now became a privileged military group; governors of Khurāsān were always chosen from among their number, and they were appointed to important posts in other parts of the Caliphate. In ʿIrāq, garrison cities were established for them at Baghdad and al-Rakkā. Al-Mansūr also relied heavily on members of his own family. They were frequently given key governorships in ʿIrāq and he used a large part of his resources to build a new capital at Baghdad. Part of the reason for this was the need for security, and the outbreak of the Rāwandiyya had shown how vulnerable the caliphate was to even small-scale rebellions. Baghdad was also developed as a centre for the Khurāsānī soldiers who had come westwards and could not be settled in existing cities like al-Kūfah without arousing the hostility of the local population. On the Euphrates in al-Diṣrār, al-Rakkā was also developed from 155/772 onwards, as a Khurāsānī base to supervise the affairs of Syria and the Byzantine frontier.

In 147/764, al-Mansūr forced the resignation of 'Īsā b. Mūsā from his position as heri apparent and designated his own son Muḥammad al-Mahdī, who enjoyed a profound support of the bulk of the Rāwandiyya, who now obliged 'Īsā to content himself with being heir to al-Mahdī.

Al-Mansūr died on the road to Mecca in Dhū 'Al-Ḥijjah 150/October 775 in his mid-sixties. The twenty-one years of his reign had seen the establishment of the 'Abbasid caliphate as a centralised state under the caliph's control. He was a politician of genius who pursued his aims with a single-minded but prudent determination. He cannot be considered a popular ruler; he was noted for his hard work and his almost proverbial meanness (cf. his nickname ʿAbū 'l-Dāwānīk "Father of farthings"), and many felt that his autocratic style of government had betrayed the hopes of the 'Abbasid Revolution. Yet without his firm hand, the Muslim world might well have become prematurely fragmented in the mid-2nd/8th century.

AL-MANSUR (Madinat-) [see Baghdad]

AL-MANSUR, AL-MALIK MUHAMMAD B. UMAR B. S.fahanshah, local ruler of Hamat [q.v.], historian and patron of letters, b. 567/1171-2 (al-Makrizi, Suluk, i, 205), son of Salāḥ al-Dīn’s nephew al-Malik al-Muẓaffar Ṭakī al-Dīn Umār [q.v.], and paternal grandfather of Abu l-Fidāʾ [q.v.] (but not Tūrānghāʾ’s grandchild, as in vol. i, 805, above).

According to autobiographical remarks in his Midmār (see below), al-Mansur was still a child when taking part in campaigns and sieges of Salāḥ al-Dīn and Ṭakī al-Dīn. When in 579/1183 the latter was appointed governor of Egypt by Salāḥ al-Dīn, al-Mansur accompanied him (Midmār, 158, 227), and in Alexandria he studied ḥadīṯ with Abū Tāhir al-Silāfī [q.v.] (al-Ṣafādi, Wāfi, iv, 295, no. 1790), and with Abū Tāhir b. Āwāf [q.v.] (al-Dhahābi, Ḥabar, v, 71). Already in 580/1184, when his father had to leave Cairo temporarily (Mufarridi, 200), he became his official representative in Egypt. After his father’s death in Ramaḍān 587/September-October 1191, he became ruler of the city state of Hamāt and its dependencies, Maʿarrat al-Nūmān, Manbij, Kalʿat al-Najm and Salamiyya [q.v.]. The fiefs on the eastern side of the Euphrates, however, which Salāḥ al-Dīn had granted to his father in 586/1190, he had to restore to his brother al-Malik al-ʿAdil [q.v.] (Ibn al-ʿAṣir, vii, 82-3; Ibn al-ʿAdīm, Zubda, iii, 121-3; Abu l-Fidāʾ, Maḏḥasār, iii, 85). Eight years later in 595/1199, al-Mansur conquered the fortress of Bārīn (mons ferrandus) (Ibn Wāṣiūl, Mufarridi, iii, 101), but was forced by al-ʿAdīl to surrender it for his brother (Ibn al-ʿAṣir, xii, 195; Ibn al-Makrīzī, al-Ṣafādi, vii, 208). This thus his territory was at least a compact unit.

Hamāt and its surroundings held a key position against the Crusaders on the one hand, and on the other they were, after Salāḥ al-Dīn’s death, a buffer state between the main opposing rulers of the Ayyūbids, especially between al-Malik al-Zāhir Ghāzī in Aleppo and al-Malik al-ʿAdīl in Damascus (see Ayyūbids).

Al-Malik al-Mansur succeeded in maintaining his sovereignty and keeping his territory together through all the dangers of the internal struggles of the Ayyūbids. Moreover, for thirty years to come, i.e. until his death in 617/1220, he made it into a centre of adab and the sciences. In and around Hamāt he engaged in a busy building activity (Abu l-Fidāʾ, Maḏḥasār, iii, 132; Yakūt, Muḥqiq, ii, 300), and made the town into an almost impregnable fortress. The results of these activities proved useful during his victorious battles against the Crusaders (599-601/1203-4), as well as during the difficulties with his father’s cousin and his temporary overlord al-ʿAdīl. For the battles against the Crusaders and the relations with them, see F. J. Dhamman, al-Malik al-ʿAdīl, 118 f.; Ibn Wāṣiūl, Mufarridi, iii, 141-50; Abu l-Fidāʾ, Maḏḥasār, iii, 111-2; al-Makrīzī, al-Suluk, i, 164; Ibn al-Furāt, Taʾrīḫ, v, 22-4. The sources do not agree in the details: Ibn Wāṣiūl, Mufarridi, iii, 163 f.; Ibn al-ʿAṣir, xii, 195; Ibn Naẓīf, al-Taʾrīḫ al-Mansūri, 15 (= Grynjevič, Moskow 1960, fol. 122b); Sibṭ b. al-Djiwāzī, Mirʾāt, vii, 2, 523. For his difficulties with al-ʿAdīl, see Ibn Wāṣiūl, Mufarridi, iii, 121-3; Abu l-Fidāʾ, Maḏḥasār, iii, 99; Ibn al-ʿAdīm, Zubda, iii, 149. 对于他的病后生活, see Ibn Wāṣiūl, Mufarridi, iii, 152; Ibn Naẓīf, al-Taʾrīḫ al-Mansūri, 8 (= Grynjevič, fol. 111b); Ibn Wāṣiūl, Mufarridi, iii, 132, and after him Sibṭ b. al-Djiwāzī, Mirʾāt, ms. Topkapı Sarayi Ahmed III 2907/xxii, fol. 292b, l. 11 (this line lacking in ed. Haydarabadī, vii/2, 510).

During the unrest after Salāḥ al-Dīn’s death, al-Mansur officially took the part of al-ʿAdīl. In 595/1199-1200, he even declared himself ready to enter into a loose alliance with the latter against al-ʿAdīl (Ibn al-ʿAdīm, Zubda, iii, 144; Ibn Wāṣiūl, Mufarridi, iii, 101). However, at an early stage he had also recognised the political advantage of an alliance with Salāḥ al-Dīn’s brother, already in 590/1194 he openly showed his sympathy for the part of al-ʿAdīl (al-Makrīzī, al-Suluk, i, 124). But this again did not prevent his from playing the Ayyūbīd rivals off against each other to his own advantage.

Both al-ʿAdīl and al-ʿAdīl wanted control over northern Syria, while al-Mansur was able alternately to promote or to foil their plans. In 596/1200, after al-ʿAdīl had become sultan of Egypt, al-Mansur swore allegiance to him (Ibn Wāṣiūl, Mufarridi, iii, 114) and the sultan confirmed him as ruler of Hamat. In 598/1201-2 he married one of al-ʿAdīl’s daughters, and in 603/1206 and 606/1209 he supported the sultan in his attacks on the Crusaders’ territory and in al-Djazīra (Ibn Wāṣiūl, Mufarridi, iii, 172 f., 192; Ibn al-Furāt, Taʾrīḫ, v, 86-90).

In politics, al-Mansur did not have much room for direct manoeuvring. However, his decision not to engage in politics of his own, who was amiable and conciliating, but tried to keep a balance between the competing forces of the Ayyūbīds, benefited not only his own city state but in the end also the state as a whole.

He was the first ruler of Hamat to have copper coins struck with his own name (Balog, The coinage, 249-52). They also bear the name of the ʿABBāsīd caliph al-Nāṣir li-Dīn Allāh [q.v.] whose futuwwa [q.v.] he had joined with great pomp (Ibn al-Furāt, Taʾrīḫ al-duwal, in JÁ, 5th ser., vi [1855], 283 f.). His escort (maṣwāb) was so large that it was compared with the ones of al-ʿAdīl and al-Zāhir (Ibn Wāṣiūl, Mufarridi, iv, 81).

The ruler of Hamat was not only an important Maecenas and an ʿālim in his own right (Abu l-Fidāʾ, Maḏḥasār, iii, 132) but also imām and mufti in several fields (al-Makrīzī, al-Suluk, i, 205). His illness and death in 617/1220 threw the whole state considerably out of balance (see Gottschalk, al-Malik al-Kāmil, 103-4, 167-70). The pretender to the succession, al-Mansur’s middle son Khlījī Arslān, as well as the crown prince, his elder son al-Muẓaffar, who in the end secured his rights, were no more than dependents on al-ʿAdīl’s son al-Malik al-Muʿazzam of Damascus and al-Malik al-Kāmil of Egypt [q.v.].

Works 1. Mufarridi al-hakāʾīkh wa-sirr al-khaldīnīk, a chronicle originally in ten volumes, preserved in parts (see Bibli.). The full title is given by Shihāb al-Dīn al-Kūṣī (d. 653/1255), one of the author’s pupils who studied part of the work with him (al-Ṣafādi, Wāfi, iv, 259-60, no. 1790), as well as by Ibn Wāṣiūl who knew a part of the Midmār which is lost today (Mufarridi, iv, 78, 84), and by Hādżji Khalīfā, who apparently saw only a mukhtasar of the Mūfaqar (Khalīfā al-zunān, ii, 1713). Hādżji Khalīfā’s remark that some historians were sceptical about the authorship of this chronicle is refuted by al-Kūṣī’s direct information.

The exact size of the Midmār cannot be determined, the preserved part apparently being only a final section of the whole work (see Mufarridi). The text starts with the year 575/1180 and ends abruptly in 582/1186, and there are moreover lacunae (see 41, 115, 208). The text shows (39, 72) that the work was to be continued at least until 631/1137 (Mufarridi 122, 144). The Mufarridi was composed after the siege of Jerusalem (Rajjab 583/Oct. 1187), or even after the death of Salāḥ al-
Din (Safar 589/Feb. 1193), with the purpose of glorifying the deeds and character of the Ayyubid sultan. It thus stands in the tradition which began with 1Imad al-Din Isfahani, was continued by Ibn Shaddâd and came to its completion in the work of Abû Shâhâma [q. v.], in whose eyes Salâh al-Din played the role of a saviour in Islamic history.

The Mişârû is one of the principal primary sources of its time. It contains numerous autobiographical data as well as reports of eye-witnesses, which are also of importance for the biography of the author's father al-Malik al-Muzaffar [q. v.], to whom the son devoted two quarters. He explains why his father was unable to take part in the battle of Mârdû al-Uyun (Mişârû, 18 ff.) and deals with his nomination as governor of Egypt (ibid., 154-8). Here (ibid., 155-8) the certificate of investiture (iktâla) as granted by Salâh al-Din is for the first time edited in its full context. The work contains numerous official documents, several of which can only be found here. Amongst them are letters of Salâh al-Din's famous secretaries al-Kâdî al-Fâdîl and 1Imad al-Din al-Isfahâni [q. v.]. (Mişârû, 114, 149 f, 224 f). The main figures are al-Nâşir li-Dîn Allâh, Salâh al-Din and Karâkhsh [q. v.], to each of whom the author assigns a section for every year. Salâh al-Din's politics are described as exemplary, with the caliph as his direct antagonist. In this context, the Mişârû's attitude supports the claim to legitimacy which was so important for the usurper Salâh al-Din.

Two different groups of sources, an 'Abbasid one and an Ayyubid one, may underly the Mişârû, although there are only scanty indications of informants (see A. Hartmann, an-Nâşir, 14-17, and Index, s. v. Mişârû; L. Richter-Bernburg, in JAOS, ci/ii [1982], 278 f.; A. Hartmann, al-Malik al-Mansûr, in ZDMG cxxxi (1986), 570-606). For the events in Bagdadh, in which al-Mârstîniyyâ is mentioned once (Mişârû, 122), while the informants for Salâh al-Din and Karâkhsh remain anonymous (139, 226), although al-Mânstûr received some information on the last-mentioned from himself or from participants in his campaigns (e.g. 54). A direct source for much of the information on Salâh al-Din in the Mişârû is found in 'Imad al-Din al-Isfahâni's Barûk al-Shâhâ. Since the Barûk exists only in ms., with its greater part lost anyway, the Mişârû is of interest for the reconstruction of several passages of the Barûk, together with the text of al-Bundârî and Abû Shâhâma (see Hartmann, al-Malik al-Mansûr). The author must have been in very close contact with the state chancellery, but his sources have still to be investigated, as does also the influence of the Mişârû on later chronicles.

The work was denied a large circulation, as remarked by Hâdjdî Khâlîfa (Kâshf al-zunun, ii, 1713) who calls it something precious which could only have been composed by someone who belonged to the learned men of his time.

2. Akhâb al-malik wa-nuzhat al-mâlik wa 'l-mlâmik fi tâbakat al-ghurâ'awâ, 2 a lexicon in 10 volumes on poets from the Dâhilîyya period down to the author's time (GAL I, 324; S. 1, 558; Hâdjdî Khâlîfa, Kashf al-zunun, ii, 1102, ll. 27-9). Only the ninth volume, composed in 602/1205-6, has been preserved (ms. Leiden, Or. 639). It contains selections from poems and very short biographies of poets from İrâk, Syria, Egypt, Transoxania and al-andalus of the 4-th-6th/10th-12th centuries. The poets are arranged according to their functions: kings, amirs, viziers, judges and secretaries (see M. Awis, Kitâb Tabakat al-ghurâ'awa li- 'l-Mansûr b. Shâhânshâh Sâhid Hamât, al-Minâr, Dâr al-Kutb, 1983). The work was denied a large circulation, as remarked by Hâdjdî Khâlîfa (Kâshf al-zunun, ii, 1713) who calls it something precious which could only have been composed by someone who belonged to the learned men of his time.

In fragments (ms. Leipzig 606; Brockelmann, I, 324; S. 1, 558; not mentioned in Hâdjdî Khâlîfa).


AL-MANŞÛR Bül'âh (Almanzor in the mediaeval Spanish chronicles) is the name by which is known the man who was, de facto, the real master of al-Andalus from 368/978 to 392/1002. Since no new source is available, except as regards the military campaigns, to expand upon the major features of the biography of Abû 'Amir Muhammad b. 'Abd Allah b. Muhammad b. Abî 'Amir al-Ma'Sîrî, as revealed through the works of R. Dozy (Histoire des musulmans d'Espagne) and E. Lévi-Provençal (Histoire de l'Espagne musulmane), this article will be confined to a summary of this material.

Born in 326/938 into a minor aristocratic family which had settled after the conquest at Torrox, in the district of Algeciras, and which had fulfilled various posts in the judicial administration, Ibn Abî 'Amir studied in Cordova, hâdîth and fiqh as a pupil of Abû Bakr b. Mu'âwiya al-Kuraqhi, and Arabic language and literature as a pupil of Abû 'Ali al-Kâlî and of Ibn al-Kûsî [q. v.]. He began his career in the service of the kâfî of Cordova, Muhammad b. 'Ali al-Saltm, and subsequently, in 356/967, became steward of the eldest son of al-Sayyida al-Kubrâ, the sultana Subh [q. v.]. He skillfully acquired the friendship and support of the latter, according to some accounts, through
the giving of presents and according to others, through the exercise of his personal charm. This relationship was by no means unconnected with the rapid advance of his distinguished administrative career: director of the akka [q.v.], treasurer, curator of intestate property, kādi of Seville and Niebla, etc. After a brief interlude (he had embezzled from the coffers of the mint, but his friend Ibn Hudayr made good the loss before the enquiry), he continued his advance and was appointed to the functions of chief of al-gunjra al-wustūd [see Chalmeta, Rhumes de la Chalmeta, 238, 369]. The construction of his palace at al-Ruṣāfa dates from this period, and it was also at this time that he set out to court popularity among the Cordovans. The fact that he had been sent, as inspector of finances, to verify the sums by Ghalib [q.v.], during his campaign against Hasan b. Gannūn enabled him to forge solid links with the army.

The death of al-Hakam II [q.v.], in 366/976, opened a new phase. The caliph had named as his successor his son Highām [q.v.], who was only eleven years old, under the tutelage of the vizier al-Muṣḥafī. The party of palace slaves (sakaliba [q.v.] wished to appoint his uncle, al-Mūṣhir. Al-Muṣḥafī, foreseeing that this would be the end of his political career, sent Ibn Abī ’Amīr to strangle the latter. The ’Amīr was already closely linked to the vizier, through his personal ambitions and through his relationship with Ibn Abī ’Amīr. It was thus that there fell to him the task of drafting the act of allegiance (bay’u [q.v.] to al-Muṣāyяд b. ’Ilāh and of accepting the oaths of various Cordovan social groups. The new caliph appointed al-Muṣḥafī as ḫāṭib [q.v.] and Ibn Abī ’Amīr as vizier. These two succeeded totally in destroying the political influence of the slaves’ party and declared a remission of debts as a means of ensuring popular support.

In 366/977, Ibn Abī ’Amīr left to repel an attack by the Christians and captured the suburb of al-Hamma (Baños de Ledesma, in the province of Salamanca). The campaign was of little importance but, skilfully exploited, it served to increase the prestige of the new vizier, attracting to him the sympathy of military men and especially that of the commander in chief of the Middle March (al-daghr al-wustūd [q.v.]) Ghalib, who, soon afterwards received the title of ḫāṭib al-ṣawā‘ir. As the popularity of al-Muṣḥafī declined on account of his lack of political vision and his nepotism, Ibn Abī ’Amīr succeeded in taking to wife the daughter of the old general, appointed himself sāhib al-madīna [q.v.], accused the ḫāṭib of malpractice, imprisoned him in 978 and caused his disappearance.

Having become ḫāṭib, Ibn Abī ’Amīr foiled a conspiracy against him but was forced to make concessions to the opinion of the ulama who criticised his conduct, private and public, under the pretext of lack of orthodoxy. He therefore decided to “censor” the splendid library of al-Hakam II, and works of philosophy, astronomy, etc., were destroyed. It was in the same spirit of ostentatious piety that he made his own manuscript copy of the Qur’an and ordered the final expansion of the Great Mosque of Córdoba in 377/987. In order to strengthen his control of the administration of the state, he transferred the offices of Madīnat al-Zahrā [q.v.] to his new residence at Madīnat al-Zāhirah and obtained from the young caliph a “delegation of all his powers, so as to permit him to devote himself to pious observances”. He then took the title of al-Mānsūr bi ’Ilāh. The ḫāṭib then took the title of as-Samūl b. al-Ahmām.

The activity of al-Mānsūr, which was brilliant, and passed to him in 984; Sancho Garcés Abarca of Navarra had been his client since 982; Vermudo II of Léon asked and obtained from the ’Amīr an army which helped him to re-establish his authority; and the Castilian Count García Fernandez surrendered in 990. Sancho Garcés and Vermudo II gave their daughters in marriage to al-Mānsūr, who became the true arbiter of the Spanish situation. It is equally certain that these campaigns ruined a major part of the work of “reconquest” and almost the entire effort of repopulating Léon in the 9th century; the whole of Estramadura was devastated. The effects seem to have been still more in those eastern states which had no “frontier” (cf. P. Bonnassie, La Cathédrale du militant du XVe à la fin du XIe siècle, Toulouse 1978).

The Masāfīlīl al-Brar [q.v.], which reproduces the chapter of Ibn Hāṣīn [q.v.] on Hispano-Maghribi relations, is the principal source for the study of his North African activity. Al-Mānsūr inherited the policy of Abd al-Rahman III [q.v.] and of al-Hakam II; rather than seeking conquests, he preferred to obtain submissions and vassalages. This had the double advantage of not immobilising too many troops while allowing the recruitment of large numbers of colonial troops for the purposes of his Spanish campaigns.

There were numerous dangerous moments: when the pro-Fāṭimid Bulwūnī b. Zīrī [q.v.] advanced as far as the gates of Čeuta in 980; the insurrection of Hasan b. Gannūn in 985 (he was executed in defiance of the guarantee of security given by Ibn Abī ’Aṣkalāṇa, which aroused a considerable degree of resentment); and the rebellion of Zīrī b. Ṭiyāya [q.v.] in 998, suppressed by ’Abd al-Malik al-Muṣṭafī [q.v.], who went on to install a sort of “viceroyalty” of Fās.

Almost all the authors stress the politico-military activity of al-Mānsūr, which was brilliant, and pass too quickly over his internal policy. The famous military reforms have not been correctly assessed and are generally considered an innovation, whereas they were in fact simply a systematic application of the policy inaugurated by the caliph al-Nāṣir, when the latter drew conclusions from the disaffection and subsequent rout of his troops during the campaign of 327/939, that of al-Khandak (on this expedition and its setbacks, see Chalmeta, Simancas y Alhambra, in Hispania [1976], 397-464). Al-Mānsūr confined himself—in regard to the ethnic basis of recruitment—to intensifying the policy already applied by al-Nāṣir in 328/939-40 (see Chalmeta, Simancas y Alhambra: el año siguiente, in Actas Jornadas Cultura Árabe [1978]) and to enlisting only non-Andalusians. This was therefore an army without attachment to the country, or to its people; a “neutral” army.
force, a “Foreign Legion”. These professional war-
riors, mercenaries, required payment and were ex-
pensive to maintain. The Amirid novelty consisted in
taxing heavily all the Andalusians, even the Arab
agnád. The desired effects were achieved. Powerful
ponents were estranged from the army (thus
deprived of prestige, of command, of access to infor-
mation and to weapons), the considerable sums raised
compensated the troops, who could be mobilised at 24
hours notice and who were entirely in his pay. The ef-
cet of his action was, primarily (Tobén, 17) to forge
for himself an instrument of internal repression and,
subsequently, an army which by its very nature con-
stituted an offensive machine of quality, but whose
numbers and composition made it unsuitable for use
as an occupying force (hence for the consolidation of
captured positions). This policy also had unforeseen
and undesirable effects in the long term: the im-
poverishment of the local population; its indifference
towards the government; and its lack of military train-
ing. The otherwise incomprehensible phenomenon of
the collapse of the caliphate, when confronted by the
Christians of the north at the time of the fitna [q. v.],
thus becomes understandable and almost inevitable.
The impact of the orthodox “purge” of the library
of al-Hakam II on the intellectual life of Arab Spain is
inexplicable. The troops took away not only the
heavy toll. Many volumes must have been unique in
Andalus, and their destruction must have prevented,
or at the very least delayed, their dissemination.
In an indirect fashion, the library of al-
Hakam also performed, in part, the function of a
library of a public library, and it was dispersed during the siege
of Cordova; furthermore, the economic crisis which ac-
companied the fitna put a severely reduced profit on the
constitution or enrichment of private libraries.
The campaigns of al-Mansur, which assumed a
change in relations between al-Andalus and the Chris-
tian kingdoms, were to bring about, in the long term,
the birth of a new attitude, a new sense of unity in the
popular Christian consciousness. Hitherto the
Muslim campaigns had only been responses to Chris-
tian initiatives. In order to avoid conflict, it was suffi-
cient to abstain from provocation. These campaigns
had also been relatively benign, without too drastic ef-
effects in terms of destructions and death. After all, the
deepers had relatives on the other side; they
could be caught unawares in their turn; etc. The
Christian states had hardly ever struck in any depth,
and the danger had never affected the majority of the
population. However, the Amirid raids were not
responses, but attacks, and thus difficult to foresee.
They were conducted with a ferocity unprecedented
in the Spanish context, and left behind a long trail of
destruction, of death and of rancour. The Muslims
were no longer Hispano-Arabs, but foreigners, dif-
ferent people. These campaigns affected the hinter-
land, it was no longer simply a matter of
frontier-dwellers, of people who had chosen, in ex-
change for certain fiscal and social advantages, to
“live dangerously”. All sectors of the population, in-
cluding those people who preferred a peaceful ex-
istence, far from the exposed territories, were
affected, capital cities were plundered, etc. Since sur-
vival was at stake, any likelihood of coexistence must
have seemed absurd. These destructive raids pro-
vided a defensive reflex and a much greater sense of
solidarity between the various Spanish Christian
kingdoms. The economic damage is the proof of this—faced with
what was coming to be regarded as a common enemy.

The Amirid campaigns, which employed a
number of Christians, either as mercenaries or as
vassal troops, for example in the famous raid against
St. James of Compostella, enabled the latter to ac-
cquire, from the inside, a useful knowledge of the
deaths, the resources and the structure of the Cordovan
state. This was to prove advantageous, some years later,
when the Christians put into effect, in the reverse direction, the
Amirid policy. By this time the damage had been done. The bitterness accumulated
as a result of al-Mansur’s 52 expeditions had engendered the notion that it was essential at the
earliest possible opportunity to settle accounts with the adversary whose lack of reaction aroused contempt. The new identification between the concepts of Christendom and Spain required the
expulsion of the “other Spain” (Chalmeta,
Historiografía hispana y arabísmo: biografía de una disrior,
in Rev. Infor. Esp. UNESCO [1982]).

The systematic policy of infiltration, destabilisation and then reorganisation of the Cordovan state which
had enabled al-Mansur to seize power and above all to
sustain it, led to the annihilation of all the struc-
tures constituting a system: political, economic,
social, ethnic, cultural, etc. After him, there was to be
no more caliphate, great families, surplus budgets,
social or ethnic coexistence. The Andalusians were
hereafter aware of only one enemy: the Berbers.
They forgot the Christians, or saw them as their allies.
In view of the fact that al-Andalus was a feudal society, its chances of resisting the advance of a
society which had the necessary mechanics for wag-
ing war were limited. According to the Chronicle of
Silos, “In the year 1002, Almanzor died; he was en-
tombed in Hell”. Such was the Christian verdict. It
could be extended to the whole of Muslim Spain, for
the political-military muscle engendered the mental at-
titude which spelled the doom of Hispano-Muslim
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(M. CHALMETA)
to describe the internal conditions of the Samanid kingdom under Mansur as an eye-witness; cf. especially BGA, ii, 241: *fi waktind hddhd;* 344 on the fightind hddhd; 344 on the character of Mansur "the justest king among our contemporaries, in spite of his physical weakness and the slightness of his frame". On the vizier Abü 'Ali Muhammad Bah'ami, see bat'ami, where also information is given about the Persian version of al-Tabari's history composed in 352/963 by or orders of this vizier. On the rebellion of the commander of the Samanid bodyguard, Alp-Tegin, and the independent kingdom founded by him in Ghazna and on the establishment of Samanid rule there in the reign of Mansur and the son and successor of Alp-Tegin, Ishâk (or Abü Ishâk İbrâhîm) see Alp-Tegin and Ghazna; in Barthold, Turkestân, 251, n. 4, Abü Ishâk İbrâhîm should be read for Ishâk b. İbrâhîm (this passage is misunderstood in the Russian original). In other directions also in this reign, the Samanid kingdom prospered in its foreign affairs; the fighting with the Buyids [see BUVAYHIDS] and Zîyârîds [q.v.] was a rule successful.

2. MANSUR B. NUH II, Abü 'l-Hârith, ruler in Transoxania only (387–99/997–9). His father Nuh II b. Ahmad, was as a rule successful. His father Nuh II b. Ahmad, was as a rule successful.

3. MANSUR B. NUH II, Abü 'l-Hârith, ruler in Transoxania only (387–99/997–9). His father Nuh II b. Ahmad, was as a rule successful.

During his brief and impotent reign he was hardly feared by every one for his extraordinary severity. The last months of his reign were devoted to fruitless efforts to settle peacefully the question of succession, Mansur was dethroned on the 5th of Dhu al-Hijja 614/April 1217. He had to fly to Amul [qa'da, 615/May 1217] but was called back to Bukhara.

The Ghaznavid historian Bayhaqi, ed. Morley, 803, ed. Ghäni and Fasyâd, 640, Russian tr. Arends', 776, talks highly of his courage and eloquence; on the other hand, he is said to have been feared by every one for his extraordinary severity. During his brief and impotent reign he was hardly able to instil terror into any one. The last Samanids were quite helpless against the rulers and generals Fa'îk, succeeded even to the neighbourhood of Kawkaban, where he built a substantial house for himself and quarters for his followers, and even set up a mint. After frequent engagements, a truce was agreed upon in 613/1216-17. Having removed to Kawkâban and then to Zafar, the last Samanid b'illah died in Muharram 614/April 1217 in Kawkâban (Redhouse, Al-Mansur, ii, 1217). For a more detailed survey of the intricate situation in the Yemen during the life of al-Mansur b'illah, see al-Mansur b'illah (q.v.), ed. Serjeant, 61-3.

Al-Habâhi, Mu'alla'fât, 37, mentions four si'as of al-Mansur b'illah: one anonymous, one by Muhyi al-Din Muhammad b. Ahmad al-Walîd, a third one by 'Ali b. Nahwân b. Sa'id al-Hînâyâr, and a fourth one by Abu Firas Daghâlam (+ Dû'aym) al-Sâñî, the Imam's secretary (see Smith, Ayyâbids, ii, 8, 78 n. 4, 98). Al-Mansur b'illah is also the last Imam treated by his companion Hamîd b. Ahmad al-Muhammî in his Kitâb al-Hadîth al-wâridiya fi dibhir (manâshi' a'immat al-Zaydiyya (Brockelmann, I, 525; S I, 560; Strothmann, Die literatur, in Isl., i, 361). Like many other Zaydi Imams before and after him,
al-Mansur bi'llah developed a great literary activity. Besides the 21 titles mentioned in Brockelmann (GAL, I, 403, S I, 701; cf. also Ahlwardt, Verzeichnis, iv, 4950, XI), al-Habashi, Ma’alafat, 48, lists 62 other titles, some of which may be the same as those summarised in B.L. Suppl. nos. 210, 211, 1230 IV-VII.

In his Kitāb al-Shafi‘ (Brockelmann, I, 403, S I, 701; al-Habashi, Ma’alafat, 44, no. 53), the Imām often quotes from the Kitāb al-‘Unda by al-Hilli al-Wāṣṭi‘ (Brockelmann, S I, 710; Van Arendonk, Dēbāt, 15/17 n. 1) and makes use of the kutub al-‘umma, i.e. collections of traditions favourable to the descendants of Fātimah and the ‘Alī (v. Strothmann, Die Literatur, 141, i, 358, ii, 64). Of historical interest might be the following mentions, numbered by al-Habashi, Ma’alafat. No. 23 is a da’wā to Sunukr of the year 599/1202-3. This Sunukr is probably the atabeg Sayf al-Dīn Sunukr, a manūl of Tughtakin (cf. Smith, Ayyūbids, 97, 98; Ghāva, i, 356 ff.). No. 24 is a da’wā to the ’Irākī amīr al-hadjāj Tughtakin (= Tashkīn?) cf. A. Hartmann, an-’Nāṣir, 146), while no. 64 is a kitāb to (the same?) amīr Kānim al-’Irākī. No. 25 is a da’wā of the Imām to (al-Mu‘īzz) Ismā‘īl b. Tughtakin when the latter came down (baṭa) to Kabkabān, of the year 599/1202-3. (According to San‘a‘, ed. Serjeant, 62, al-Mu‘ūzī was murdered in 598/1201-2, but see Ghāva, i, 300). No. 56 is a sūra kitāb to the ’Amil of the Banū ’Abdāb in the Yemen, and no. 60 is a da’wā sent to the ’Abdābīd amīr ‘alā al-Aṣūr (al-Mu‘īzz b. Tughtān when Imam Tashkīn = Tashtikīn? cf. A. Hartmann, an-’Nāṣir, 146) while no. 62 is a da’wā to the Shaykh, Imam Tashkīn (i.e. Imam Ayyūb, Imam al-Malik al-Nāṣir li-dīn Allāh (see Ghāva, i, 400 n. 1)). According to al-Habashi, part of this kidaša is mentioned in Muhammad Yahyā Zubārā, A’immat al-Yaman, Ta’īṣ 1375/1955-6, (but see San‘a‘, ed. Serjeant, 572), 139-41, and there is a commentary on it by Hamīd b. Ahmad al-Muḥallī, d. 652/1254, entitled Maḥāsin al-âzār (Brockelmann, I, 325, S I, 560). No. 63 is a da’wā to al-Malik al-Abī Bakr b. Ayyūb [q.v.] of the year 598/1201-2, while no. 79 contains correspondence between the Imām and the Banū Rasā’il.


The battle for al-Kayrawān began at the end of Shawwāl 334/beginning of June 946, and ended after two months of fierce fighting in the crushing defeat of the Khārījī leader, now driven to retreat into the region of the Zāb, the original seat of his revolt. But even though this battle allowed the Fatimid ruler to save his kingdom, it did not mean the end of the revolt, but only the beginning of the decline of Khārījīsm. It remained for the Fatimid ruler, in order to extirpate the roots, to continue and subjugate its adherents the Kamlān, Birzāl, Huwwārā and other Zanāta elements in their fastnesses of the Aurės and
the Záb. Also, he still had to kill Abū Yazid. But to put an end to his formidable enemy, Isma'īl had to dislodge him from there and force him to fall back to the north of the Záb mountains, into the massif of 'Ukbār, the 'Djajal Mā'sā'idī. Thus harassed, Abū Yazid retired into the strongholds of Shākir and Kiyānā. It was in this last, which was taken by storm, that he was at last taken prisoner, before dying of his wounds a few days later, in the night of Wednesday-Thursday 28th Muharram 336/ August 947. Having suppressed the rebellion and killed the "accursed" Khārījī, Isma'īl could now make public his father's death and his own accession to the throne with the title of al-Mansūr bi 'l-Shāhī. Then having pacified the Záb from Manṣūrī [q.v.] onwards, where the Banū Kamlān, previously uncompromising participants in the revolt but now submissive, had come to give him their submission, he proceeded to Tāḥārt in order to re-establish his authority there and to punish the rebellious tribes, notably the Lawātā [q.v.]. Did he then dream of leading his troops still further towards the central Maghrib with the intention of making an impression of his rival in al-Andalus, 'Abd al-Rahmān III and his Zānātá allies? Some Isma'īlī sources suggest this. In any case, a serious illness reduced him to inactivity, and when he at last recovered, he took the road towards Ḫirīkiyā, on Saturday, 18 Rabi' II 336/November 947. He only arrived there two months later after a long stay at Sēfī which, amongst his faithful adherents the Kūtāmā, from whom al-Mansūr had recruited his army, in order to settle in the new capital al-Mansūriyā.

It was on Thursday, 27 Dādūmād II 336/13 January 948 that Isma'īl entered there. His return was celebrated with great pomp, and in his presence was held a parade in the course of which the crowd was amused by the comic spectacle of the "man on the donkey", his skin stuffed with straw and hoisted on to the back of a camel and handed over to the tricks of an ape and monkey.

Thus only 15 months had been necessary for al-Mansūr to finish off the leader of the Khārījī insurrection. But hardly had he got back when he had to go personally to pacify the provinces of the Kastillāyā region and the southern part of the Aurēs and to reduce to obedience the Manāwā, Maghrāwā, Kālālā and other Yafrān tribal elements stirred up by Fadjl, a son of Abū Yazid. The death of Fadjl put an end to all Ibadī threats to the Fātimid kingdom. For the remainder of his all-too-short reign, less than seven years, al-Mansūr devoted himself to dealing with internal and external affairs of his realm, which had suffered considerably from the revolt of the "man on the donkey". He resumed the wars of prestige undertaken by his predecessors in the central Maghrib against the Muslim Spanish ruler, who had not failed to support Abū Yazid; and also in Sicily against Byzantium, which had, during the opening stages of the revolt, caused a deterioration of the authority of the Fātimids there. Order was soon re-established in Sicily, and rule there was entrusted to the faithful family of the Kīmādī [q.v.], who had just submitted to the influence of the Spanish Umayyads which occurred probably in 387/997 or 388/998, he occupied Sa'da, the stronghold of the descendants of al-Abāsā. It was on his orders that the chief of these last, Ahmad al-Diynābī, was made in 340/951 to restore to Mecca the Black Stone which his father had carried off after seizing Mecca.

Before dying in his capital, hardly having reached the age of 40, on 28 Shawwāl 341/18 March 953, Isma'īl al-Mansūr could justly pride himself on having restored in a short period of time, the tottering edifice of the Fātimid caliphate in Ḫirīkiyā.
Hādi, and brought Nadjran and the territories of Khawlan, Wāda'ā and Bakil under his control. After his death, a rebellion erupted, however, his administration quickly crumbled. In Muḥarram 389/January 999 he returned permanently to Yaman. During the next two years, he extended his sway over much of the highlands of Yaman. In the heyday of his reign, his rule extended from the Bilād Ḥaḍath ʿam to Ṣanʿāʾ and Ḍhamār, and included the territory of Khawlan ʿal-ʾAliya, ʿAnṣ, Alḥān, Ḥimyar with Shībām Akiyān, Kuḥlān, ʿAṣṣa, Ḍjabal Maswasr and Ḍjabal Tays. His extensive kingdom, however, had no outlet to the sea, and his hopes to gain control of the Red Sea port of Ṣaṭhār, settled by two, possibly Ziyādī, slave amīrs, by diplomacy or military means, came to nought. For his residence in Yaman he came to prefer the town of Ṣayyān, a two days' trip south-east of Ṣaʿdā, in the territory of the Banū Ṣalāman, who were among his most loyal supporters. He also acquired an estate which he brought newly under irrigation in Wādī Maḍḥāb, between Ṣayyān and Ṣaʿdā, and built a castle there. In Ṣaʿdā he restored the ruined castle of the Imām Ṣaḥḥām al-Naṣir, son of al-Ḥādi, which lay outside the town, for his own use. His position in the old capital of the Zaydī state was, however, precarious, as the population and the tribes of the neighbourhood were predominantly loyal to al-Ḥādi's descendants, while the Turks had relinquished their claim only under duress. Al-Ḥādi's rule over the descendants of al-Hadf, whose allegiance to his tribes of the neighbourhood were predominantly loyal
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Matters became settled for a time after 11 Dhu '1-Hijja 1016/28 March 1608, when, on petition from Ḍi‘ā’er Pasha, Sinān Pasha’s successor, al-Kāsim agreed to a ten-year peace treaty, by which the Ottomans recognised his control over much of northern Yemen and undertook to release his son Muḥammad. Matters became settled for a time after 11 Dhu ‘1-Hijja 1016/28 March 1608, when, on petition from Ḍi‘ā’er Pasha, Sinān Pasha’s successor, al-Kāsim agreed to a ten-year peace treaty, by which the Ottomans recognised his control over much of northern Yemen and undertook to release his son Muḥammad. Matters became settled for a time after 11 Dhu ‘1-Hijja 1016/28 March 1608, when, on petition from Ḍi‘ā’er Pasha, Sinān Pasha’s successor, al-Kāsim agreed to a ten-year peace treaty, by which the Ottomans recognised his control over much of northern Yemen and undertook to release his son Muḥammad.
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But this should not obscure the fact that he conducted frequent military operations during the military off-season in his wars with the Turks. Among the more frequently mentioned are accounts regarding the various stages of life, it is useful, indeed essential, to examine his relations with the poets and leading political figures of his time. In view of his numerous impressive military gains against four Ottoman governors over more than two decades, it is hardly surprising that most accounts of Imām al-Kāsim dwell on his role as a warrior imām, so much so that one of his biographers (al-Djurmuzi) arranged the history of his imāmate according to his ‘risings (nahādat)’ against the occupying power. But this should not obscure the fact that he commanded wide respect among fellow-Zaydi for his scholarly attainments and extensive knowledge of Islamic law and religious practice. Al-Habshi’s study of the literary output of the various Imām attributes to al-Kāsim’s authorship some 41 works, a productivity surpassed apparently by only four of his peers. His performances, both in poetry and in prose, range in length from one or two folios to several hundred and deal mainly with jurisprudence and Zaydi dogma. Although some were produced prior to the proclamation of his da‘wah, others must have been composed during the military off-season in his wars with the Turks. Among the more frequently mentioned are al-Ḥiṣām, a substantial work on ḥadīth uncompleted at his death; al-Asās li-‘alād al-aṣbāḥ, concerning the fundamental principles of the faith and widely commented upon; al-Iṣbaḥ li-sabīl al-rashid, a collection of articles; and several compilations of his answers to questions regarding law and dogma.

**Bibliography:** The principal source for the life of al-Kāsim is a biography by Ahmad b. Muḥammad al-Saffah (d. 1055/1645-6); an early supporter of the Imām and one of his officials. A ms. of the second part of this isra (title unknown) at Edinburgh forms the basis for A. S. Tritton’s *The rise of the Imams of San'a*. London 1925; it is possible that this isra and another title attributed to the same author, al-Labīr al-aṣīl, is also an abridged edition of Durra al-mudīya fi l-tīra al-Kāsimyya (and its abridgement, al-Nubdha al-mudīya) by al-Djurmuzi (d. 1077/1667), who freely acknowledges his debt to al-Sharafi. Yet a third biography is the anonymous Sirat al-Manṣūr bi ‘l-ḥāl al-Kāsim described by Ayman Sayyid (Muḥammad ta’līf al-Yaman, Cairo 1974, 332) as a history of Yemen 858/1057-1674. Abu Ṭīf in details are the Rauṣ al-ṭārīf bi ʿĪsā b. Ṣuf Ṭīl Alliance b. al-Mutahhar (d. 1048/1638), Ghāyāt al-āmānī by Yāḥyā b. al-Husayn (d. ca. 1100/1688), al-Kāsim’s grandson (ed. Sa‘īd ʿAbd al-Fattāḥ ʿAǧṣūr, Cairo 1968, ii, 770-814), and al-Iṣbaḥ by al-Mawzū‘i (d. ca. 1031/1621), unique among these treatises for its anti-Zaydi bias. For other ms. source materials, especially those of the 12th/18th century, consult al-Habshi, Ma‘alullat hukkam al-Yaman, Wiesbaden 1979, 127 f., which work also identifies, describes and locates the mss. of all works attributed to al-Kāsim’s authorship (pp. 128-36). Ottoman archival materials for al-Kāsim’s era are extensive. An important monograph on this figure is by al-Muṣṭafā, al-Kāsim al-Manṣūr bi ‘l-ḥāl al-Kāsim, Qudeda 1982. Other published secondary materials include Muhbibi, Khulṣayt al-ṭārīf, Cairo 1284/1867-8, i, 485-7, ii, 73-6, 217 f., iii, 293-7, iv, 296-9; Ahmad Rājīd, Ta’līfī Yemen wa San‘ā‘, Istanbul 1291/1874-5, i, 170-223; Wustenfeld, Ṣan‘ā‘ al-sīrah al-sīrah, xvi (xvi), Dresden, 1884, 38-48; ʿArif Pasha, Yemen ta’līfī, Istanbul 1236/1908-9, 86-96; Zāḥib, Ḥufuf al-muḥadhdun, San‘ā‘ 1343/1924-5, 78 f.; Šawkwānī, al-Badr al-tārīf, Cairo 1348/1929-30, ii, 47-51; Djiḏri, al-Muṣṭahaf min ta’līf al-Yaman, Cairo 1951, 141-4; ʿArghī, Bulāq al-maram, ed. al-Karmali, Cairo 1939, 65 f.; Muṣṭāfā Sālim, al-Fahh al-Uṯmānī, Cairo 1969, 338-69; Bayḥānī, Abshīr al-anwar, Cairo 1319/1971-2, ii, 244, n.l. (J. R. BLACKBURN)
tion in literary subjects*. Moreover, these contacts were not limited to the poetic sphere. It was al-Asbahānī who introduced al-Namārī to al-Fadl b. Yāḥyā, who persuaded him to come from al-Ḍajjār to Raḥḥālī and introduced him to Raḥḥālī. Subsequently, rivalry broke out between the two poets, and it was through the good offices of the celebrated Tāhir b. al-Husayn (d. 207/822) that they were reconciled. Besides these poets, Mansūr al-Namārī was acquainted with numerous political figures. In addition to the Barmakids and especially al-Fadl b. Yāḥyā and his brother Dīnār (d. 187/803) and the aforementioned Tāhir b. al-Husayn, he knew al-Fadl b. al-Raḥīm b. Yūnus (d. 208/824) (q. e.), an enemy of the Barmakids and himself the vizier of Raḥḥālī. Al-Fadl b. alRaḥīm intervened with the caliph to secure the release of the poet, who had been imprisoned for his proclaimed Shī‘ī tendencies. A similar intervention was assured him, we are told, by Yázid b. Māzyad al-Shaybānī (d. 185/801), the governor of ʿAḥṣār bāydaḏjān. Al-Namārī knew al-Maʿmūn (d. 218/833) then heir to the throne, at whose court he met numerous poets. But according to all the evidence, it was the caliph Raḥḥālī who influenced the life and who signed the death warrant of the poet. In fact, Raḥḥālī invited al-Namārī to his court, where the latter addressed eulogies to him and received gifts from him. The poet himself shows the pro-ʿAḥṣār tendencies, he cast him into disgrace, imprisoned him and ordered Abū ʿĪṣa, a pro-ʿAḥṣāsīd Zaydī, to torture and execute him. But the latter was only able, on arriving in Mecca, to attend the obsequies of the poet, probably in 190/805.

2. Works. Of the hundred-page Dīwān attributed to Ibn al-Nadim (d. 305/919) to the poet and of the anthology of Ḥāфиз al-ʿUṯmānī al-Namārī attributed by Yāsīk (d. 622/1225) to Ahmad b. Tāhir, it is possible to assemble only 57 fragments totalling 386 verses gleaned from various historical or literary sources, of which the most important are the Ḧāḏīqān (14 pieces), the Ṣamāʿī of al-ʿAlāʾ (d. 356/9699) and the Tihābīn or ʿAqādī Dīwān al-Mutanabbi by ab-Ḥūbārī (d. 616/12219) (10 pieces), the Tābaqāt of Ibn al-Muʿtazz, the Zahr al-adab of al-Ḥusayn b. ʿAbd al-Ḥādī al-Muhanna of the Muwāṣṣata al-ʿAmīḍī (d. 571/1174) and the K. al-Ṣināʿī ʿatayn of al-ʿAskarī (d. 395/1005) (7 pieces). On the other hand, two modern authors, al-Rifāʿī in Aṣr al-Maʿmūn (10 pieces) and especially al-ʿAmīḍī in the Aṣrān al-Ṣanʿa (15 pieces) have taken an interest, among many others, in Mansūr al-Namārī.

These 57 fragments, of which 14 may be disregarded since they are also attributed to other poets, are of unequal length; only 15 contain 7 verses or more and may thus be considered kasidas, 16 others contain one verse, 11 others three verses, and 8 two verses.

The poet uses 10 different metres and, in particular, ṯawīl, basīt, kāmil and wafīr (respectively 20, 8, 6 and 8 fragments) which are the “noble” classical metres; ṭamāl, munsārīn, ḥaṣāq and mukāṯāfīn, the “light” metres, are used only once. For rhyme, al-Namārī uses 14 of the 28 letters of the alphabet: most prominently used are lām, hāʾ, rāʾ, mīn, dāl and nān (respectively 14, 9, 8, 5 and 4 times), a common phenomenon in Arabic poetry. Ḥamza, hāʾ, fāʾ, kāf and ʾayn are used only once. Moreover, in his poetry (or in that portion of it which is available to us) al-Namārī makes use of the principal poetic genres. While he reserves for satire (ḥīf, ḥakīf, ḥikāf) boastfulness (faḏḥ) and lament (ṭuḥfi) only respectively 1, 2, 3 and 4 pieces, on the other hand he devotes to erotic poetry (aḥzād) 17 fragments which are in fact nothing more than amorous preludes, where the poet evokes youth and looks forward with foreboding the old age. But, according to all the evidences, it was laudatory poetry (madh) which al-Namārī practised most prominently. In fact, 20 pieces or 200 verses are devoted to madh, of them for the above-mentioned viziers and governors and 14 for al-Raḥḥālī; noble lineage, munificence, courage, dedication, competence in handling the affairs of the state, in other words the socio-politico-religious qualities commonly recognised, are the principal themes of the laudatory poems and especially of those which are dedicated to the caliph. However, some authors make the remark that al-Namārī is not at all pro-ʿAbbasid and that he only praises alRaḥḥālī with prudent dissimulation (ṭayyiq) as do many poets. Moreover, he displays his Shīʿīsm in 9 pieces totalling 69 verses, emanating exclusively, admitted, from Shīʿī sources. The poet expresses his deep affection for the ʿAlīids, mourns al-Ḥusayn (d. 61/681), displays his hatred of the Umayyads and the ʿAbbasids to whom he denies all merit, and calls for armed revolt with the purpose of averting the sons of Fāṭima.

In conclusion, in poems of classical structure and in a pure language and a sometimes quite virulent style, al-Namārī practises the principal genres, distinguishing himself in his so-called "opposition" poetry in spite of the contradictions which the majority of classical Arab poets display.

**Bibliography:** In addition to the works mentioned in the article, see T. al-ʿAshṭarāḥī, ʿIrāq Mansūr al-Namārī, Publications of the Arab Academy of Damascus, 1401/1981, and the reviews by ʿAbd al-Ḥādī al-Fāḥšām in MJMA, Ivi (Oct. 1981), and M. ʿAlaʾī, in Hawliyyet al-Dīmār al-Tūnisiyya, xii (1982).

**MANSÜR AL-YAMAN**

**Shaybānī, Sabīl Abū l-Kāsim al-Ḥasan b. Faraḍī b. Hawsbāb al-Zādhibn al-Nadji ʿAbd al-Nasr Al-Kūfī, often known as Ibn Hawsbāb, was the founder of the Ismāʿīlī dawwa in Yaman. Other forms of his name and genealogy are less well attested; later Ismāʿīlī tradition considered him a descendant of Muhammad b. Ṣād b. Abī Tāhī.**

He was a Kūfī Imāmī Shīʿī, probably from Nars, a canal near Kūfah, learned in the religious sciences, and was won for the Ismāʿīlī cause by a dāʿī, who is identified in a Fāṭimid source as the chief dāʿī ʿAbd al-Raṣūl and by the ʿAlawīs as Ibn Abī ʿĪsā, an assistant of ʿAbd al-Raḥmān in Iraq. According to his own account, as related by ʿAbd al-Raḥmān, he was introduced by the dāʿī to the imām who, after a training period, sent him together with the Yamanī ʿAli b. al-Fadl al-Dījāshīnī to Yaman. They arrived there early in 268/late summer 881 and separated. Ibn Hawsbāb passed through Ṣanṭāna and Ćanad and stayed some time in ʿAdan before establishing himself, allegedly in accordance with the instructions of the imām, in the village of ʿAdan Lāʿa in territory under the rule of the ʿHādīs (Yāʿfurīdhs). In 270/885 he began his mission, publicly proclaiming the imminent appearance of the Mahdī, and quickly attracted a large following. After an attack on his followers by a local ʿHūdī garrison he occupied the stronghold of ʿAbī Muḥarrar on a mountain below Ḏabāl Maswar (ca. 272/885-6). Later, he captured Ṣayf b. ʿAdalī on Ḏabāl Tūlqah and fortified Bayzd b. Ḏabāl Maswar as his residence. He sent the dāʿī Abū l-Malāhīm as governor to Ḏabāl Tays and conquered Bīlād Shāwīr, ʿAyān and Hamdūn. His first campaign against Ṣḥībām, the residence of the ʿHādīs, failed. Later, he took the town aided by the
treason of a Hiwalid client, but was soon forced to leave again. These events took place before 290/903, though their exact dates are unknown. It is evident, however, that he was firmly established before 278-9/982-3 when the dā'ir Abū 'Alā Allāh al-Sḥīfī [s.v.] was sent to him from ʿIrāk to be trained for his mission in the Maghrib. He sent dāʿīs also to other countries: al-Hayṭām, cousin of his wife who was the daughter of a local Shīʿī, to Sind: ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAbd Allāh al-Sḥīfī al-Mansūrī [s.v.] and others to al-Yamāmā and Hind (presumably Gudjarāt). His lakāb al-Mansūr or Mansūr al-Yamān, which he was given after his early successes, implied ideas both of a restorer of Yamānī glory and a precursor of the Mahdī (see B. Lewis, ʿAlī b. al-Fadl as a Consul, in ʿAlī b. al-Fadl al-Yamānī: Al-Fadl b. Abī Yaḥyā al-Hasanī, ed. S.ʿAlī, al-Shayyal, i, Cairo 1971, 166-173). In 282/995 ʿAlī b. al-Fadl, who had initially established himself further south in the Bilad Yafi, decided to move to Delhi 1968, Kitdb al-Rushd wa ʿl-hīdyya, of which fragments are ex-


AL-MANSŪRA, the principal city of the province of Sind under the Arabs. It was founded by ʿAmr b. al-Ḥuṣayn b. ʿAbd al-Muṭṭalib. The son of the celebrated conqueror of Sind, in 120/738 or shortly afterwards (al-Baladhurī, Futūḥ, 444; Yaʿlā b. Abī ʿAlī, ca. 889, Caetani, Chronographia Islamica, 1507), 47 miles to the north-east of modern Haydarābād [see HIND]. Geography, at iii, 407, Al-Birūnī’s statement, according to which Mansūra is merely a Muslim name given by Muhammad b. al-Kāsim to the ancient city of Brahmanābād at the time of its conquest (al-Djamāhirī maʿrifat al-dāʿībārī, Haydarābād, Deccan 1355, 48; al-Kānin al-Masʿūdī, Haydarābād, Deccan 1954, 552), is at variance with the earlier traditions, though the sites of the two cities were certainly close to each other. The attribution of the founding of Mansūra to the Umayyad governor and adventurer Mansūr b. Ḫumār (Hidayat Hosain, in ʿAlī b. al-Ḥusayn, Kāba ṭaḥla, 74; H. Halm, Die Sirat Ibn ʿAlāʾ: Die ismaʿiliische"
The exact location of Mansura, the question whether it was built on the site of Brahmanabad or at some distance from it, as well as the precise date and circumstances of its destruction and abandonment, are inconclusively discussed by several authors. (See Bibliography.)

The location of Mansura, the question whether it was built on the site of Brahmanabad or at some distance from it, as well as the precise date and circumstances of its destruction and abandonment, are inconclusively discussed by several authors. (See Bibliography.)

**AL-MANSURA, a town in Lower Egypt near Damietta (Dimyāt [q.v.]),** and chief place of the maḏrīsyya al-Dakahlīyya. The town was founded in 616/1219 by the Ayyūbid sultan al-Malik al-Kāmil [q.v.], as a fortified camp against the Crusaders, who had conquered Dimyāt in Saḥban 616/116 November 1219. Situated at the fork of the branches of the Nile near Dimyāt and Ugmūm Tannah, the town dominated the two most important waterways of the eastern delta and served as an advanced outpost of Cairo. In July/August 1221, the advance of the Crusaders under King John of Jerusalem and the Catalan-Legate Pelagius was checked before al-Mansura in exactly the same way. In December 1249 the Franks, approaching from Dimyāt, appeared before the town and pitched camp again in the angle between the branches of the Nile. On 5 Dhu 'l-Ḥaḍra 647/10 February, 1250, they forced the crossing of the Bahr Ugmūm and penetrated into al-Mansura, but were driven back after heavy street fighting, during the ensuing battle before the gates of the town, King Leo Tzachares himself facing Baybars I al-Bundukdārī [q.v.]. After hesitating for several weeks, the Franks beat a retreat, but did not reach Dimyāt. On 3 Muharram 648/7 April 1250, the King and the remainder of his army were taken prisoner, and on 5 Safar 7 May of the same year were ransomed for exchange for Dimyāt.

During the reign of the Mamlūk sultans, the town belonged to the province of al-Dakahlīyya, whose chief place was Ugmūm Tannah, the present Ushi, renamed maraj in 1871) with 60 villages. As a staple of cotton, harvested in the Delta, al-Mansura witnessed an important increase in population: 27,000 inhabitants in 1900; 49,000 in 1917; and 210,000 in 1970.


**AL-MANSURA, a town in Lower Egypt near Damietta (Dimyāt [q.v.]),** and chief place of the maḏrīsyya al-Dakahlīyya. The town was founded in 616/1219 by the Ayyūbid sultan al-Malik al-Kāmil [q.v.], as a fortified camp against the Crusaders, who had conquered Dimyāt in Saḥban 616/116 November 1219. Situated at the fork of the branches of the Nile near Dimyāt and Ugmūm Tannah, the town dominated the two most important waterways of the eastern delta and served as an advanced outpost of Cairo. In July/August 1221, the advance of the Crusaders under King John of Jerusalem and the Catalan-Legate Pelagius was checked before al-Mansura. When al-Malik al-Kāmil ordered the dikes to be pierced and the land flooded, the Franks, who had pitched their camp in the angle between the two branches of the Nile, were forced to surrender and to purchase an unhampered retreat by giving up their Egyptian conquests (7 Rashād 618/22 July, 1221).

During the reign of the last Ayyūbid Turāngāh, the Crusade of Louis IX of France came to its end before al-Mansura in exactly the same way. In December 1249 the Franks, approaching from Dimyāt, appeared before the town and pitched camp again in the angle between the branches of the Nile. On 5 Dhu 'l-Ḥaḍra 647/10 February, 1250, they forced the crossing of the Bahr Ugmūm and penetrated into al-Mansura, but were driven back after heavy street fighting, during the ensuing battle before the gates of the town, King Leo Tzachares himself facing Baybars I al-Bundukdārī [q.v.]. After hesitating for several weeks, the Franks beat a retreat, but did not reach Dimyāt. On 3 Muharram 648/7 April 1250, the King and the remainder of his army were taken prisoner, and on 5 Safar 7 May of the same year were ransomed for exchange for Dimyāt.
himself and the leaders of his army and laid the foundation of a mosque. In the year 702/1302 the "Victorious Camp" (al-Mahallat al-Mansura), was given the form of a regular town by the construction of a ram part. In addition to the mosque, the dwelling of the chiefs, the storehouses for munitions and the shelters for the army, there were baths and caravanserais. As Tlemcen was inaccessible to caravans, al-Mansûra, or New Tlemcen, as it was called naturally attracted the business of the besieged town. Documents in the archives of the Crown of Aragon attest to the fact that it was visited by Christian merchants, and that a Marini d lived there. After a siege of eight years and three months, the Marînids in 706/1307 withdrew from Tlemcen following the death of Sultan Ya'qûb and, al-Mansûra was methodically evacuated under the direction of Ibrahim b. 'Abd al-Djalîl, the vizier of the sultan Abu Thabit. The people of Tlemcen were compelled, by the terms of the treaty made by the Marînids, to respect the town for some time later; then, when the entente between the two empires had collapsed, they demolished its building and rendered uninhabitable the entitlements left at their gate by their hereditary enemy.

The second phase of al-Mansûra's existence began 30 years afterwards, in 735/1335, with the Marînids drive eastwards under the great ruler Abu 'l-Hasan (al-Mansûriyya, or Mansûriyya 441). The town, a prosperous centre of rice cultivation, was built (747/1348-51) under the leadership of the vizier, who had accompanied him to the town, and provided with a kasba and mosque, a medina, a house of justice, palaces, baths and caravanserais. It was probably at this time that the great mosque was completed and that the "Victory Palace," was built. The Marînids court installed itself there and conducted the affairs of state thence until the defeat of al-Karawân and the re-installation of the Banû 'Abd al-Wad at Tlemcen (Djumâdâ II 749/September 1348).

After the retreat of the Marînids, al-Mansûra, once more abandoned, fell gradually into ruins. Today the rampart of terrace pisé flanked by square towers is still comparatively intact, but the inner is lost under vegetation. Still exists, however, the ruins of a palace, no longer distinct, a section of a paved street, and probably the surrounding wall in terrace pisé of the mosque with half of the great stone minaret which rose above the principal entrance. Although the inlaid ceramic work has almost entirely disappeared, the façade of the square tower, which is 120 feet high, is one of the finest pieces of Maghribi art of the 8th/14th century that survives. The columns and the capitals in marble of the mosque are preserved in the Museums of Tlemcen and Algiers.


(G. Marçais - M. Shatzmiller)
and to have used the method of strangling or stoning, because they held that iron weapons must not be employed before the coming of the Mahdī. They considered all belongings of their victims as booty and turned over a fifth (khums) to their leader. Al-Džahīz describes them as living and travelling together in groups and acting together, beating their drums and tambourines and making their dogs bark in order to cover up the cries of their victims. Abū Mansūr’s “foster mother” (hādima), Maylā, is named as a head of the strangers in a poem of Hammad al-Rawīya.自行车, the description (or is it the expression) of truth and to that which is derived from concepts and to that which is derived from judgments (tawassiriyāt and tadžkīyyāt). This definition presupposes the valid distinction between the rules that hold that the rules of logic “supply knowledge of the methods permitting a passage from the necessary truths of intuition to speculative truths, because this expression at first sight gives the impression of a passage which is effected [directly] by itself (intikāl ġlīth), while the more general sense is that this is a passage which is either made directly by itself or through an intermediary (la tādār bi ‘l-tawāṣil). This being so, al-Tahanāwī points out the difference between logic and grammar (handasa) on the other. Grammar “only explains the general rules which apply to the quality of elocution in Arabic terms, and that in general manner; when one wishes to propound a discourse appropriate to a particular subject (mukāhī) in a congruous and proper manner, that is to find for particular modalities (aḥkām ḥiqqiyā) which are drawn from these rules as are normally the derivations (fara‘) of principles (ulūl). But this does not apply in the passage of thought from a known to an unknown. Grammar is of absolutely no assistance in making passages of this kind. The name is true of geometry; it is in posing principles (nafṣīdh) in the practice of them”. This science, al-Tahanāwī continues, “was called mantık because the root naṭ (action of speaking, elocution) applies in a general fashion to statement (lafe), to the perception of universals (idrāk al-kulliyāt) and to the reasonable soul (al-nafs al-naṭāk), since this act reinforces the first of these concepts, through the second it follows the path of rectitude (sadd), and by its means the perfection of the soul is realised, a word has been derived from this root to designate it, sc. the word mantık. It is the science of rules (kaʿānīn) which explains the methods for passing from that which is known to that which is unknown, and the conditions that they pose (gharā‘īt) so that error (ghalat) will not survive in thought (ṣkr). The known extends to the necessary truths of intuition (darārisiyāt) and to speculative truths”. It may be noted that this distinction corresponds to that made by Aristotle (Anal. Pr. i, 10, 76 b 10) between “common axioms” and “entirely demonstrated conclusions”. As for the unknown, “it extends to that which is derived from concepts and to that which is derived from judgments (tawassiriyāt and tadžkīyyāt)”. This definition presupposes the valid distinction between the rules that hold that the rules of logic “supply knowledge of the methods permitting a passage from the necessary truths of intuition to speculative truths, because this expression at first sight gives the impression of a passage which is effected [directly] by itself (intikāl ġlīth), while the more general sense is that this is a passage which is either made directly by itself or through an intermediary (la tādār bi ‘l-tawāṣil). This being so, al-Tahanāwī points out the difference between logic and grammar (handasa) on the other. Grammar “only explains the general rules which apply to the quality of elocution in Arabic terms, and that in general manner; when one wishes to propound a discourse appropriate to a particular subject (mukāhī) in a congruous and proper manner, that is to find for particular modalities (aḥkām ḥiqqiyā) which are drawn from these rules as are normally the derivations (fara‘) of principles (ulūl). But this does not apply in the passage of thought from a known to an unknown. Grammar is of absolutely no assistance in making passages of this kind. The name is true of geometry; it is in posing normative problems (masb‘āl kānīnīya) that it tackles objects of research on configurations, in the sense that it makes these problems the principles of the demonstrations whereby it reasons on these objects. As for the particular notions which intervene in these demonstrations, geometry does not in any way contribute to their understanding.” Al-Tahanāwī is no doubt thinking here of the Euclidian method which proceeds from problems to arrive at theorems: the given data of the problems serving as a base for the demonstrations. As for the particular notions, they relate to the terms of the syllogism, in particular the middle term which is the cause of the conclusion in the minor. Thus Aristotle writes (Anal. Post., i, 11, 94 a 27-34): “Why is the angle drawn in the semi-circle a right-angle? Or, from what given information does it follow that is is a right angle?” J. Tricot explains Aristotle’s argument in these terms: “We have here the following Barbara syllogism, in which B, the middle term, is the cause of the conclusion: Every angle which is the half of two right-angles (B) is a right-angle (A). Every angle drawn in the semi-circle (r) is

**1. Etymology.**

The LA gives mantīk as a synonym of kalām in the sense of “language”; a book is described as being mantīb (that which has a voice). But it is certain that the Kurgan uses this root with a normative sense which has a broader sense to the word mantīk. The man who has received wisdom (hikma) is named as a head (maṭla‘ “foster mother”, hawdy). The man who has received wisdom (hikma) he does not talk through passion but he does so according to reason. It is understandable that reason distinguishes him on the spiritual level. As for the particular notions which intervene in these demonstrations, geometry does not in any way contribute to their understanding.” Al-Tahanāwī is no doubt thinking here of the Euclidian method which proceeds from problems to arrive at theorems: the given data of the problems serving as a base for the demonstrations. As for the particular notions, they relate to the terms of the syllogism, in particular the middle term which is the cause of the conclusion in the minor. Thus Aristotle writes (Anal. Post., i, 11, 94 a 27-34): “Why is the angle drawn in the semi-circle a right-angle? Or, from what given information does it follow that is is a right angle?” J. Tricot explains Aristotle’s argument in these terms: “We have here the following Barbara syllogism, in which B, the middle term, is the cause of the conclusion: Every angle which is the half of two right-angles (B) is a right-angle (A). Every angle drawn in the semi-circle (r) is...
the half of two right-angles (B); Every angle drawn in the semicircle (r) is a right-angle (A)." But it is evident that the role of geometry is precisely to show that every angle drawn in the semi-circle is the half of two right-angles. Although it implicitly uses the preceding syllogism, it is not by means of the syllogism that it achieves the end which it seeks. Consequently, the science of logic is different from the demonstrative science of geometry. Logic is definitely defined as one of the instrumental sciences (min al-ilm al-diliyya). But if it plays a role in the treatment by each particular science of its own object, what is the object of logic itself?

"It is said," al-Tahanawi states, "that it has its object (mawjud) concepts (tasawwurat) and judgments (tadsikat)." It is a process of passing from known concepts or judgments to unknown concepts or judgments, by short or long steps: short when a concept is defined through haul or through sam, or when judgment is by analogy (kisay), induction (istikr), or comparison (tamb bif); long, when there is the added consideration that a concept is universal or particular, essential or accidental, or when a judgment is proved by a contrary or contradictory judgment (kadiyya wa-takfiyya wa-nakhdh). The logician also enquires into concepts in as much as they give access to judgment when they are considered as subjects (ma'add) and judgments. Those who are concerned with the precise meaning of words (al-tabaks) reckon that the object of logic is constituted by secondary intelligibles (al-ma'kali'at al-thaniyya) not as such and taken in themselves, nor as existing in thought, for it then becomes an issue to be dealt with by philosophy; but in as much as they give access to the unknown. "In fact, when the universal intelligible notion (al-ma'add al-akhl) exists in thought, and is compared with particular things which are beneath it, it becomes either essentiality (al-dhatiya) because it becomes a part of their quiddity, or accidentalness (al-raftadyya) because it is exterior to them, or specificity (al-ma'addyya) because it is their quiddity itself. That which becomes essentiality is the genre (dim) relative to its different individuals, and the specific difference (al-ma'add al-akhl) existing in thought, and which becomes accidentalness is either an attribute (khiss), or a common accident ('arad 'amm), according to two differing points of view." These "intentions" (ma'dani), i.e. the fact that the universal notion is essential, accidental or specific, do not belong to exterior entities; they are what becomes of the universal natures (al-tahd Y al-katllya) when they are found in thought. The same applies to the fact that a judicative proposition is attributive or declarative, that an argument is an analogy, an induction or a comparison, for this is what becomes of the nature of particular relation (al-nisab al-dgulyya) in thought. Consequently, these secondary intelligibles are indeed the object of logic. Finally, al-Tahanawi comments that logic is also concerned with "intelligibles of the third degree" (al-ma'kali'at al-thaniyya) which are essentially what becomes of secondary intelligibles. Thus the judicative proposition (kadiyya) is a secondary intelligible. But inquiry can be made as to its divisibility (niksism), on the fact that it contradicts another (tanakud), or that it is convertible (insik), or that a conclusion may be drawn from it (imud); these are intelligibles which fall to the third rank (al-daragha al-idiltha). These questions are tackled by Aristotle in De Intermed, and in the Prior Analytics, whence this separation of intelligibles into three degrees seems to be derived. As for the purpose (gharan) of logic, it is the discernment of truth and falsehood (tamyiz al-sik wa'l-khld) in speech, of true and false (al-hakk wa'l-bht) in beliefs (fi 'l-bhtkd), of good and bad in actions (al-khayr wa'l-thghr fi 'l-a'mal). Its utility (manafa) is thus to give access to the theoretical sciences (al-ilm al-nazariyya) and to the practical sciences (al-analyiya).

Such is the survey of logic made by al-Tahanawi at a late date (12th/18th century). It shows the ideas which were current in the Muslim world, following a long history in the course of which it was both attacked and defended, and cultivated in a more or less fruitful fashion. It is necessary now to go further back in time.

3. Discussions of logic among Arab-Muslim thinkers.

A. Grammar and logic. It is undeniable, and the work of Aristotle proves this, that there is a connection between logic and language in general, and with the spoken language and its grammar in particular. But can logic, which aspires to be universal to all men, be reduced to the grammar of a language spoken by a particular people? This question was posed in the course of a famous debate described by Abi Hayyan al-Tawhifi, between the Christian logician Abi Bshar Matta b. Yunnus and the grammarian and commentator of Sibawayh, Abi Sa'id al-Sifar. Matta defines the purpose and utility of logic in the same terms as those employed by al-Tahanawi. Logic is an instrument comparable to a balance, giving awareness of what weighs the most, but not the nature of that which is weighed. Furthermore, in bodies, not everything is evaluated by weights; there are measures other than weight. The same applies to intelligibles. This reply is evidently an argument al hominem which does not explain how, alongside the grammar which regulates discourse, reason would pronounce, in intellectual problems, on the truth and falsehood of ideas.

Whatever the case, Abi Sa'id returns to his thesis: it was a Greek who instituted logic according to the language of his people, on the basis of the technical terminology (istilh) applied to it by the grammarians and of knowledge of the traits which characterise it. How could this logic be imposed upon Turks, Indians, Persians and Arabs? Matta replies that logic is concerned with intelligibles and ideas; on this level all men are equal. For all men, two and two make four; the same applies to the rules of logic, which is denied by Abi Sa'id, who declares that these intelligibles are only reached by the language with its nouns, verbs and particles. To preach the study of logic is to preach the study of the Greek language, seeing that the people who spoke it have disappeared and it is known only through translations into Syrian, then into Arabic. But, Matta replies, the translations preserve intentions and ideas. Abi Sa'id does not insist and does not pose the problem of the difficulties of translation, unlike al-Dhahabi (K. al-Hayawdn, i, 75-9). Even admitting, he says, that these translations may be accurate, there is no reason to think "that there is no proof other than the intelligence of the Greeks". To claim that the sciences (al-ilm) of their contribution to the sciences, he replies that "knowledge of the world is dispersed throughout the world among all the inhabitants of the world", without perceiving that by this reasoning there could be a logic common to all.
If the Greeks do not occupy a privileged position, it is also true that Aristotle is not the whole of Greece; he has not taken on the gravity of his words, for they pose the question of knowing if there are divergent mentalities in reconcileable in their diversity, and if there are among men one or several truths. Should the existence be admitted of as many logics as there are languages and grammars and people? Whatever the implications, he concludes: “The world has remained the same after the logic of Aristotle as it was before.” This being so, he attempts to explain that it is by grammar and not by logic that one can understand, for example, all the uses of the particle  

(And), which is undeniable, but proves nothing. Matth replies that the logician has no need of grammar, although the grammarians need logic: it is by accident that the logician is concerned with words, as it is by accident that the grammarians hit upon an idea (  

); but the idea is more noble than the word. On the contrary, for Abä Sa’id, “Zayd is the most virtuous of the brothers”. It is certain that logic is a grammar, but it is included in the language”. The difference between the word and the meaning (  

), is that the word is a “natural reality” which is effaced with time, while the meaning is a “reality of intelligence” which remains fixed across time. He then shows that, in order to express his logic, Matth needs the Arabic language and its grammatical terms of genre, type, specific difference, at-tic can invalidate any kind of reasoning.

This being so, Abä Sa’id leaves the consideration of words in order to turn towards the intellectual content of their meanings. What is to be made of the statement “Zayd is the most virtuous of his brothers”? Matth believes that this is correct. Abä Sa’id retorts that he is mistaken and that the statement should be: “Zayd is the most virtuous of the brothers”. Zayd is one of the brothers, but he is not one of his brothers. In fact, “the brothers of Zayd are other than Zayd, and Zayd is exterior to their group.” Abä Sa’id claims that Matth does not know why one of the propositions is correct and the other false. But he himself does not explain how grammar demonstrates this, and his own explanation, based on the logical notions of inclusion and exclusion, has nothing grammatical about it. It is true that Aristotle does not deal directly with this type of proposition. Nevertheless, Matth should have been able to reply, for the notion of a brother is relative and according to Aristotle (Categories, 7, 6 a 36) relatives “refer to another thing.” Zayd, as a brother, is thus the brother of his brothers who are other than him: he is not one of them.

Finally, Abä Sa’id criticizes the logicians for having done nothing more than “frighten people” with the technical terms of genre, type, specific difference, attribute, accident, individual, and especially with the neologisms in  

, such as  

,  

,  

,  

,  

,  

, etc. Ibn Kutayba had already made a similar critique in the  

. Abä Sa’id mocks the “magical” formulae of the syllogism and concludes, “All of this is nonsense, trifles, incomprehensible and confused propositions. Anyone possessing fine intelligence, good discernment and refined insight, can do without it altogether.”

This critique poses more problems than it resolves, in particular that of a grammatical logic. Abä Sa’id’s performance is that of a debater seeking only to have the last word, unperturbed by his self-contradictions and avoidance of questions. But his critique is interesting, in that it shows the existence of a certain Aristobism opposed to all things Hellenic, based no doubt on the religious belief that God has revealed the  

in clear Arabic language (XVI, 103).

B. The doctrine of Ibn Hazm. The Zähiri views of Ibn Hazm leads him to deliberate on the nature of languages and to lay the foundations of a Zahir gram-
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Unfortunately, translations render them in obscure terms and arcane usage: "Nor every expression is right for every notion." Consequently, "No one can say of the meanings of the words, nor of their complex terms, equally comprehensible to the common man and educated, to the scholar and the ignorant, in the same measure as we have understood them:"

This being so, Ibn Hazm surveys the eight books of logic. As regards the *Isagoge*, it is sufficient to mention what he says of names which can designate several individuals, or a single one, as the case is presented in Arabic. For example, God says (III, 2): "In truth, man is in distress." Here, the name indicates the species (nau₃). A phrase such as "The man whom you know has come to see me," refers to an individual. But the ambiguity can be removed by the use of the collective: *al-nāṣ* instead of *al-insān* (the man), *al-khayl* instead of *al-faran* (the horse). This reference to the Kurʾān and to Arabic is worthy of note. Ibn Hazm then tackles the works of Aristotle: first the book "of isolated names" (*al-asma restarted*/al-mustafa), i.e. the Categories (*Kātibṭ harm) ; these are the ten mubālat. He begins by defining synonyms (*al-asma restarted*/al-mustafa restarted) and homonyms (*al-asma restarted*/al-mustafa stalka), for example, *nār* which denotes the vulture, a star, a stallion's head, and the shoe of a horse. He gives a different definition to paronyms which he calls "derivations" (*al-asma restarted*/al-mustahkka), the word *παρά* which was used by Aristotle having the sense of a word formed from an example of another; but it is never "born", for the substance (*gawhar*) bears and is not born.

Here there is established the ambiguity which results from the substitution of names for beings. Aristotle has stated clearly, "Among beings, some are affirmed by a subject, while not being in any subject" (Cat., 2 1 a 20). Ibn Hazm should have specified that Man, in the sense of a secondary substance (cf. Cat., 5, 2 a 10 ff.) is not in a subject, but as a universal, he can be the predicate of an individual subject: Zayd is a man of the tribe of the horse. Then the names of the third group are like the knowledge of a man: it is born in his soul and is qualified by knowledge. The names of the fourth group are like the knowledge which is a kind of quality relative to the soul and which includes such studies as medicine, jurisprudence, etc., par-ticular types of knowledge which it qualifies. What is of interest to Ibn Hazm is names, their meanings and their relationship within the language and their usage. The thing denominated is only considered in terms of the name which renominates it.

Turning to the ten categories, Ibn Hazm follows Aristotle, while simplifying him. With regard to the substance which is that which exists in itself, he does not say that the primary substance is neither in a subject (Indo *νοοτριγια*), not attributable to a subject (Indo *νοοτριγιαν*), while the secondary substance, once it has been seen, is not in a subject, but is attributable to a subject. He insists above all on the fact that the substance has no contrary (dīd). When two substances are taken to be contraries, the contrariety derives from their qualities (kaygīya). Consequently, God, having no qualities, is in no sense contrary to His creation. It is no longer possible to talk of more and of less: an ass is not more than another ass in "the-nature-of-the-ass" (fi ʿihamiriyā), nor a goat more than another goat in "the-nature-of-the-goat" (fi ʿi-tayyiyā): it is interesting to note this use of abstract terms in -iya which in principle Ibn Hazm rejects since they evoke ideas of the Platonic type existing in reality. But here there is little risk of "realism", since the context shows quite clearly that hmiriya and tayyiy are nothing more than conventional terms which designate the ass and the goat in the sense of secondary substances. Without pursuing further this analysis of the categories, it is evident that logic has so far been presented as a means of classifying words, of specifying their usage and thus developing a method of explaining the *Kuranic* text which is often quoted to illustrate, or to support, such-and-such a significa-tion. Nevertheless, in his chapter on the *De Interpretatione*, he calls "Book of Enunciations" (*K. al-Akhbār*), where there is a discussion of "names joined
to express a new signification (al-madīṃa ʾīlā ḍayyirāb), in other words "composites" (al-marabbāb), he denotes pure "nominalism". All qualifications and enunciations bear on the things denominated, not on the names, for the things denominated are the significations (al-maḍārî), and the names are the expressions of them (al-ʾibār ṣanḥâ). It is thus well established that the name is other than the thing denominated." Those of a contrary opinion seek support from the verse (LXXXVII, 1), "Praise the Name of your Master...". But they are mistaken, since a thing denominated can only be reached through the name which expresses it; these are the two inseparable relations.

It is worth paying attention to what Ibn Hazm says concerning speech, in order to show how he understands Aristotle in relating him to the notions of Arabic grammar. He renders the word ʾapha by kalima and says that it is what the grammarians call qualifications (nāʾî) and the theologists attribute (ṣīfa). The Greek word in fact primarily signifies speech and discourse (and in second place "verb" in the grammatical sense). J. Tricot writes (De l’Interprétation, 81, n. 1), "In the language of Aristotle and also that of Plato (cf. Sophist, 262 c; Cratylus, 399 b), the word ʾapha expresses the act of qualifying a subject or the qualification which is given to it, in a more general sense that which is stated on a subject."

The Arab grammarians describe it as "a name derived from a verb (fiʿl)". For example: ʿabbā, yāṣhhu, fa-ḥuwa ṣabīh (sense of being in good health). Kalima indicates a determined time. Thus ṣabīh is a statement (ṣibḥār) on the present fact of health of a person; ʿabbā indicates an action in the past (fi l-ʾmadāʾi); yāṣhhu, a future action (mustākbāl). The word ʾibaḥ (act of being in good health) is a name (ism), not a kalima. It is what the grammarians call masdar (verbal noun). These are of two types: (1) the masdar can express the action of an agent (fāʿil) or the movement of a mobile, for example the blow (darb) of one who strikes (dārīb); or (2) that which is a qualitative for what is qualified, for example the fact of being in good health (ṣibhā, masdar or ʿabbā) for someone who is in good health and is one of his qualifications*. There are thus two enunciative propositions: (1) Zayd strikes (darabeh), and (2) Zayd is in good health (ṣabīh), which means that Zayd is the agent-subject of the act of striking which is the effectiveness (taʿbīr), and that he is the qualified-subject of the fact of being in good health which is "borne" (maḥmûl) on him. With this incursion into Arabic grammar, Ibn Hazm deviates considerably from what Aristotle says.

In his study of the first part of the Prior Analytics, Ibn Hazm follows Aristotle fairly closely. He speaks of defined propositions (kadāsī maḥsûrā), "those which are explained by a word (laḥf, cf. below: ʿàr) which explains that they are intended to signify a global extension (al-ʾummān); these are universal propositions; or else a limited extension (al-khsusā); these are particular propositions. Next come undefined propositions (maḥmûlā), "in which the one who enunciates them does not state explicitly that he means a part (baʿād) of what is offered by the sense of the noun which they contain, or in which nothing prevents them from receiving a signification of global extension". It is evident that it is always the verbal expression (laḥf, ṣim) which interests Ibn Hazm, where Aristotle speaks of attribution to such or such a subject (wannuṭalāb). Furthermore, when he employs the words masdar (subject) and maḥmûl (predicate), he always explains them by terms borrowed from Arabic grammar: maḥmûl ʾaṭrā (that on which an enunciation bears) and ṭabar (enunciative). He stresses the means of concluding in an always true and necessary fashion (ṣittidā ʾahlan ʾahlan). Logical necessity has posed a problem for theologians (cf. below). But here it is reduced to evidence supplied by the sense of words themselves. If the noun "man" denotes living beings, and if the noun "existence" is applied to living and to inanimate beings, it is evident that the noun "existence" applies to man. If this is formalised, the result is a first-figure syllogism of the Barbara type: Every living being is substance; man is a living being; thus every man is substance. (N.B. This syllogism is given in the order major, minor, conclusion, whereas Arab logicians enunciate first the minor, then the major.)

Ibn Hazm devotes several paragraphs to judgments and to conditional syllogisms (girairriya). Aristotle does not deal with these in the Prior Analytics. As in the case of al-Fārābī and Ibn Sinā, a Stoic influence is evident here. The conditional proposition is either conjunctive (maṣūm), or disjunctive (muḥkām). Conjunctives are divided into connected propositions (muttasia): if A, therefore B; and into propositions with exception (ṣittidā): A or (not A) unless if B. The disjunctive enumerates cases, two or several, exclusive of one another, in a manner which is exhaustive (therefore perfect) or non-exhaustive (therefore imperfect): either A, then B; or C, then D...; now A, thus B. Ibn Hazm gives examples, which are known as instruments of the Stoics: if the sun has risen, it is day. The rising sun is the cause (ṣabāb) of the day. But he also gives judicial examples, which is to be expected since in the K. al-Muhallā, among other texts, he stresses the obligation to take account of the conditions which are in the Book of God (al-ṣarīf fi Kīsāʾ Allāh), without exception or addition. Thus a fornicator who is married, adult and healthy of mind, is punished by flogging; that which intoxicates is forbidden; now the wine of figs, when (iḏhā) it is fermented, intoxicates; thus the wine of figs if fermented is forbidden. The conditional particles are if (in), as soon as (maṭā mē), when (iḏhā mē), whenever (maḥmû, kullāmā). This being so, Ibn Hazm examines the different conditional syllogisms, according to whether their premises are universal or particular, affirmative or negative.

This brief appraisal shows that, without rejecting logic in general, and that of Aristotle in particular, Ibn Hazm reduces it to an instrument for the evaluation of names and of their meanings, whether they are isolated or connected in speech. By this means, genres, types, differences, particulars and accidents serve first to classify names, then, through them, the things denominated, to define the relations between names, and thereby between things denominated. While laying the foundations of a Zāhiri grammar, he has transformed the logic of Aristotle into a Zāhiri logic. It makes no attempt to advance a theory of quiddities and essences, being designed above all to serve in commentaries on Kūrānic and prophetic texts, and the truth that it propounds is that of legal maxims and of akhbām. It is for this reason that it is illustrated essentially by examples drawn from "Islamic law", and the nature of the work in question is clearly indicated by the full title, al-Takrib li-hadd al-maṭpar ilayhi bi-l-alfar al-ʾāmmiya wa-l-amīna wa-l-fikriyya.

C. The theologians and logic. (a) The ʾHanbalis. Very attached to the notion that all knowledge comes from God, they admit however that reason (ʿaṭā), being a gift of God, is something of which use should be made. This is stated, for example, by al-Barbahārī.
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[q.v.], although he denounces personal and arbitrary use of reasoning. He attacks innovations (bida*) as also does Ibn al-Ba'ta [q.v.], who denounces those "who take ignorant and debased beings as their masters, although the Lord has given them knowledge," and thus adopt "ideas which have no proof in the Book of God" (Profession de foi, introd., ed. and tr. H. Laoust, Damascus 1958). There is no doubt that logic is envisaged in this attack on bida*.

But the most important text written by a Hanbali on this subject is the "Refutation of Logicians" (K. al-Radd 'ala 'l-mantiqiyin) by Ibn Taymiyya [q.v.]. The author is at pains to show the uselessness of the logic of Aristotle. For example, a definition teaches nothing about the defined object to those who do not already have knowledge of it: "There is nothing more clear than 'man', but his definition as a reasonable animal encounters objections*. There is no need for a definition in forming a concept (taṣawwur) of the defined object and of its reality. "All men of good sense in all nations know the realities of things without being taught them by the school of Aristotle." However, Ibn Taymiyya admits nominal definitions which "distinguish between the defined object and that which is other than it*. But he reproaches al-Ghazālī for having introduced Greek logic (nabidh) and fikr al-dīn and renounces his works al-Mussafa', Mihkāl al-nazar, Miṣyār al-sīm and al-Kīsāfī al-mustakīm. On the other hand, when the logicians declare that knowledge of judgments can only be formed by the syllogism (kiyās), this is a negative proposition (kādiyya saliva) which is not known through evident intuition (badhā), and they have no proof (dalil) of this negation. How can they claim that none can acquire knowledge of a non-intuitive judgment except through the intermediary of a logical syllogism based on the universal (br-ussātī al-kiyās al-mantikī al-shumūlī)? The difference between the intuitive and the speculative is relative. A judgment is intuitive when it is sufficient to observe the two terms (subject and attribute) in order to recognise that it is true. But in this men are very different from one another. Some are capable of understanding a concept or weakness of the faculty of thought of different individuals. In this sense, the logic of Aristotle, indeed all logic, will be nothing other than methods of exposition of known truths, not rules for transference from a known to an unknown.

In matters of religious tradition, there may be a need for universal propositions. If, for example, the prohibition of nabih is to be explained, the statement will be that nabih is an intoxicating drink and every intoxicating drink is prohibited (or, nabih is a form of khamr (fermented drink), and all khamr is prohibited). Each of these propositions is known through a text (Kur'ānic or prophetic) or through consensus (imāra*). It is objection to the minor premise, the reply will be that it is established in the Sahih of Muslim that the Prophet said, "All intoxicating drink is fermented drink, and all intoxicating drink is forbidden*. Those who believe that there is a demonstration by means of two premisses display enormous ignorance, "for the Prophet is of too eminent rank to have recourse to such a method in the dissemination of knowledge*. But it appears that this method may be applied to the purpose of those whose intelligence is of a less eminent rank.

Furthermore, universal propositions are known, in a general manner, not by demonstrative proof (burhān), but by an analogy of comparison (kiyās tamghīl). If the demonstration of the logicians requires a universal proposition, the knowledge that is had of them must have a cause. If one advances the consideration of the fact that which is absent by that which is present (al-khās bi-l-a'ādād), or that the principle that the judgment borne on a thing is identical to that which is borne on a similar thing, then one has recourse to the analogy in question. If it is said that at the time of particular perceptions, there is produced in the soul a universal knowledge by the grace of the Giver of Intellect (Wāḥib al-dīl = Wāḥib al-dīl), who is the Agent Intellect (al-khalīf al-fāsād), or, further, that in perceiving particular things, the soul is "disposed* to receive from the Agent Intellect the influx of the universal, the reply will be that it is discourse (kalām) on particular things which shows that the universal judgment is knowledge and not opinion or ignorance. Finally, if demonstrative proof supplies only a knowledge of the universal, as the universal is only in thought and there is nothing at the exterior but the determined existing (mawjud mu'āyan), it follows that, through burhān, no existent can be absolutely known. The above are a few of the many criticisms levelled by Ibn Taymiyya against the logicians.

(b) The Aṣḥāris. In his K. al-Tamhīd, al-Bākīllānī brings together various kinds of demonstrations (istidālī), (1) those which divide a thing in the intelligence (fi 'l-dīl) into two or more parts which cannot all be true or all false; proof (dalil) shows that these divisions are false, except one; the intelligence judges as necessarily true that which remains; (2) that which states in that which is presently given (fi 'l-dīhīd), that it is necessary to judge and to qualify a thing by reason of a cause: it must therefore be judged that which has the same qualification in that which is absent (cf. Gardet and Anawati, Introduction à la théologie musulmane, 365 and n. 3). "In fact it is impossible (mustaflī) to establish a proof which shows that which
justifies the qualification by an attribute in the absence of that which renders this attribute necessary. This is known as the body is qualified as a body only by reason of the fact that it is composite; it must therefore necessarily be judged that everything qualified as a body has a composition; (3) that which demonstrates the truth or the falsehood of a thing according to (salāt) the truth or the falsehood of another thing which is similar to it and included in the same notion. For example, it is shown that God can give back life to the dead by the fact that this is the same thing as giving it to the living. Other types of demonstration depend on the exigencies of lexicography, or on the Qur'ān, the Sunna, tafsīr and the analogical reasoning of jurists (al-kiyād al-ghārî) which, likewise, is linked to a "cause" (ṣīla, cf. below). "All these traditional proofs (adilla sam'yya) have the same role in the unveling of truth through kiyās as have judgments based on reason."

In his Ithārāl, al-Dhuwaynī defines just reasoning (al-nazar al-sahlī) as "everything which leads to an understanding of the manner in which the proof proves (al-saltārā al-ruqūd al-llāhī minku yuḍūl al-dalālī)." As for proofs, "they are that which, through just reasoning with regard to them, lead to the knowledge of that which is not known in a necessary manner by deep-rooted practice. "Muslim theologians are confronted with the problem of the demonstration of the propositions, which, al-Dhuwaynī explains clearly. "Reasoning (nazar) does not engender knowledge as a derived effect (lā yuwa'llūd al-ṭīm); it does not necessitate it (lā yuḍūbahu) in the way that the efficient cause (ṣīla) necessitates its effect. "He thus expresses, on the one hand, the opposition of the Ash'arīs to the Mu'tazilī doctrine of tawallul, and on the other hand, their opposition to the doctrine of al-falāṣīfīa which, for according to Aristotle, considers that the minor clause of a syllogism is the cause of its conclusion by the route of essential necessitation. According to the Ash'arīs, it is God who immediately creates knowledge of the conclusion as soon as the premises have been posed. This is an application to logic of the doctrine of occasional causes. Logical laws, like the laws of nature, are for God a custom (ṣāla), a rule of conduct (sunnah) which He freely decides to observe, and the correlation between premises and conclusion is purely ʿādī. Nevertheless, for al-Dhuwaynī this correlation is rational (ʿādī) in the sense that God has created reason and its necessary principles; they cannot be incumbent on Him, since He creates them freely, and it is by the same free act that, having created them, He decides to observe them habitually."

(On this question, cf. Luciani, El-Irshad, ed. and tr. Paris 1938, 14-15, n. 2.) This problem of logical necessity (al-ṭarîfir) is of prime importance to theologians. According to al-Bākiliānī, in his Tadhkîl, a knowledge is necessary in two senses. First, it is a knowledge which is attached to the creature itself "by a connection (laṣūm) of which it cannot rid itself". Doubt is not possible; there is an act of violence done to the one who knows, for, in the language, the word ʿītārār signifies ʾiksh (violence), i.e. ʿāqib (constraint). It is in this sense that there is talk of a necessary knowledge. Subsequently, a knowledge can be said to be necessary when there is a need for it, for, in the language, ʿarāra signifies ṣāla (need). In the first sense, sensible knowledges are necessary, since they are imposed on the five senses. But there is a sixth necessity "which has been originally created in the soul, arrives through one of the senses, such as the knowledge that the soul has of itself, and the knowledge of the principles of necessary intuition, such as that a statement is true or false; two statements positing two contrary objects cannot be simultaneously true or simultaneously false; and this applies in all cases where the intelligence makes a division by which is applied the principle of the excluded third. It is this necessity which renders the conclusion necessary. Here, too, there is recourse to the notion of the ʿādī connection. (On the tripartite division of knowledge, cf. Iṣraḥāl, 25, and n. 1.)"

In his Mukāfīr min al-dalālī, al-Ghazālī writes that questions of logic have no reference to religion, either to refute or to prove it. "They are a rational examination (nazar) of methods of proof and of criticism, of conditions relating to the premises of the demonstrative syllogism (birākān) and the manner of disposing them, of the conditions of correct definition and the manner of organising it." However, misuse of this science leads to the belief that the conditions of demonstrative proof necessarily engender certitude (al-yakin). On the level of religious problems, it is not possible to unite these conditions in an exhaustive manner. If al-Ghazālī thus warns the theologian against the dangers of logic, he does not fail to recognise in the Ḥiyāt al-ʿulūm al-dīn that logic, as "enquiry into the manner and conditions of proof and of definition", enters into the science of kalām. A branch of philosophy, it is placed in the second rank, after mathematics and before metaphysics (al-šāhīdīyyāt) and the philosophy of nature (al-kiyād al-ṣawāīqīyyāt). But al-Khatīb al-Mustakīm, al-Ghazālī has shown that there are syllogistic demonstrations in the Qur'ān, which he is set to form in.

4. The logic of the faṣāṣifa.

(a) Preliminary comment. The logic of Aristotle depends on judgments of attribution which express the inherent predicate in the subject (some statements regarding the term of a proposition). A simple principle of logical attributes, or its simple presence in the subject, when the predicate is accidental. The link between the predicate and the subject is marked by the copula "is" (ʾaṣma). But the Arabic language disregards the copula. The verb kāna indicates a state at which the subject has arrived, a manner of being; this is why it is followed by the direct case (wasṣ) such as a biṭ. Grammarians recognise only the relation of the mubṭadaʾ (inchoative) and of the ʾıkhabar (enunciative). In his commentary on the Muṭāṣsāl al-Zamakhshārī, Ibn Yaʿṣīḥ [cf. 25, n. 25] explains that the mubṭadaʾ is definite in order to show that it is known to the two interlocutors who are in accord in discussing it, while the ʾıkhabar is indefinite in order to show that one of the two is ignorant of that which the other intends to tell him regarding the mubṭadaʾ. It is thus not a case of a discussion expressing the relation of a predicate to a subject, but of an informative discourse (ʾıkhabar) of one who addresses a second person regarding something which is the object of the information (al-mukāfīr). This concept is close to that of the Stoics in regard to the λέξεις, that which can be said of a thing. Their dialectic concerns true or false statements relating to things; these statements or judgments (ʾikhāṣiyyat) comprise a subject (substantive or pronoun) and an attribute expressed by a verb. They never express the relation of two concepts. Although the ʾıkhabar can be something other than a verb (even an entire proposition, e.g. Zayd, his father has come) there is evident kinship between the notions of the Stoics and those of the Arab grammarians. There is even a relic of this where Muslim thinkers, especially Ibn Yaʿṣīḥ (see below) adopt formulae of the Aristotelian type. It may further be noted that for Ibn Yaʿṣīḥ, the true agent of a proposition is not the grammatical subject, but the one who enunciates
it: before every statement, there is an understood "I say that". Now the verb kdla (say) is constructed with kdla, although its copulative huwa is normally introducing the consecutive of kdla, testify to the reality of this understood preface.

This being so, the falsa, the under the influence of Aristotle, were obliged to find an equivalent of the copula. The particle adopted for this purpose was huwa (he; Zayd, he [is] wise), although its copulative usage is incorrect. As is shown by N. Taha (Langage et philosophie, Rabat 1979, 25), "in its ordinary usage, the pronoun huwa serves to establish a relating of idenity between the subject and the noun (or rather the nominal description) attributed to it, for example, Ibn Khaldun huwa mu'allif al-Mukaddima (Ibn Khaldun is the author of the Prolegomena)". But it is also admitted, for example by al-Farabi in his commentary on De Interpretatione (Shakir K. al-'Ibadi, Beirut, 103) that the copula is "potentially" contained in the statement, since the verb to be is "either expressed in a word, or contained in the idea" (ibid., 46).

(b) The commentaries. The work of the falsa, rest on translations and commentaries on a major, medium and minor scale, of the books of the Organon. In the article Maniik in EF, Van den Bergh wrote, "The Arab philosophers did not develop this logic, but they have summarised, reproduced and commented on it, often with felicity". But this judgment assumes a positive contribution on their part. It should first be stated, with N. Rescher, that the first generations of Arab writers on logic, including al-Kindi, Abū Zakariyya, al-Rāzī and al-Farabi, were in a true sense "the products of Syriac schools". "The Arab logicians, in this tradition of the Greeks of the Hellenistic period, and the Muslim Aristotelians, like al-Farabi and Averroes, are the last link in a chain of which the first members are the masters of the Greek language, such as Alexander of Aphrodisias, Porphyry, Themistius, Ammonius and Joannes Philoponus" (Al-Farabi's Short Commentary on Aristotle's Prior Analytics, Pittsburgh 1963, Introd., 23). Nor should the influence of Galen, and through him of Stoic ideas, be forgotten. Thus in his Short Commentary on the Prior Analytics, al-Farabi introduces the conditional syllogism which Aristotle does not discuss, although he has promised to do so (Pr. Anal. 50a 40 - B 1). On the other hand, the theory of propositions-and modal syllogisms to which Aristotle devotes more than a half of his treatise, is entirely ignored (cf. Rescher, ibid., 38). It is true that al-Farabi has dealt with this in his Major Commentary. In his disdain for modal syllogisms, Rescher sees the influence of the Syriac theologian-logicians. It may be noted that Galen, in his Institutiones Logicae, does not speak of them either. One original step taken by al-Farabi in this short commentary is the use of ecthesis (Ex tôn w: iōtir, apax, which D. M. Dunlop suggests should be amended to iōtir, or iōtir) in the reduction to the first figure of syllogisms of the second of the Baroco system and the third of the Bocardo. The following is an example of the Baroco system (with the major moved to the head):

Every mobile (M) is corporeal (C) Major A
Some existent (X) is not corporeal (C) Minor O
Some existent (X) is not mobile (M) Conclusion O.
If some C is not O, it may be said that a part of the Xs is not C. Let this part be called P. We then have:

No P is C Minor E
No P is M Conclusion E.
But "no P is C" is converted into "no C is P", and by inverting the premises the result is a definitive reduction from Camestres to Celarent of the first figure, with the second concluding:

No C is P Major E.
All M is C Minor A.
No P is M Conclusion E.
It is thus proved by this reduction to the first figure that no P is M. It is converted that P is some X. Therefore, it is true that some X is not M. Rescher also draws attention to the originality of the chapter on analogy or transfer, in relation to what Aristotle says (Pr. Anal. ii, 25, 69 a 20 f.) on this reasoning which he calls ἀπόκρυψις. Of the latter, the following is typical: there is an evident major and a minor which is uncertain, but more probable or at least no less probable than the conclusion which is to be demonstrated. For example: Every science can be taught; justice is a science, therefore justice can be taught (syllogism of the first figure in the Barbara system). But al-Farabi's analysis is different. He revives the distinction between ἁπλός and ἄριθμος (cf. above). Rescher analyses this reasoning as follows: when A and B are two similars relative to S, and when A and B are both known, it may be concluded that T is present in B. Thus experience seems to teach us that bodies, such as animals and plants, are created. This character of being created is transferred from these bodies to the celestial bodies. But al-Farabi adds, the resemblance must be "relative to that which characterises animals as created," in other words, "a similarity between animals and the heavens on a point which gives, true to the judgment that the character of being created belongs to all these beings", for example the fact that they are all contingent. This requirement recalls a passage in the Topics concerning resemblance (i, 17, 108a 14-17): "it is in the measure that they possess an identical attribute that things are similar." Therefore the bodies of animals and plants are created because they have this character of being contingent. The result is a first figure syllogism of the Barbara type:

All contingent bodies are created.
The celestial bodies are contingent bodies.
Therefore the celestial bodies are created.
Al-Farabi is not the only one to achieve originality in his commentaries. Ch. E. Butterworth has also drawn attention to the originality of Ibn Rushd, although the latter is reputed to have followed Aristotle to the letter. He had "the onerous task of introducing the thought of a pagan philosopher to a somewhat closed Muslim community..." And, since he conceives that "teaching by means of demonstration is the apogee of what Aristotle has said on the art of logic, he sees no objection to presenting everything which precedes the exposition of this teaching as preliminaries based on general opinion, provided that this tactic induces his readers to revise their attitude towards the philosophy...of Aristotle" (La valeur philosophique des commentaires d'Averroès sur Aristote, in Multiple Averroès. Paris 1978, 117-26). Also worth consulting is the same author's very interesting introduction to the edition of the Middle Commentary on the Topics (Averroès' Middle Commentary on Aristotle's Topics, Cairo 1979).

(c) The original treatises. It is with Ibn Sinā that logic is genuinely detached from commentary to become an integral part of the great treatises. The Shīfā, the K. al-Nadibāt and the Ighārāt all begin with a section devoted to logic. In the Shīfā, moreover, Ibn Sinā
follows the order of the treatises of the Organon while making them precede the Isagoge (al-Madhkhāl), then moving on from the Categories as far as the Poetics. Ibrahim Madkour has well demonstrated that this treatise is not a commentary in the manner of those of Ibn Rūghī; it presents an original development with ‘personal hypotheses and analyses of great breadth’ (Le Shīrāzī, ed. Cairo, General Introd. 16-17). The connections between the Shīrāzī and the Naqāṣī are close. Both respond to the same principal idea: ‘to combine together logic, physics and metaphysics’ (bid., 19). The Isābāt, which are subsequent to them, further display ‘the originality and the personality of Avicenna. This is why the work is associated with the ‘Oriental Philosophy’’ (bid., 22). There has been much discussion of this philosophy, which Ibn Sīnā himself evokes at the beginning of the Madkhol. That which remains of the Manṭik al-Madhkhiliyyīn (the Logic of the Orientals) offers no new ideas in relation to the other works. Ibn Sīnā shows himself here closely attached to Aristotle. But he himself indicates the sense in which this philosophy is different. ‘We have revealed in this book the philosophy conforming to that which is in the nature of the spirit (fi ‘l-‘abṣīb) and to that which expresses the correct point of view (al-‘arṣ bi al-‘ashbī) without concessions to those who are associated in this discipline. There is no hesitation in diverging from their positions, as the formation is not the same in other books’ (Madkhol, 10). In fact, he specifies that the Shīrāzī is more in agreement with the Peripatetics (al-Madhkhīliyyīn). It could thus be considered, as a result of the works of S. Pīnēs on the K. al-Insāfī, that the Orientals are the thinkers of Khūrāsān who are represented by Ibn Sīnā and that the Occidentals are the Peripatetics of Baghdādī; it is the latter that Ibn Sīnā opposes and it is their interpretation of Aristotle that he criticises, on account of the fact that it is marked by the influence of ‘those Christian simpletons of Baghdādī’. It is certainly a fact that these Christians, Nestorians in the main, has pursued their studies of logic ‘in close association with their theological studies, since Greek philosophy provided a rational conceptual analysis, in which the theology of these churches forms an articulation’ (The development of Arabic logic, Pittsburgh 1986, 14). Nevertheless, in the Shīrāzī, there is already a debate conducted with various logicians. Nābil Shehāb (The propositional logic of Avicenna, Dordrecht 1973) has sought to discover whether these are Ancient Greeks, contemporary Muslims or Christian Arabs. The author refers to Aristotle, to the Stoics (Chrysippus), to Galien, and he uses information supplied by Diogenes Laertius, Sextus Empiricus, etc. In the postercity of Avicenna, Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī [q.v.] and Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Ṭūsī, who both commented on the Isābāt, differ on their interpretation. Al-Rāzī wrote numerous critiques of Avicenna, while acknowledging the scale of his debt to him. Rescher writes with reference to him: ‘In principle, Fakhr al-Dīn was not only a critic, but also an interpreter and a continuer of the work of Avicenna. He may, nevertheless, be considered the founder of an important western school of Persian logicians ... since it constitutes a focus of opposition to the tradition of Avicenna’ (Development, 184). On the other hand, al-Ṭūsī (597-672/1201-74) criticised the writings of the ‘westerners’, specifically those of al-Rāzī (bid., 197). In Spain, the influence of al-Fārābī was dominant, and there are seen perpetuated there the concepts of al-Rāzī’s Baghdadī, which was introduced by Muhammad b. ʿAbdūn (4th/10th century). Worthy of mention among the logicians of this country are Abu ʿI-Salṭ [q.v.] and Ibn ʿU ṭūlūs [q.v.]. Many of these logicians had maintained an ancient tradition dating back to the Syrians, that of associating the study of logic with that of medicine.

Among the successors of Ibn Sīnā, mention should also be made of Abu ʿI-Barakāt al-Baghḍādī [q.v.] who constructed his K. al-Muṭabar on the tripartite division of logic, physics, metaphysics. He sometimes follows Ibn Sīnā and sometimes attacks him. His method is based on immediate, evident a priori forms of knowledge, which, as S. Pīnēs writes, ‘disparage the a posteriori theses’ accepted by the Peripatetics. This arrangement of treatises poses the problem of deciding whether logic forms an integral part of philosophy (the Stoics), or is only a methodological introduction to it (the Peripatetics). Many Arab logicians support the latter point of view. Ibn Sīnā and the Muslim Neoplatonists reconcile these two concepts: logic is a part of philosophy to which it constitutes an introduction.

There is room here only to draw attention to the interest in the study of logic on the part of scholars of the Arabo-Muslim world in the Middle Ages. Thus it is known that the great mathematician, astronomer, [optical] physicist and physician, Ibn al-Haytham (d. 430/1039 [q.v.]) wrote on the ‘seven books’. Al-Bīrūnī, a contemporary of Avicenna, considered that this is the foundation of the perception of man, the language characterised by the bi-univocity of signifiers and signified. Nevertheless, he mentions in the introduction to his Pharmacoepia, the interesting quality of the Isagoge and the four treatises, from the Categories to the Secondary Analytics. It may be wondered what use would have been made of it in cases where the mathematical language does not apply. In these matters, much research remains to be done. (4) The logic of the Ikhwan al-Safā. It is from the 10th to the 14th Epistle that questions of logic are dealt with, after mathematics (arithmetic and geometry), astronomy, geography and music. The Ikhwān speak of the Isagoge and the first four books of the Organon. Men, being tied to a body, require for its comprehension an elocution formed of articulated words (nūk lafāz); thus, in order to answer questions, they also possess an elocution formed of thought (nūk fiṣḥī). There are thus two logical sciences to be distinguished: (1) ʿilm al-manṭiq al-lubāwī and (2) ʿilm al-manṭiq al-faṣāḥī. It is necessary to start with the first in order to make the second comprehensible; this is the object of the Isagoge, the Madkhol. Then the logic of thought (al-manṭiq al-fiṣḥī) is approached. ‘Termus (al-fatāz) are only the signs which designate ideas, which are in the thought of souls: they have been instituted between men, so that each may express to other men what he has in his soul’. These ideas are forms which are given to the individual soul by the Creator, through a series of intermediary emanations: from God to the Agent Intellect, then to the universal Soul, then to the primary Matter, then to the human soul. ‘They are that by which men expresses themselves in their thought relative to knowable things, having seen material testimony to them by means of the senses.’ Logical philosophy is thus fundamentally linked to a cosmology in which man is a microcosm (sīlam sāḥīr) and the world a makros anthropos (insān kahir). But he requires verbal logic (manṭiq lafāz) in order to convey knowledge to others and to question them. This logic is thus not an art of discovery, but an art of revealing and of answering questions. Its object is to inform and to ‘popularise’ (Rescher).

Lexicographers recognise several senses for the word ‘genre’. For the philosophers, there is only
one: that which is applied to the ten terms studied in the categories (al-^ashrat al-alfdz ... case is presented on which there is no particular text, if it resembles a case dealt with by a text, it falls under the

which they call (mukawwina), the other kinds, the one constitutive to nine genres corresponding to the nine unities. Thus perfective

constitute what do not yet exist, but have only the potential of being or not being” (De Int., 7, 17, a 36-17 b 3); they speak of enunciations of which the truth or falsehood is determined by a root (hdsa), hence the existence of inconclusive modes. The Ikhwan add ironically, “unless one wishes to call existence inadequate. In word, logic is in relation with the thought of men enclosed in a multiple world, with their awarenesses which bear on the multiplicity of finite and defined beings. But it is useful, as are the sciences which follow its rules, to show the inadequacy of this type of knowledge and the need to pass beyond it to acquire the awareness of the Absolute One which is sought by the mustarshid under the guidance of his master.

5. Logic in the judicial sciences.

One developed very early in Islam a science of the principles of law ("ilm usul al-fihkh) of which it could be said that its function in the law was the same as that of logic in philosophy and the sciences. There is thus already a doctrine of reasoning among the usuliyyun. From the Kur'anic verse IV, 83, there has been drawn the notion of istihsan, elucidation of the divine word, closely related to islah with the sense of deduction. The commandment in LIX, 2, fa-"abru ya a/* li l-ahdah” (“Draw the lesson from this, you who are of clear vision”) is also interpreted in the sense of an obligation to reflect by means of analogy. There has thus been from the start the practice of informal modes of reasoning which constitute what is called in a general fashion iddhah (personal effort). The great problem was to apply the revealed Law, often “approximately” ("ala l-ta^mil), to detailed questions and to particular cases. First to be used were the hadiths of the Prophet which gave clear guidance in detail ("ala l-tafsirl). But when this was insufficient, there was recourse to analogy.

It is with the İmâm al-Shâfi'î that analogy (kiyâs) was properly constituted as a form of reasoning more rigorous than the simple comparison of similar cases (tandhîf). Al-Shâfi'î proceeds from the notion that every single event or process has a cause ("illa), which is more general than the order itself. When a case is presented on which there is no particular text, if it resembles a case dealt with by a text, it falls under the
name judgment on account of this same cause. In his Risala, al-Shafi‘i employs the word ma‘nd in the sense of cause or reason; the kiyya which is not based on a simple resemblance is that which rests on the fact that ‘God or his Messenger have in a text (manaseq) or forbidden or permitted something li-ma‘nd (for a reason). Consequently, when we find some thing similar to this ma‘nd in a case in which it is itself the object of no text of the Book or of the Sunna, we permit it or forbid it, because it is in the ma‘nd of the permitted or forbidden’ (Risala, ed. A. M. Shāhir, Cairo 1357/1938, 40). In order to extend the application of the Law, there are distinctions drawn between reasonings in a minor ad majus (kiyya al-aqdlān), a majori ad minus (kiyya al-aqālīl), a pari or a simili (kiyya al-musawāt or al-mithl) and a contrario (dāllal al-khiṣāb). But these first elaborations of a judicial logic are contemporaneous with the translation of Greek philosophy. Also no doubt perceptible, in this distinction of arguments, is the influence of the Topica, ii, 10 and iii, 6, for example, ‘An argument may be drawn from more or from less or from the same degree (119 b 16)’. The influence of the methodology of Roman law is indisputable, and comparisons could also be drawn with the methods of Rabbinic law.

It is with al-Ghazālī, in his introduction to the Mustaṣfī, that Greek logic is genuinely introduced into judicial speculations. For him there is no logic that Greek logic is genuinely introduced into mustasfī, or consensus which is opposed to it, or on analogical reasoning has more force than another. But this point is controversial.

Thus the modality of necessity corresponds to that of the impossible to that of the forbidden. Consequently, when we find some thing similar to this this is a case in which it is itself the object of no text of the Book or of the Sunna, we permit it or forbid it, because it is in the ma‘nd of the permitted or forbidden, it is prescribed, forbidden, advisable, inadmissible. The conclusion must demonstrate under which circumstances the methods of Rabbinic law. It is with al-Ghazālī, in his introduction to the Mustaṣfī, that Greek logic is genuinely introduced into judicial speculations. For him there is no logic.


MĀNU (and also Kasr Mānu or Tin Mānu), ancient locality situated on the Mediterranean coast, in the western part of the plain of Ḫiṣān, between Kābis (Gabès) and Aṭrābulus (Tripoli), and on the old route leading from Itīkīya to Egypt. In our opinion it should be identified with Ḫaṣā Ḫaṣā (Ad) Ammūn of the Ancients, a place situated about 30 km. west of the town of Sabratha, Sabra of the old Arabic sources. It was here that there took place, in 283/896-97, a great battle between the army of the Aghlabid amirs and of the great Iḥāds Berber tribe of Nūfās (q.v.). The latter people who lived in the Dājal Nūfās to the south-west of Tripoli (it was already called Naussi or Corippus towards the middle of the 6th century A.D.), were already dominating the western part of the Ḫiṣān before the Arab conquest, having their main centre in the town of Sabratha. The Nūfās, being Christians in this period, made their influence felt as far as Tripoli, whose inhabitants appealed for their help, in the year 22/642-3, against the Arab general ‘Amr b. al-‘Ās. Later on, after the Arab conquest of Tripolitania, the Nūfās, who became orthodox Iḥāds Muslims and transferred their political centre to the Dājal Nūfās, continued to extend their domination over the plain of the Western Ḫiṣān, thus assuring themselves of control of the communication routes running along the coast between Itīkīya and Egypt. In 267/879-80 Abū Mansūr Ilyās, chief of the Nūfās and at the same time governor of this tribe nominated by the Rustamid imāms of Tāhāt, was called upon for help, as the true master of the hinterland of Tripoli, by the inhabitants of this town, which was besieged by the Tūlānīd ʻAbbās b. Ahmad b. Tulān in (q.v. in Suppl.). Sixteen years later, in 283/896-97, the Nūfās barred near Manū the


(R. Arnaldes)
passage of the Aghlabid amir Ibrahim b. Ahmad who was leading an expedition against Egypt. In the bloody battle between the two armies, the troops of Nafusa were annihilated, and the power of his people broken. From this time onwards, they were to withdraw into the mountains of the Djabla Nafusa. 


**MANÜCHIRI, ABU ’L-NADJM AHMAD B. KAWS B. AHMAD, Dângâghânî, was the third and last (after ʻUnsûrî and Farrâkhi) of the major panegyrist of the early Ghaznavid court.**

Very little is known of his life, and that little is derived exclusively from his poetry. Later tâdhkîrs writers have expanded and distorted this modicum of information with a few, readily refuted speculations. What can be ascertained with reasonable certainty is that he spent his youth, presumably in Dângâghân, acquiring an encyclopaedic knowledge of Persian and Arabic poetry and otherwise honing his poetic skills in preparation for a career as a court panegyrist. Nineteenth-century scholars speculated that Manûchîr’s first patron was the Ziyârid prince Falak al-Mâ (Ibn Khurradadhbih, 82; Ibn al-Fakhîr, 74; al-Ýâ’îbî, 337), but seems to have disappeared already in the Fâtimid period (cf. al-Kâlkhânî, _Subh_, iii, 384). It was replaced by Maḥâllat Manûf which, since the administrative reformation of the caliph al-Mustanjîr and the latter’s vizier Bâdral-Dâmalî, has belonged to al-Ghârîbiyya province (Ibn Mâmâmî, _Kawdnî_, ed. ‘Atîyya, 183). In Mâquilî times, the tax-farm lands of the town were given as ʻîdâqîs to Mâlkûs al-sultan and to officers of the guard (Ibn Dukmâk, _Intisâr_, ed. Voellers, v, 97), but later revoked in favour of the diwan al-μâfsâd (Ibn al-Dîfân, Tâlùh, ed. H. Elmorita, 91; Hâlm, _Agâhiyyat al-mumkinân_: Lehensregister, Wiesbaden 1982, ii, 523 and map 34).

2. Manûf al-Ulûyâ, the modern Manûf/Mûnûf, in Byzantine times a bishopric in Copmt Panuf Khiît, in Greek Ὀμώφως ἡ κάστον. After the Arab conquest, the town became the centre of a _kûra_ (q.v.) (Ibn Khurradadhbih, 82; Ibn al-Fakhîr, 74; al-Ýâ’îbî, 337), but to seem has disappeared already in the Fâtimid period (cf. al-Kâlkhânî, _Subh_, iii, 384). It was replaced by Maḥâllat Manûf which, since the administrative reform of the caliph al-Mustanjîr and the latter’s vizier Bâdral-Dâmalî, has belonged to al-Ghârîbiyya province (Ibn Mâmâmî, _Kawdnî_, ed. ‘Atîyya, 183). In Mâquilî times, the tax-farm lands of the town were given as ʻîdâqîs to Mâlkûs al-sultan and to officers of the guard (Ibn Dukmâk, _Intisâr_, ed. Voellers, v, 97), but later revoked in favour of the diwan al-μâfsâd (Ibn al-Dîfân, Tâlùh, ed. H. Elmorita, 91; Hâlm, _Agâhiyyat al-mumkinân_: Lehensregister, Wiesbaden 1982, ii, 523 and map 34).

**MANÜF, name of two towns in the Nile delta.**

1. Mañûf al-Sûlî, near the present Maḥâllat Manûf in the markaz of Qâdîn, in Byzantine times a bishopric in Copmt Panuf Khiît, in Greek Ὀμώφως ἡ κάστον. After the Arab conquest, the town became the centre of a _kûra_ (q.v.) (Ibn Khurradadhbih, 82; Ibn al-Fakhîr, 74; al-Ýâ’îbî, 337), but to seem has disappeared already in the Fâtimid period (cf. al-Kâlkhânî, _Subh_, iii, 384). It was replaced by Maḥâllat Manûf which, since the administrative reform of the caliph al-Mustanjîr and the latter’s vizier Bâdral-Dâmalî, has belonged to al-Ghârîbiyya province (Ibn Mâmâmî, _Kawdnî_, ed. ‘Atîyya, 183). In Mâquilî times, the tax-farm lands of the town were given as ʻîdâqîs to Mâlkûs al-sultan and to officers of the guard (Ibn Dukmâk, _Intisâr_, ed. Voellers, v, 97), but later revoked in favour of the diwan al-μâfsâd (Ibn al-Dîfân, Tâlùh, ed. H. Elmorita, 91; Hâlm, _Agâhiyyat al-mumkinân_: Lehensregister, Wiesbaden 1982, ii, 523 and map 34).

2. Mañûf al-Ulûyâ, the modern Manûf/Mûnûf, in Byzantine times a bishopric, in Copmt Panuf Rîs, in Greek Ὀμώφως ἡ κάστον. After the Arab conquest, the town became the centre of a _kûra_ (Ibn Khurradadhbih, 82; Ibn al-Fakhîr, 74). According to Ibn Hawkal (Bâqî, ii, 128) there was a tax official (ʻâmîl) and a _kâdi_ in the town in early Fâtimid times. At the administrative reform of the caliph al-Mustanjîr and Bâdral-Dâmalî, the _kûras_ were united into greater provinces (aʾmâlî, sing. ʻâmâl). The southern point of the Delta then became the aʾmâl al-Manûfiyya, with the town of Manûf as the residence of the _wâlî_ (Ibn Mâmâmî, 188; Yâkût, _Mâqâmât_, i, d). During the Mârilî period, the municipal lands of the town were divided into several _kâdîs_ (Ibn al-Dîfân, 100; Hâlm, _Lebensregister_, ii, 372 and map 23). Al-Kâlkhânî gives the name “Munûf”, and mentions the ruins of the older town to the west of the new settlement (_Subh_, iii, 405; cf. iv, 66). Under the jurisdiction of the _wâlî_ of al-Manûfiyya, there came also the small province of Ibîyâr (Dâjqâzîr Bânî Nasr), neighbouring on the north-west. In 1826, under Muḥammad ʻAli Pasha, the town was replaced by the larger ʻÎshîb al-Kûm as chief place of the mîhârîyyat al-Manûfiyya. At present, Manûf is the centre of the markaz of the same name.

_Bibliography:_ ‘Ali Pasha Mubarak, _al-Khitat
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(H. HAML)

AL-MAŅŪFI, a nisba referring to the Egyptian town of Manūf [q.v.]. The vocalisation of the name of the town and the nisba varies. In the older texts (cf. Mubarak, Khiat, xvi, 47) the name is vocalised as Manuf. The recent official vocalisation is Minuf; cf. Wizarat al-Maliyya (Maslahat al-Misaha), 107 ff., 190, 222 ff., Maspero-Wiet, Matmats, Cairo 1909, 202 ff.

AL-MAŅŪFI, a nisba referring to the Egyptian town of Manūf [q.v.]. The vocalisation of the name of the town and the nisba varies. In the older texts (cf. Mubarak, Khiat, xvi, 47) the name is vocalised as Manuf. The recent official vocalisation is Minuf; cf. Wizarat al-Maliyya (Maslahat al-Misaha), 107 ff., 190, 222 ff., Maspero-Wiet, Matmats, Cairo 1909, 202 ff.

AL-MAŅŪFI, a nisba referring to the Egyptian town of Manūf [q.v.]. The vocalisation of the name of the town and the nisba varies. In the older texts (cf. Mubarak, Khiat, xvi, 47) the name is vocalised as Manuf. The recent official vocalisation is Minuf; cf. Wizarat al-Maliyya (Maslahat al-Misaha), 107 ff., 190, 222 ff., Maspero-Wiet, Matmats, Cairo 1909, 202 ff.

AL-MAŅŪFI, a nisba referring to the Egyptian town of Manūf [q.v.]. The vocalisation of the name of the town and the nisba varies. In the older texts (cf. Mubarak, Khiat, xvi, 47) the name is vocalised as Manuf. The recent official vocalisation is Minuf; cf. Wizarat al-Maliyya (Maslahat al-Misaha), 107 ff., 190, 222 ff., Maspero-Wiet, Matmats, Cairo 1909, 202 ff.
where the tent [see KHAYMA] are erected, and in general, this term is a synonym for the encampment of nomadic Arabs and then for the halting place of caravans.

In the geographical works and travel accounts of Arabic authors from the mediaeval period, this term is used for the site or encampment of caravans on the fringes of some settlement or equally, at the side of a khan [q. v.] along the highway which might be fortified to a greater or lesser degree according to the needs for security. At the opening of the 7th/13th century, the Ayyûbid al-Malik al-Mu‘azzam established a lodging-place (makâm) at each manzil on the Pilgrimage Road (darb al-hadjj [q. v.], according to Ahmad b. Tülin in his Ka‘la‘id. Ibn Batutta mentions a funduk [q.v.] at each stop (manzil) along the Cairo-Damascus road; these must be the foundations of Nâṣîr al-Dîn, Tankiz’s daawâr. According to Sauvaget, there was, during the Mamlûk period, a lodging-place (manzila) at each posting-stage (manzil) of the barid [q. v.] network. It could also happen that a manzil could be the origin of a village, as at Khân Shâykhûn in central Syria.

Manzil is thus the equivalent of a dâr al-manzila: a house where one halts, whence a place where one offers hospitality, a ‘hospice’, for travellers. Along the routes through Arabia used by the pilgrims, the manzil was often a pious foundation, with a wakf’, this is probably why Niebuhr mentions the “free hostelries” in his Travels in Syria, and why Burckhardt says, in his Travels in Syria and the Holy Land, in the second, similar hospitality was definitely used by travellers; the owners who offered this hospitality did great credit to the Turks’ sense of hospitality.

At the present time, manzil denotes a lodging, a house and even an appartment. It is sometimes accompanied by a term which pinpoints its function more exactly, e.g. manzil al-tâlîbih “home for female students”, the title of a work by Fawziyya Mâhrân which appeared in Cairo in 1961.

The term manzil forms part of certain place names. We find mention of the main halting-places considered to be manzârî in such authors as Ibn Khûrrâd-dîbîb (272/885), al-Yâ‘kûbî (287/900), Ibn Hawkal (366/971) and al-Mukaddasî (390/1000), or later, the Andalusian ones al-Bakîrî (487/1094) and al-Idrîsî (ca. 1154), who give us the itineraries of the main commercial routes of the Dâr al-‘Islâm and the Pilgrimage ones. Thus along the darb al-hadjjî of Egypt, between Fustâṭ and Mecca, one finds the Manzil Ibn Bundûkû (BGA, vii, 111, 149, 190, vii, 183), which al-Mukaddasî (215, 249) and al-Idrîsî (Opus geographicum, 345) call Manzil Ibn âd-dâsh, between Buwayh and A‘dîrûd; at the next stage, there was a manzil at Râbî‘l-Hûdâ, but with merely a well and no provision for travellers. Going westwards from Egypt, Ibn Khûrrâd-dîbîb (223) mentions in Cyrenaica, on the track connecting Barka with Sulûk, in the Wâdî ‘l-‘Arab, the Manzil Shâshik al-Fahmi, which de Goeje translated as “territoire”. Amongst the best-known manzâlî of mediaeval Êfrikiya should be mentioned Manzil Bashâhî [q. v.]; the Manzil of Kâbîs [q. v.] (Brunswick, Hafzûdû, i, 313), which in the 7th/13th century was outside the walls and which Victor Guérin visited in the mid-19th century in the course of his travels through the Regency of Tunis; and on the coast, at the end of the 7th/13th century, to the north of Sousse, Manzil Alî Naṣr and Manzil Tâmûn, a fishing port with a fertile hinterland [see ya‘rib ‘al-dâkhil]. The dependencies of al-Mahdiyya [q. v.] included Manzil Khâyâr, Tâbi‘ûn and Manzil Ma‘rûf (Brunswick, Hafzûdû, i, 309). In Sicily, there existed a Manzil Amîr which al-Harawi (55/125) calls Kârṣ al-Amîr (the present Mislîmi), a famed pilgrimage place, where, according to some, was the tomb of Gâlen (Ka‘b Dâlînî) and according to others, that of Aristotile. Numerous place names in al-Andalus recorded by al-Idrîsî as being in the 4th clime are followed by a preposition a, e.g. Manzil Abû-‘l-Hûdâ but, with merely a well and no provision for travellers.

At the end of the Mamlûk period, at certain stages there were fortified caravanserais, with kitchens and fortiﬁers attached, which could accommodate military detachments. In the Ottoman period, Mustafâ Pagha, governor of Damascus, built in 971/1564-3 to the north of the citadel, in the Taht al-Kal‘a quarter, a khan and also independent lodging-places in its vicinity; the manzil in this way became an inn meant for travellers without either mounts or merchandise. Al-Khîyârî (d. 1083/1672), who in 1080/1669 travelled from Medina to Istanbul, states that there were, in Êfrikiya, on the road from Ta’izz to Mecca, two manzil, at al-Dârîyûn and in the Dâlwân, a manzil where one could stay in tents in summer but live in a khan during the winter. In 1081/1671, the stage of Mâdînîn Sâhîl [see al-Hûstî], one of the centres where the pilgrims assembled on the Pilgrimage Road to the south of Tabûk [q. v.], suffered a serious attack by the Bedouns. The frequency of such attacks against this manzil led Asad Pagha to construct, in the middle of the 12th/18th century, a fort in order to protect the religious caravans. At the end of the Ottoman period, there were, according to Tibawi, two types of hostelry: the madîfa, which was communal, and the manzil, which was private. In the first, lodging and food were offered free to travellers; in the second, similar hospitality was given in private houses situated along the roads constantly used by travellers; the owners who offered this hospitality had to pay reduced taxes.

At the present time, manzil denotes a lodging, a house and even an appartment. It is sometimes accompanied by a term which pinpoints its function more exactly, e.g. manzil al-tâlîbih “home for female students”, the title of a work by Fawziyya Mâhrân which appeared in Cairo in 1961.

2. In the eastern Islamic lands.

In Iran and, especially, in Hindustan, it came to designate a camp, characteristically the royal camp, with corresponding verbs like nāzil kārdan and manzil giriftan meaning "to encamp." This usage is distinct from the sense of udār [q.v.], properly "the royal precinct in camp" from Mongolian ordo, and of yūr [q. v.] meaning "camp site, territory" as in Turkish, from the time of Djiwaynī onwards. The camp centre had already been organized as a drudūntūm through the arrangement of the emperor's screened precinct differentiated into an outer and an inner area, as a mobile extension of the palace. The concept appears to have been inherited by the Mongols, but with the orientation shifted from east to south. The sides were defined by lines of carts and tents, the royal guard was quartered to the rear, forming the battle guard, yeke kol, and in front stood the wing comprising the royal enclosure with the three rings of the khan's camp that they were known as the "travelling royal camp, with corresponding verbs like nāzil kārdan and manzil giriftan meaning "to encamp." This usage is distinct from the sense of udār [q.v.], properly "the royal precinct in camp" from Mongolian ordo, and of yūr [q.v.] meaning "camp site, territory" as in Turkish, from the time of Djiwaynī onwards. The camp centre had already been organized as a drudūntūm through the arrangement of the emperor's screened precinct differentiated into an outer and an inner area, as a mobile extension of the palace. The concept appears to have been inherited by the Mongols, but with the orientation shifted from east to south. The sides were defined by lines of carts and tents, the royal guard was quartered to the rear, forming the battle guard, yeke kol, and in front stood the wing comprising the royal enclosure with the three rings of the khan's camp that they were known as the "travelling royal camp, with corresponding verbs like nāzil kārdan and manzil giriftan meaning "to encamp."
change was from the cart tents which had been characteristic of the Golden Horde and were still used everywhere, they have been supplanted by trellis tents. The protective circular camping formation is already defined by Rashid al-Din (Mongol geographum, 293, 302) calls moreover Djazlrat Shank which al-Idrīsi Hawkal (tr. Kramers-Wiet, 69-70) further says: "...


MANZIL BASHSHU, a place in Ifrīqiya whose site has been identified as the place called Djiadida.

Under the Aghlabids [q.v.] it was the chief town of the administrative district of the peninsula of Cape Bon or Djazlrat Shank which was probably composed by Abu Hamfa's pupil Ibn Hanbal. It is possible that this third stand-

The idea of a manzila bayn al-manzilatayn is prepared in a saying attributed to the Basran ascetic Yazd al-Rakashi (d.

The region remained abandoned from the end of the 6th/12th century to the opening of the 11th/17th one.


AL-MANZILA BAYN AL-MANZILATAYN, a theological term used by Wāsīl b. "Atā' [q.v.] and the later Mu'tazila [q.v.] for designating the salvational status of the mortal sinner (fāṣik [q.v.]). The word manzila alone is attested, in the technical sense of "salvational status", in Hadīth (cf. Muntakb al-Hindi, Kanz al-ilmīyy, Makdīdīt al-Islāmiyy, ed. K. al-

Alim wa 'l-mutallim c for designating the theological term used by Wāsīl b. "Ata': "Where do you locate someone: "Where do you locate [aya tunzila] the unbelievers in the Hereafter?" and gets the answer: "In Hell"; Abu Hanīfa, Risāla tār Uṣūlm al-Butti, ed. Kawgāri, Cairo 1368/1949, 38 n.)...

The felt tent in Middle Asia, urn-0.17. (Musnad, iv, 438, preserved by Ibn Hanbal)

A century later, al-Bakr mentions at Bashshu a menzaila which we possess agree that, in reality, he did not...


MANZIL RASHSHU, a place in Ibrīkiya whose site has been identified as the place called Djiadida.

Under the Aghlabids [q.v.] it was the chief town of the administrative district of the peninsula of Cape Bon or Dżaszr Sharīk [q.v.], which al-Idrisi (Opus geographicum, 293, 302) calls moreover Dżaszrz Bashaçu. In the 4th/10th century, it was an "extensive and fertile region", concerning which Ibn Hawkal (tr. Kramers-Wiet, 69-70) further says: "...

The tax yield and the population are both numerous. A small province is attached to it; there are various kinds of harvests there, and the merchants come there to get supplies. At more than one spot, there are polluted waters, whose impurity is obvious; hence all outsiders entering the town fall ill, with the exception of Blacks, who retain their good health. These Blacks can be used in all conditions and perform their tasks with good humour. All sorts of fruit are to be found there. Each month, Bashshu has a market which is held on a fixed day".

A century later, al-Bakr mentions at Bashshu a menzaila which we possess agree that, in reality, he did not...


MANZIL RASHSHU, a place in Ibrīkiya whose site has been identified as the place called Djiadida.

Under the Aghlabids [q.v.] it was the chief town of the administrative district of the peninsula of Cape Bon or Dżaszr Sharīk [q.v.], which al-Idrisi (Opus geographicum, 293, 302) calls moreover Dżaszrz Bashaçu. In the 4th/10th century, it was an "extensive and fertile region", concerning which Ibn Hawkal (tr. Kramers-Wiet, 69-70) further says: "...

The tax yield and the population are both numerous. A small province is attached to it; there are various kinds of harvests there, and the merchants come there to get supplies. At more than one spot, there are polluted waters, whose impurity is obvious; hence all outsiders entering the town fall ill, with the exception of Blacks, who retain their good health. These Blacks can be used in all conditions and perform their tasks with good humour. All sorts of fruit are to be found there. Each month, Bashshu has a market which is held on a fixed day".

A century later, al-Bakr mentions at Bashshu a menzaila which we possess agree that, in reality, he did not...


Nader, 118, 11. 2 ff.; Pseudo-Kasim b. Ibrahim, K. al-Ádī wa l-taḥqīḥ, in Rusā’il al-Ádī wa l-taḥqīḥ, ed. Muhammad á’Mara, i, Cairo 1971, 125, 11. 4 ff.): the unbeliever must be fought and cannot be inherited from, the believer is loved by God, the munafik should be summoned to do penance or otherwise be executed; all this cannot be said about the fāṣik. Therefore, since these juridical regulations (ahkām) cannot be applied to him, the corresponding designations (asma’) are not valid in his case either. In this presentation of the problem which became common in the future, the term munafik was replaced by tom thus it slowly lost its significance for the theological vocabulary. Dirār b. ÁAmr (2nd century [q.v.]) and Bishr. b. al-Mu’tamir (d. 210/825 [q.v.]) still wrote treatises about the munzila bayn al-manzilatayn (cf. Fihris, 215, i. 13 and 205, 11. 23 f.). Abu 1-Hudhayl included it among the usul al-khamsa; Ibn al-Rawandi [q.v.] refuted the Mu’tazila in this point (cf. Fihris, 217, i. 10). The terms ism and hukm are already found, though perhaps not yet systematically linked with each other, in Abu Hanifa’s Risāla i’il-Álmān al-Batt (ed. Kawglari, 35, 1. 16 and 36, 11. 12 f.). The disputation between Wāṣil and ÁAmr b. Ubayy preserved by al-Shāfī’i al-Murtada (Amāli, ed. Muhammad Abu 1-Fadl Ibrahim, Cairo 1373/1954, i, 165, 11. 8 ff.) where Wāṣil uses ism but not hukm, is apparently no precedent finding for the K. áMigārā baynahat [sc. bayna Wāṣil] us-bayna ‘ÁAmr b. Ubayd (cf. Fihris, 203, n. 1) which may have been composed in the second half of the 2nd century; nevertheless, it remains our oldest testimony for the Mu’tazila position and shows archaic features in part of its argumentation.

Similarities with Christian speculations about penitence have been pointed out by E. Gräf (in OLZ, iv [1960], 397; cf. also R. Strothmann, in Ed., xiv [1915], 211). There is, however, to date no proof for any influence.

Bibliography: Given in the article. Cf. also W. Madelung, Der Imam al-Qasim ibn Ibrahim und die Glaubenslehre der Zaiditen, Berlin 1965, 10 ff.; W. M. Watt, The formative period of Islamic thought, Edinburgh 1959; P. van Ess, in REI, xvii (1979), 51 ff.; M. Cook, Early Muslim dogmas, Cambridge 1981, 94. See also FASIK and MU’TIZILA.

(J. Van Ess)

MAPPILA, standard Western form of Malayalam Mappila, the name of the dominant Muslim community of southwest India, located mainly in the state of Kerala, primarily in its northern area popularly known as Malabar. Significant numbers of Mappilas are to be found also in southern Karnataka and western Tamil Nad, as well as in diaspora groups scattered throughout India, including the Laccadive Islands, Pakistan, the Gulf States and Malaysia. In 1971 there were 4,162,718 Muslims in Kerala, almost all Mappilas, and of these 2,756,747 (est.) were concentrated in Malabar. Mappila growth in the past century has considerably outpaced that of the general population. If the rate of increase in the decade 1961-71 (37.5 %) was maintained, the size of the community in 1981 would exceed 5,700,000. Mappila share the language (Malayalam) and the culture of the inhabitants of Kerala (Malayalis), as well as the unique religious blend of its 25 million people (39.5% Hindu, 21.0% Christian, 19.5% Muslim). Not only because of its size but also because of its particular historical experience, the Mappila community represents a significant segment of Indian Islam.

1. The Name

The name Mappila ( - Māppila, Mopolah) is a direct transliteration of the current Malayalam term. Its origin is not settled, but it appears to have been a title of respect formed by a combination of malāh “great” and pilla “child”; it was restricted to visitors and immigrants from abroad, both Christians and Muslims, either in the broad sense of “honoured ones” (Logan, i, 191; Innes, 186; Hameed Ali, 265; Kareem, 61) or in the more specific meaning of “bridgegroom” and “son-in-law” (Miller, 33; Thurston, iv, 458; Gough, 442; Gundert, A Malayalam and English dictionary). The latter meaning may have been interpreted as points of intermarriage and is supported by contemporary usage in colloquial Malayalam and Tamil. Other derivations, including Arabic, have been suggested, but none so persuasive as the above.

In time, the term became the distinctive appellation of the indigenous Muslim community of Malabar, although it is still occasionally applied also to Syrian Christians in South Kerala.

2. The origin of the Mappilas

Mappila culture is the Malayalam culture of Kerala with an Arabian blend, a fact that points to the ancient intercourse between Kerala and southern Arabia, founded on the great spice trade. The Mappila community traces its origin to that well-documented relationship. Arab trade with Malabar [q.v.] was going on for centuries prior to the advent of Islam. As settlements in particular became energetic from the 4th century A.D. and continuing until the European era. Islamised Arab traders brought their faith with them to Kerala, where some settled and intermarried with the native Malayalis. The earliest generally accepted epigraphic evidence of Muslim presence in Kerala is represented by the Tarisapally copper plates dated 235/849 (Kunjanpillai, 370), which contain Muslim names in Arabic script; however, a Muslim tombstone at Irrikuril dated 50/670 was observed by Mappila scholar C.N. Ahmed Moulaevi before it was washed away, and another tombstone inscription at Pantalayini-Kollam dated 166/782 was legible in the 19th century (Logan, i, 197; but note the criticism of Burgess in Logan, i, p. ix). Because of the Kerala climate and the impermanence of palm leaf writing materials, there are no however Muslim inscriptions in Malayalam predating the 14th century. Nevertheless, despite the paucity of material proof, I.H. Qureshi’s (p. 11) balanced opinion that Islam entered Kerala “within a few years of the proclamation by the Prophet of his mission” is very probably correct and Mappilas, in that light, may be regarded as the first settled Muslim community of South Asia.

Another view favouring a later 3rd/9th century dating for Mappila beginnings is dependent on an unreliable passage of the Akhbār al-Sin wa l-Hind [q.v. in Suppl.] Arab geographers, who provide the available materials for the 3rd-6th/9th-12th centuries of Mappila history, were compelled to rely on such reports (only al-Mas‘ūdī travelled to India, and he to the north; cf. Nainar, 3 ff.). The point of view, however, is also related to the persistent and much-debated tradition of the conversion of an important Hindu ruler, Chērāman Perumal. The form of the tradition that is generally accepted by Mappilas is that reported by Shāvkh Ahmad Zayn al-Dīn (904-89/1498-1531) (referred to as Zainuddin), who was the earliest known Kerala Muslim to deal with the subject of Mappila origins and whose Tuhfāt al-mughālibin became the basis for later Indian Muslim writings on the subject (Fīrigha, iv, 531). Zainuddin dates the conversion event to 207/822, but most Mappilas prefer an earlier dating, that of 5/624. According to the story, Chērāman Perumal’s missionary followers

Given in the article. Cf. also W. Madelung, Der Imam al-Qasim ibn Ibrahim und die Glaubenslehre der Zaiditen, Berlin 1965, 10 ff.; W. M. Watt, The formative period of Islamic thought, Edinburgh 1959; P. van Ess, in REI, xvii (1979), 51 ff.; M. Cook, Early Muslim dogmas, Cambridge 1981, 94. See also FASIK and MU’TIZILA.
led by Malik b. Dinār established a series of mosques, thus facilitating the expansion of Islam. While there is no historical evidence for the strongly-held tradition, there can be little doubt of the hospitality and toleration of native Hindus toward the Arab visitors and their faith.

The direct relation of Mappilas with Arabian Islam is as significant as their relative isolation from Indo-Persian Islam. That original relationship continued over the years, furthered in recent times by the extensive employment of Mappilas in the Gulf region, and it has affected the Mappilas more profoundly than any other Indian Muslims.

3. Mappila development to 1921

(i) Beginnings to 1498

Through eight centuries from their origin to 1498, the Mappilas and Islam in Kerala experienced an apparently calm and peaceful development. Mutual economic interest and religious tolerance, expressed in the direct support of Arab traders by the Zamorin of Calicut, the leading figure in Malabar commerce, paved the way. Immigration, intermarriage and missionary activity were inter-woven strands in the Mappila growth. While occasional stress must be assumed, there is no record of overt abrasiveness or militant encounter between the religious communities; the long period of harmonious relationships, including as it did the delicate areas of religion and marriage, stands as a model development in the history of the subcontinent. Mappilas flourished under these conditions, especially in coastal areas, as noted by Ibn Batūta (704-79/1304-77) during his three stops in Malabar; Zainuddin estimates that 10% of the population of Malabar was Muslim by the midpoint of the 10th/16th century (p. 59).

(ii) The European period

Vasco da Gama's arrival in Calicut in 1498 ushered in the European era and signalled a sharp change in Mappila fortunes. A participant in the events, Duarte Barbosa (p. 78), summed up the history when he said: "Thus they continued to thrive until the Portuguese came to India". The imperialist aims of the newcomers, embracing both economic and religious interests and exercised through military means, introduced a new note into Kerala life. They succeeded in cutting off the Arab trade, and Mappilas who had been prevented from becoming landowners by the hereditary system of land tenure and who depended on commerce, were cast into reduced economic straits which eventually became a pattern of poverty. As new alliances developed the warm relationships between Hindus and Mappilas were also disturbed, and in the end cordiality was replaced by antipathy. Extreme cruelty, chiefly on the part of the Portuguese, produced an inevitable reaction. The Portuguese attitude reflected the mediaeval European tradition and was well represented by the governor of Goa, Afonso Albuquerque (d. 1515), who dreamt of destroying Mecca and who bitterly persecuted his Mappila opponents.

The volatile combination of commercial rivalry and religious animus produced long-lasting negative effects on the Mappila community: economic regression, estrangement from Hindus, bitterness against Christians and a new spirit of militancy. These trends continued in the ensuing period of "pepper politics" as the Portuguese were replaced by the Dutch (1656), the British (1662) and the French (1725). Power remained in the hands of a coalition of Christian foreigners and their Hindu allies, while the Mappilas gradually became a society of small traders, landless labourers and poor fishermen. The Mappila community experienced psychological gloom and distress, and defensive attitudes developed.

During the period 1755-99 the Muslim leaders of neighbouring Mysore [see MĀHISĀR], Ḥāyār ʿAli (d. 1782) and Tīpū Sultān (d. 1799) [q. v.] briefly interrupted the European hegemony over Malabar. Their suzerainty provided fresh hope for the Mappilas, who for the first time in their history were under Muslim rule. Mappilas were now able to obtain some land rights and administrative positions. There was a sharp increase in the community's growth, especially through accessions from the outcaste society. The fanatical religious policy of the Mysore rulers, however, served to intensify the spirit of militancy in the whole region, and the Muslim-Hindu alienation that had been born in the Portuguese period now became an established pattern.

The British assumed full power in 1792 (continuing till 1947), and the newly-raised Mappila hopes were dashed. The British restored the old order, adopting a policy of deference to Hindu leadership and maintaining a wary eye toward the Mappilas. The latter, disappointed and embittered, displayed their resentment in a series of 51 militant outbreaks during the century 1821-1921. The formal causes of the outbreaks included agrarian discontent, poverty, religious zeal and resentment toward the rulers, but underlying these was the emotion of an oppressed people, who responded to a seemingly hopeless situation with often unreasoned and self-destructive violence. Not all Mappilas shared in the depression-agression syndrome, and only a small portion of the populace actively participated in the outbreaks. Those who did participate, however, did so in the tradition of militant ghātā, resulting in violent activities against those whom they perceived as their oppressors, whether British administrators or Hindu landlords (jennis), and they very willingly accepted martyrdom.

This course of events reached its final dénouement in the Malabar Rebellion of 1921, frequently called the Mappilla Rebellion. This was a spontaneous uprising (not one of "systematic preparation", as stated by T.W. Arnold, ET, MAPPILAS) that included the establishment of a temporary "Moplastan" in Eranad, South Malabar, under V.K. Kunhamsad Haji. The new factor that helped to provoke this major upheaval was Mappilla involvement in the Khilafat movement [q. v.], an organised effort within Indian Islam and the Non-cooperation Movement, to help restore the caliphate in Turkey [see KHALIFA]. This ill-fated cause had helped to generate temporary Hindu-Muslim unity in the Indian freedom struggle. The message that came to the Mappila community through the visits of leaders such as M.K. Gandhi and Shawkat ʿAli was clear: only a free India could effectively plead the cause of Muslims, and they very willingly accepted martyrdom.

Those whom they perceived as their oppressors, whether British administrators or Hindu landlords (jennis), and they very willingly accepted martyrdom.

The immediate results for the Mappilla community...
were disastrous. The Rebellion was put down after six months of bitter fighting in which thousands lost their lives. Severe reprisals followed: 292 Mappilas were executed, 502 were sentenced to life imprisonment, thousands were jailed or transported to the Andaman Islands, and large fines were levied. A special force named “The Malabar Special Police” was organised to provide a permanent solution to the “Mappila problem”. The community was recumbent in defeat, its relations with Hindu neighbours at an all-time low, its reputation for uninformed zealotry unparalleled on the sub-continent. The fundamental implication was that Mappilas were at the end of the kind of road that had been followed; a fresh philosophy needed to be developed, and a new life forged. Contemporary evaluation within India tends to the view that the Malabar Rebellion was a war of liberation, and in 1971 the Kerala Government granted the remaining active participants in the revolt the accolade of Aayagi, “freedom fighter”.

4. From 1921 to the present

Subsequent events have dramatically altered the shape of the Mappila community from a defeated and closed society to a community marked by recovery, change and positive involvement in the modern world. Factors producing the change include: the new political spirit; the new shaping of the Mappila community has involved it in severe inner conflicts and introduced a series of unresolved dilemmas. In the process, however, Mappilas have been transformed from a negative symbol to a positive force in contemporary Indian Islam.

(i) The political factor

In the post-Rebellion period, 1921-47, Mappilas began to draw away from the Congress Party, although Mappila leaders such as the highly-esteemd Muhammad Abdurrahiman Sahib and E. Moidu Moulavi continued to struggle for the nationalist cause. Most Mappilas were convinced that a Muslim party must speak for them, and they aligned with the Muslim League. They were led by the inspirational K. M. Seethi Sahib (1898-1960), the chief architect of the Mappila revival. In the Partition controversy, these Mappilas upheld the two-nation theory and put forward an abortive proposal for a separate Muslim-majority province in the Malabar region, to be called “Moplastan”. Although the Muslim League suffered a demise in the rest of India, it continued to remain a serious political factor in Malabar, and Mappilas eventually provided the leadership for its resurgence on a national level.

It was after the linguistic state of Kerala was formed in 1956 (including Malabar District, formerly part of Madras State) that Mappilas became a strong political force, giving the community a new sense of confidence and importance. Mappila political views covered a broad spectrum, and Mappilas were associated with every major party. Under its able leaders Syed Abdurrahiman Bafaki Tangal (d. 1973), P. M. S. A. Pukkoya Tangal (d. 1975) and C. H. Muhammad Kcrad (1928), the state Muslim League, however, held the allegiance of the majority of Mappilas, and it played a king-making role in the state. Although never gaining more than 14 seats in the legislature, through clever alignments it participated in several governments. This success not only created a taste for power politics, but also encouraged the conviction that the welfare of the Mappila community depended on political prowess. Their participation in Kerala politics further gave rise to a psychology of accommodation that took Mappilas into co-operative relationships with all segments of society, including coalitions with Marxist parties. The strong Mappila support for a Muslim party, however, gave rise to the charge of “communism”, a criticism that rose from both within and outside the Mappila community.

It was noted that Pukkoya Tangal, much revered for his saintly qualities, was at the same time the President of the Samastha Kerala Jamiat-ul-Ulema and President of the Kerala Muslim League. The criticisms increased when the Marxist-led state government granted the wish of the League for the formation of a Muslim-majority district in 1969 (Malappuram District, 64% Muslim, the fifth largest Muslim-populated district in India), over vigorous protests of the Jan Sangh and other right-wing Hindu organisations. In 1975 the contention of the Muslim League that it represented the sole legitimate Muslim voice was seriously weakened when the party, largely as a result of personality conflicts, split into a continuing group led by M. K. Kresh living in the US in 1983, and a rival group. The League, however, held the allegiance of the majority of Muslims in the state, receiving 12.8% of the seats in the state assembly (Indian Union Muslim League, 14; All India Muslim League, 4).

(ii) The economic factor

Mappila material strength recovered very slowly during the period 1921-47 and there was only slight improvement thereafter. Economic disabilities were keenly felt (e.g. by 1947, only 3% of taluk officers in Malabar were Muslim, though one-third of the population was Muslim; in 1971 Muslims held only 30% as many state government posts as did Hindu Nayars, whose numbers they exceeded). The problems of poverty and unemployment, endemic in densely-populated Kerala, were felt in a special way by the educationally-backward Mappilas. The situation produced within the community an emphasis on material concerns, self-critical attitudes, a thirst for education, and an open door to the influences of Communism.

Traditional Mappila leaders appeared baffled by the magnitude of their community’s problems, and many disadvantaged Mappilas were gradually attracted to the arguments of Comunists that promised a better life. Communist parties, strong in Kerala, had down-played religious issues and had become accepted as ordinary political alternatives. As did many Hindus and Christians, Mappilas began to mark their ballots “Communist” without any sense of contradiction. It has been suggested (by Mappilas; precise data unavailable) that more than a fifth of Mappila voters may have made this choice at one time or another. For most, it was a statement of protest rather than an affirmation of ideology; some, however, were influenced by the ideas of the Communist movement, others became doctrinaire proponents of Marxism, and a few became prominent Party leaders and officials. Typifying the latter is Ayesha Bai, the first Muslim woman to rise to public fame in modern Kerala, who illustrates the startling impact of Communism on this conservative Islamic society. Joining the Communist Party in 1953, she became Deputy Speaker of the Kerala Assembly (1957), an organiser of the State Women’s Society (Mahila Samajum), and an aggressive advocate for the forward progress of Mappila women.
Within the past five years, a dramatic turn-around has taken place in Mappila prospects as a result of the great influx of funds from the earnings of Mappilas employed in the oil production centres of the Middle East. The sudden and unevenly distributed wealth is creating a new set of circumstances, within which the interplay of economics and religion will take new forms.

(iii) The educational factor

Pre-independence governments had made special efforts to advance Mappila education, but Mappilas had maintained a generally suspicious attitude toward those efforts (the community’s literacy rate was only 5% in 1931). By the 1950s, however, the Mappila community had accepted the state programme of universal education, especially at the elementary level, and by 1960 nearly half the eligible Mappila children in Kerala were attending schools: by 1972 almost all were enrolled. Higher education experienced slower growth. In 1922, the Aikya Sankhum society was founded in Cochin State to promote higher education, and it provided strong impetus for the establishment of Mappila-managed schools. In 1936 a special Mappila high school was founded at Malappuram under the pioneering C.O.T. Kuniyapikki Sahib. Another significant event was the founding of Farook College in 1948, through the efforts of Moulavi Abussabah Ahmedali (d. 1971) who had spent some years in Egypt in association with Taha Husayn. The Islamic context was deliberately maintained in the College, but modern disciplines were placed in the foreground. Under the leadership of K.A. Jaleel (b. 1922), later Vice-Chancellor of Calicut University, the institution had great impact on the Mappila community. By 1974 there were over 700 elementary schools, 36 high schools, nine first-grade colleges, and several technical institutions conducted under Muslim management. The spirit of modern education was still the subject of controversy in the Mappila community, but not the value of schools.

The explosion of education fostered an increasing sense of individual independence and intellectual freedom. The Muslim Educational Society (MES), founded in 1964 by a group of M卓ila professionally trained men, headed by P. K. Abdul Ghafoor, a professor of medicine, typified the new Mappila spirit and brought into sharper focus the increasing conflict between the old and the new. The MES was characterized by intense dissatisfaction with the slowness of the community’s forward progress, by the call for ‘revolutionary change’, by its attack on what it regarded as superstition, and by a burst of philanthropic activity. In addition to promoting new colleges and providing support for students, it began social service activities, including the founding of 14 hospitals. Its influential periodical, MES Journal, led the cry for change. The response of the Mappila community was broadly supportive, and the success of the MES gave it a wiser prominence in Indian Islam. The movement, however, came into conflict with traditional approaches, and major controversies within the Mappila community followed in its wake. After initially supporting the new dynamism, the Muslim League and Jamiat-ul-Ulema each issued calls to Mappilas to dissociate themselves from the popular cause, charging it with advocating changes in the Shari'a. As a result, Mappilas began to be polarised between progressive and conservative views, and did not break into sharp and formal division. The MES itself, however, experienced a schism in 1982; dissatisfied with its leadership some members formed a new, parallel organisation called the Muslim Service Society.

5. Mappila theology

(ii) Major features

Mappila theological development followed a path independent of trends in other areas of Indian Islam, a phenomenon accounted for by the origins of the community and by its linguistic and geographical situation. It was the conservative pattern of Arabian Sunni orthodoxy that provided the major external influence. Mappila development has not been merely imitative, however, but it has been affected by its living experience in the Malayalam cultural context, especially after 1947.

Mappila isolation from Urdu-speaking Islam is notable, although never total. Contacts in the post-Independence period have increased significantly as Mappilas assumed leadership roles in the Indian Union Muslim League, as well as in other all-India Muslim organisations; but these have been primarily of a political and social rather than theological nature. The only Malayalam translation (1967) of a major Indian Muslim work on theological themes is that of Sayyid Amīr ʿAlī’s Spirit of Islam. The views of Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khān, of Sir Muhammad Ibkāl, and even of Mawlānā Abū ʿl Kallām Āzād, remain relatively unknown. Mawlānā Abū ʿl ʿAlī’s Mawdūdī’s work is better known as a result of the translation efforts of the Dīnūrī-ʿIsmāʾīlī. A few Mappilas have studied at Aligarh or Osmania universities, and Urdu is offered as a language option in Kerala schools. These factors, combined with societal mobility, indicate a probable deepening of relationships in the future.

The basic Mappila theological orientation is summed up in the two statements: All Mappilas are Sunnis. The majority of Mappilas are Sunnis. Both statements may be understood correctly. The former refers to the absence of Shi'a in the Mappila community. The latter refers to ordinary Mappila usage of the term Sunnī: in common parlance it signifies the traditionally orthodox in contrast to adherents of other movements. Chief among the latter are the Muddāḥirds; the Dīnūrī-ʿIsmāʾīlī party has some influence, and there are a few Ahmadiyya. In this secondary connotation, about two-thirds of the community are Sunnis, who represent popular Mappila religious belief marked by conventional doctrine and practice, and alligiance to Shāhī’ī law.

(ii) Mappila religious leaders

The major categories of authoritative religious figures are maulavis, mullas, tangals and kādīs. Maulavis (= musalar, the earlier term) are the true leaders, combining in effect the functions of inām and khatīb, and to some extent those of fāsāk and mufīṭ, the latter being dependent on the community’s esteem. A maulavi must have graduated from an acceptable training program. Mullas are religious workers of lesser standing and slight education, whose functions are primarily Kur‘ān reading and home visitation. Tangals (Mal. pers. pron.; honorific) are individuals descended from saintly families; not necessarily engaged in religious vocations, they are generally respected and occasionally revered. Kādīs are fewer in number, and though their sphere of influence is limited, they are well regarded; they may be hereditary tangals or appointed.

Mappila theological progress is closely related to the pattern of maulavi training. The older form was set by the Shaykh Makkhīmīn institution at Ponnani. Said to have been founded in the 6th/12th century, it reached its peak under Shaykh Zayn al-Din b. Shaykh ʿAlī
(872-928/1467-1521), known as the “senior Makh-dum”, who wrote religious treatises, and his famed grandson, Shaykh Ahmad Zayn al-Din b. Shaykh Muhammad al-Ghazali, the historian and scholar. The office of the Makh-dum was hereditary, the style of education personal and the curriculum narrowly traditional. Although the institution has lost its earlier importance, its spirit lives on. It houses the Maanath-ul-Islam Sabha, whose key purpose is “instructing new converts to Islamism” (Maanath-ul-Islam Sabha—Articles of Association, Ponnani 1949, 1).

Contemporary maulavi training follows two paths. The Ponnani tradition is carried forward by the Qamara Nuriyya College at Pattikad (founded 1965) led by T.K. Abu Bekr Musaliar, which has rapidly become the premier Sunni training college for Mappilas. Some Mappilas still attend al-Baiykat-us-Salihat College at Vellore, Tamil Nad, and a few have gone to Deoband. The curriculum at Qamara Nuriyya follows the Deoband model, substituting Shafi'i law for Hanafi; theological authorities studied include al-Baydawi, al-Mahalli, al-Nawawi and al-Ghazali. The basic intent of this educational stream is that the student becomes a true proponent of taklid and obtain basic vocational skills, and the educational style combines the lecture method with memorisation. The narrow and concentrated learning experience instils the dedication for which the Mappila maulavi is noted, and assures that he will remain the symbol of continuity. Its lack of foundation in modern knowledge, however, has also made the system the focus of vehement criticism from within the Mappila community, and many Mappilas regard the reform of religious education as the key to Mappila forward progress. Reflecting this view a second track of maulavi training has developed that emphasises a basis in modern education. A high school degree, and desirably a college degree in Arabic is a prerequisite, led by T.K. Abu Bekr Musaliar, which has rapidly gone to Deoband. The curriculum at Djamia Salihat College at Vellore, Tamil Nad, and a few have served the Mudjahid movement, while the Qamara tradition is carried forward by the Rouzathul-Uloom at Feroke.

(i) Mappila theological reform

Mappila theology remained in a fairly constant mould until the present century when Wakkom Muhammad Abdul Khader Maulavi (1873-1932) of Quilon sparked the beginning of the modern reform movements. He was influenced by the Egyptian reform of Muhammad ‘Abdul and Rashid Ridā through al-Manâr [q.v.] and was to some degree aware of the ideas of Ishaq al-Din al-Aghâni [q.v.] and Muhammad b. ‘Abd al-Wahhab [see ibn ‘Abd al-Wahhab]. Wakkom Maulavi exhorted Kerala Muslims to abandon un-Islamic practices, to respect reason, to adopt English education, and to develop progressive movements. He spread his views through the short-lived but influential Arabic-Malayalam periodical, al-Ilâm (1919) and by his Malayalam books A literary view, Progress and literature and The rights of man. He inspired a group of students at Trivandrum who carried forward his ideals, including K.M. Seethi Sahib in the socio-political realm and Khatib Muhammad Maulavi (1886-1964) in the religious field. A Malabar scholar respected for his skill in taflîr and fikr, for his important fatwas, and for his efforts to establish the all-Kerali Jamia-ul-Ulema, Khatib Muhammad’s integrity and personality enabled him to transmit the southern reform to the more traditional north. To help express the spirit of the reform, “K.M.” also joined with his colleagues, E. K. Maulavi and M. K. Haji, in establishing the major Mappila orphanage at Trirangadi.

The tide initiated by Wakkom Maulavi and carried forward by his followers was basically a conservative reform, marked by an insistent call to return to the fundamentals of Islam and a positive reaching out to the new world. It is this fact, taken together with the quality of its leaders and their effective teaching and writing, that accounts for its wide impact. In the end, the movement affected a broad spectrum of Mappila leaders: orthodox maulavis, teachers and other professionals, and business men. It took on an organisational form in 1952 when some Mappilas formed the Nadvat-ul-Mujahideen as “a progressive” organisation to enlighten the Muslim masses “on scientific lines,” to further “the true injunctions of Islam” and to promote harmonious relationships” with other religiousists” (cf. imprints on Mudjâhid inscriptions). Sunni leaders felt compelled to resist many of the new trends; they called the Mudjahïds “Wahhâbiyyah” as a term of reproach and criticised the Mudjâhid practice of establishing separate mosques. Mappila Mudjâhid place strong emphasis on tawhîd, accompanied by severe criticism of saint veneration and other “superstitious” practices. They lay stress on the Kurân in contrast to Hadîth, and they argue for the validity of translations and the use of the vernacular in mosque and madrassa. They support the use of reason in the interpretation of the Kurân (“how it promotes thinking and discourages imitation”), C.N. Ahmed Maulavi, Religion of Islam, Calicut 1979, 53) and its appropriate application to modern conditions. In that connection, the principles of sigmât and taklîd are attacked, and tawhîd is affirmed. Modern education is to be promoted and should include women. C.N. Ahmed Maulavi (b. 1906), the premier Mudjâhid scholar and the most prolific Mappila theologian writing today, represents this approach. His six-volume translation of the Kurân (1951-61) was the first in Malayalam. His translations and other interpretative works (cf. Bibi.) comprise an important body of reformist literature and have made “C. N.” the subject of controversy in the Mappila community.

The final stream in the contemporary Mappila theological development was added by the social reformers represented by such organisations as the MES (see above). Communist Mappilas had criticised what they viewed as “other-wordly” religion, but the orthodox tendency was to resist the critique in view of the source. The lay leaders of the Mappila social reform from a stronger base declared in effect that theology must be judged by its ability to respond to human problems. Their treatment of zakât, which produced a major controversy, is illustrative. Traditional charitable giving practices should be altered, and a portion of zakât should be diverted to revolving funds that will help establish productive enterprises and so deal with the roots of economic hardship. Science is to be respected, for there is no conflict with religion, and co-operation with people of other faiths for mutual uplift is enjoined. The fundamental emphasis of the Mudjahîds and MES is the same: it is not Islam but Muslims that need change and reform.

As a result of these influence, Mappila theology displays an increasingly divided face. Sunni theology, which has both resisted and absorbed, is no longer a solid block. There is considerable inner movement and diversity of approach. The possibility of a new theological synthesis exists, but may be difficult to realise.
6. Mappila religious and social custom
(i) Religious practice
Formal religious life centres on the mosque, of which there are 3,300 in Kerala, an estimated one for every seventy Muslim homes (Kerala Muslim Directory, 668). The architecture is unique, following the general pattern of Kerala Hindu temples, with peaked roofs and no minarets. Mappilas believe that the oldest mosques were originally Hindu temples, setting the pattern for later construction. Newer mosques tend to an amalgam of style; the explosion of mosque construction in the early 1980s reflected both Arab cultural and financial influence. A defined geographical area will include a djanmadatu mosque, other mosques and a number of small prayer halls (niskaranapalli). Each mosque has a maulavi assisted by a muktri (= ma'nuthgini), and other staff, depending on its size and affluence. Arabic continues to be the primary language of the Khulta, with Malayalam making some inroads. Women do not ordinarily attend mosque services. The popular Ramadhi night services, however, are open to all and are well attended. Since only a minority of Mappilas attend the Friday mosque service, religious leaders look to a combination of Ramadhan programmes and nadrass instruction to nurture the community.

Advanced Arabic studies are conducted at the more than five Arabic Colleges in the state. The majority follow the older method of rote instruction, but seven are chartered to grant the Afi-id-ul-Ulama degree which is based on modern language study and which qualifies the bearer to teach the subject in secondary schools. The art of chanting has been drawn into public rhetoric and has created a special Mappila art form. The qawwals of the Kur'An are taken with great seriousness, and it has led to the protective use of Kur'Anic phrases in amulet form, usually blessed by a person possessing the grace of karâmat, and used especially to ward off sickness.

Mappilas commonly observe the basic practices of dîn, and a disproportionately high percentage of the annual pilgrims from India to Mecca are Mappilas. Mawlid readings are common in Mappila homes. Even more important are the Arabic-Malayalam mîlas, religious song-stories, which celebrate the lives of Muslim saints or heroic events in the history of the community. The most popular is the Muden Mâla representing the life of al-Djilânî (470-561/1078-1167), closely followed by Rifa'in Mâla commemorating al-Rifâ'î (500-78/1106-83). Sunni Muslims also revere local saints, who are regarded as having miraculous powers, although the practice of shrine visitation is falling into some disrepute as the result of community criticism and the relentless pressure of modern views. The best-known is Syed Alavi of Mambram (1749-1843), whose shrine is still frequently visited; “by the foot of the Mambram Tangal” is a sacred verbal seal to a Mappila agreement. Other important shrines are those of Shaykh ZainuddIn at Ponnani and the Kondotti shrine of Muhammad Shâh Tangal. The latter was an 18th century saint, possibly an itinerant Sûfi, whose followers have always denied the Sunni allegation that he was a Shî'ti. In addition to Bakr Îd and 'Id al-Fitr, special festivals called ne'râs are connected with particular localities. The most famous of these, the Malappuram ne'râ, recalls the deaths of 44 Mappila martyrs (1141/1728). These celebrations were traditionally accompanied by much fanfare and with very high emotional expression, but are increasingly regarded by the educated populace as outdated expressions of religious fervour. A number of Sunni leaders are waging a determined battle to validate the concept of awalih, which is the most hotly debated issue in contemporary Mappila religion.

(ii) Social custom
Mappila social custom is governed by the Shari'a, subject to the restraints of national law and the conditioning influences of Malayalam culture. Mappilas have generally stood for the inviolability of the Shari'a in the area of personal law. Birth, marriage and burial ceremonies are strongly traditional, but in other areas, Mappila customs have been relatively open to change, including the area of family planning. Mappila women are experiencing a quiet revolution; some are joining professional vocations and assuming leadership roles. Polygamy was never common, but the divorce rate is high. Social classes in the Mappila community are not sharply defined, but there is a continuing distinction of Mappilas of Arab descent, which is maintained through marriage practice and special regard for descent from the Prophet’s line.

Mappila adaptation from the Hindu environment is not pronounced. The most striking example is the matrilineal system called marumakkathayam, indigenous to the Nayar caste, which played an influential role in Mappila history. Although in South Malabar accessions to Islam were primarily from outcaste groups, in North Malabar many Nayar joined Islam through conversion or intermarriage. Through this process, marumakkathayam took its place alongside the patrilineal system in Mappila Islam. The practice traces descent through the female side, assigns authority to the eldest sister, and controls property through the joint family system. This pattern, unusual in Islam (but cf. the Minangkabau Muslims of Sumatra) is progressively yielding to the development of nuclear families and to the pressure to conform to the more traditional Islamic order.

Other elements of Kerala culture, ranging from dress habits to architecture, have become part of the Mappila tradition. It is not possible, however, to speak of a fundamental cultural inter-penetration between Mappilas, Hindus and Christians. Mappila religious practice and theology, in particular, remain relatively isolated. The notable example of syncretistic practice—that associated with the Muslim saint, Vâvâr, at the Hindu Sabarimala shrine in South Kerala—is an isolated exception to the general rule.

7. Mappila character
The key element in Mappila character is devotion to Islam. Although there is controversy within the community over the answer to the question “What is Islamic?”, the importance of the issue is not doubted. The intensity of this commitment has given rise to the Mappila reputation for excessive religious fervour. The assessment that Mappilas are “religious fanatics” has followed as a more or less accepted assumption in many scholarly writings, particularly Western, contributing to the development of a caricature that bears little resemblance to reality.

As a result of the stress and reverses of the European period, Mappila reactions were extreme from time to time. The emotional and untutored response of some Mappilas to conditions that seemed hostile to Islam, however, did not represent an innate disposition characterising the entire community, which for centuries had co-existed with Hindu and Christian neighbours in practical harmony. Even those who maintained the “fanatic” assessment were forced to recognise the ties between Mappilas of north and south Malabar, and in the south between coastal and inland Mappilas; these generalisations were too
broadly sweeping, however, to be accurate or helpful. Since 1947, Mappilas have turned their backs on the kind of reactions that produced the caricature; nothing clearly illustrates that fact as the Mappila restraint in the anti-Muslim riots that took place in Cannanore District in 1971.

Mappilas share the emotional traits of Malayali personality, but Mappila character is especially marked by simplicity of faith; loyalty to friends, Muslim and non-Muslims; fortitude and patient endurance; honest and frugal, industriousness, marked ability in commerce; a sense of community pride and oneness; and the readiness to follow recognised leaders. Various influences are modifying the traditional character. Community loyalty is no longer blindly granted, and there is a new sense of individual freedom, as well as more impatience with unsolved problems. Although displaying remarkable vitality, religious faith is neither so simple nor so stable as it once was, and as the public attention is more and more directed to social progress, there is a growing tendency to view it as a purely private matter.

8. Mappila literature

For much of Mappila history, the number of Mappila writers and their influence upon the community was severely limited by the lack of education. As Mappila literati developed, religious publications dominated the field. These continue to increase rather than decrease in quantity, and the Kurâan itself remains as the best-seller. More recently, however, Mappila writers have expanded their interests to general themes, and secular literature is being written and published in abundance.

The special, and still largely hidden, Mappila literary achievement is the Arabic-Malayalam body of religious materials, narrative poetry and songs. It is estimated (P. Seyd Muhammad, Varan College Annual, 1974, 56) that less than 10% of these materials are translated into Malayalam. This literary form emerged about five centuries ago as a complex blend of Malayalam language, Arabic script with special orthographic features, and some Arabic, Tamil, Urdu and Persian vocabulary. Particularly loved are the khwaab ballads, comprising a series of romantic ballads and battle songs. These heroic epics represent the private Mappila folk annals, which are memorised and sung on special occasions, particularly by women. The poet laureate of the Arabic-Malayalam song literature is Moyinkutty Vaidyar (1857-91). With the rise of general education, the Arabic-Malayalam literary genre is on the decline, although religious literature is still being produced in considerable quantities at the publishing centre of Parappanangadi for use in madrasas.

Mappila periodical literature is extensive and wisely read, and is especially influential in the religious sphere. Almost one hundred periodicals have appeared during the past half-century, the majority in Malayalam, but many have died an early death. There are currently about a dozen significant publications, representing different points of view. A Mappila newspaper which played a significant role in the community's development is the Chandrika (founded 1934). For a more natural picture of Muslim life and emotion, the works of contemporary Muslim novelists must be considered. They represent Mappila culture, views and feelings with realism, freshness, honesty and a sense of humour. Generally uninterested in political strife, novelists also tend to be both in spirit and deal lightly with religion, showing little hesitation to smile at its pretensions or to mock its idiosyn-

cracies. Drawing on universal human issues, they project a paradoxical mood of hope and pessimism. Leading authors include U.A. Khader, K.T. Muhammad, N.P. Muhammad and Moide Padiyath, but the outstanding Mappila novelist is the widely honoured Vaikom Muhammad Basheer (b. 1910). His most noted work, Nâdappokkottanmrconnu ("My grandfather had an elephant", 1951), follows the interaction between a conservative and progressive Mappila family, the elephant symbolising unrealistic traditionalism; the story illustrates a dilemma that faces Mappilas both in the present and in the future.


In general, western studies of the Mappilas from the British period must be used with great care because of frequent bias and inadequate sources, but see P. Holland-Pryor, The Mappilas or Moplahs, Calcutta 1904, a caste handbook of the Indian Army; W. Crooke, The Moplahs of Malabar, in Edinburgh Review (1922), 181-93; G. MacMunn, The martial races of India, London 1933. Much more useful are the Madras and Kerala government-published District gazettes, and of these the best is William Logan's oft-quoted Malabar manual, 3 vols., Madras 1887, a mine of information, meticulously gathered by a relatively objective civil servant, and generally reliable; C. A. Innes, Malabar, ed. F. B. Evans 1933, is an up-dating of this classic. E. Thurston, Castes and tribes of Southern India, Madras 1909, iv, 455-501, provides ethnographic information, much of which is now outdated.

MAPPILA


The complex Malabar land tenure system that has played a major role in Mappila history is introduced in Sreedhara Menon, The evolution of the Jenmi system in Kerala, op. cit., 325-69 and F. N. Pillai, Jemmi systems in Kerala, Kottayam 1966. For observation of the Mysorean impact, cf. F. Buchanan, A journey from Madras through the countries of Mysore, Canara and Malabar, 3 vols., London 1807. The development through the British period may be traced in the Guide to the records of the Malabar District, 1714-1935, 9 vols., Madras 1936. For a British opinion favourable toward Mappilas, see Logan, i, 621-70, while Innes, 304-72, summarises the different types of land rights. L. Moore, Malabar law and custom, Madras 1905, and A. Mayer, Land and society in Malabar, Oxford 1952, provide systematic overviews. M. A. Oomen, Land reforms and socio-economic change in Kerala, Madras 1971, outlines the recent dramatic changes.


Orthodox Sunni beliefs are found in short Malayalam or Arabic-Malayalam writings such as Muslim praramba matangal ("Basic Muslim tenets") Ponnai, 1950; Madrassa textbook, Classes 1 to V. Parappanangadi 1972; K. Umar Maulavi, Tarjum-un-ul-Khan, Tirurangadi 1971; and al-Mumt Annals of the Madras college, Madras 1950. The classic Shai're manual is Shaikh Ahmed Zainuddin, Fathul Mun'ir, Trichur 1968. Uncritical hagiologies of Muslim saints include M.A.


---

466 MAPPILA — AL-MAR'A

Woman

1. The Arab world.

For a long time, the problem of woman has been avoided or dealt with only partially or in a biased way, but now a general twinge of conscience has brought it to the focus of our attention. Not just one but many different problems confront the Arab woman and affect how she is seen by society. There is the legal aspect, defining the precise relationship between the two sexes in law; there is the collection of "distorted pictures" (the expression used by Etiem-
later practice allowed the husband or the brother to put the suspected woman to death more expeditiously. Divorce (II, 226/52 and LXV in totu) is an absolute right conferred on the husband (LXV in totu), who must nevertheless refer to "the evidence of honest men among you" at all times. But in practice, this control has been neglected over the centuries. In the end, a new legal right evolved, allowing a man to use the police authorities to bring back a wife who has left the conjugal home (bayt al-ta'ā). Nevertheless, there had been constant reference to the Kur'ān even when irrelevant (bayt al-ta'ā, stoning the adulterous woman) and this was used as an argument for "sacralising" the status imposed on a woman.

This sacralising of her inferiority is perhaps the main reason for the problems of the Arab woman. She is regarded from an ontological point of view as a second-rate human being, coming after man in the order of God's creatures. She submits to her duties, is limited in her powers and is mistress neither of her own development nor of her own body. Everything about her is considered taboo, so that "marriage is dealt with in the same way as a man thinks about correct behaviour".

However, in the early stages of Islam "correct behaviour" was still flexible. Verses were revealed at the request of the Prophet to allow the Prophet to marry the divorced wife of his adopted son (XXXIII, 37) or, according to the exegetes, to expose the depraved character to public abuse for having accused A'ishah of adultery (XXIV, 11-19; see note in Blachère's translation). Later, after the death of the Prophet, the conquests increased the number of marriages between Muslims and Jews and Christians. Although there was clear authorisation for this in the Kur'ān, the caliph 'Umar temporarily prohibited this type of marriage for the sake of the welfare of the state. The revealed text was distorted or even contradicted to justify the need of the moment (cf. Muhammad Mustafa Shalabi, Ta'ilt al-ahkâm, 244).

In fact, the law was to become the battleground for two opposing factions. There were the literalists with their rigorous interpretation, who claimed to take their stand on the Kur'ān and the Sunna (al-tafsir bi 'l-manākul) as well as on "consensus" (ijmā'ū) and "precedent" (taklīf), methods essentially formalist or literalist. On the other hand, there was a body of rationalist or liberal opinion from the Mu'tazilis to Avicenna and to Khalīd Muhammad Khalīd in the 20th century who have tried to take into account the original historical setting of the statutes and the development of individual interpretation, especially concerning women. However, over the period of the Arab-Muslim evolution, it has been the literalist tendency which has carried weight, even where in one region or another of the Muslim world some traditional customs favoured women's rights (cf. G.-H. Bousquet, 161 ff.).

In modern times, Muslims jurists, influenced by reformist ideas, have tried to make a distinction between "human law" and "divine law": the "'ibādat, religious acts which bring the creature into contact with his creator", and the "mu'amālatā, relations between individuals" (Chehata, 11). Since 1897, the institution of marriage (which is included in the mu'amālatā) has been a written contract in Egypt and, therefore, has implied some means of protection for women, even though traditionally "it is not advisable to write it down" (Linant de Bellefonds, ii, 40). It has become more and more the general rule to draw up a legal document (in Ottoman law, 1911; in the Tunisian statute book, 1956; in Morocco, 1958; etc.). By borrowing from articles drawn up by the most liberal judicial schools, the modernists have followed a parallel course and tried legally to restrain the practice of polygamy (which includes the monogamy clause) taken from the Hanbal school. This is why the Ottoman law of 1917 allows a wife to obtain the annulment of her marriage contract if her husband marries someone else. The Jordanian legal code of 1951 is similar. The Syrian (art. 14.3) and the Irākī (art. 3.4) codes do not include the monogamy clause, but insist that the second marriage is given preliminary authorisation by a judge. The Tunisian code of 1959 (art. 18) was the first in an Arabic-speaking country, and until now (1982) the only one, to prohibit polygamy completely. As with marriage, there has been a gradual tendency to embody the procedure in a written document. It happened in Egypt in 1931 and in Syria in 1953 where, as also in Morocco, the judge may sentence the husband to pay costs and alimony. Several Islamic countries have forbidden "triple repudiation" in any circumstances. There has been a complete break with tradition in Tunisia, where (arts. 31 ff.) the act of repudiation is not reserved just for the husband, but it is possible to have "legal divorce", granted by the court "at the request of either husband or wife", each having equal statutory rights.

In Syria the law of 31 December 1975 (art. 60) stipulates that "the dowry must be paid to the woman herself" and almost everywhere, legal limits are imposed on the minimum age of marriage for young women and young men.

Although in most Arab-Muslim countries, it remains true that the witness of two women is worth that of one man; a marriage between a Muslim and a non-Muslim woman is null and void; and rights of inheritance are always regulated in an unjust way, improvements cannot be systematically denied. The wishes of a woman herself about her own future are now being taken into account. For example, the woman who marries a man with a different nationality is no longer obliged to lose her own nationality if she acquires that of her husband. In Irākī (f'O no. 2217, 1973), she may choose the nationality she wishes. In Lebanon (document dated 11 January 1968), she may have dual nationality and will lose her own only if she makes an official request to have her name removed from the registers of her native country. In Libya (Law no. 7, 1963), she keeps her nationality unless she is able and wishes to assume that of her husband; it is the same for Egyptian women (Nationality law, 1958) and for Syrian women (1969, art. 12). In Tunisia and the Sudan, the husband's nationality has no effect on that of the wife, who always keeps her own. It is also of note that in two decrees by the Supreme Court of Appeal in Egypt, in 1972 and 1975, equal weight was given to the testimony of women and men, and thereby the principle of the charter of 1962, "Woman must be equal with man", was introduced into the judicial system. Such examples indicate the tendency in recent times to concede a much greater autonomy in legal matters to a woman.

Distorted images of women in literature. From earliest times to the Nahda, poetic and literary compositions present their heroines with two sides to their character. Poetry of the archaic type always praises the hard life of the Bedouin with their historical reckonings of events, their virtue and their sweethearts, who were not only ravishingly beautiful but were sometimes perfidious, were small-waisted and heavy-hipped, mendacious and inconstant (cf. Ka'b b. Zuhayr's
They were always moving about, wandering with their tribes, seeking watering places as well as those of the inaccessible free-woman. Poetry and prose alike express the sexual frustrations experienced by writers who have accepted the social prohibitions and who respect the traditional hierarchies. In love with his goddess, whose social standing has been questioned by biographers), Al-Abbas b. al-Ahnaf claims only to "adore" a free woman. He says, "Only slaves can love servants" (Ditän, ed. Khazardji, 86, poem 161, verses 3, 4, 5). The same contempt was expressed later by al-Djahiz concerning slave prostitutes (cf. Ch. Pellat, Le milieu barrien, 253-4).

Theologians were appalled at the sacralisation of woman before she became this symbol of mystery. Al-Abbas b. al-Ahnaf is said to have "added apostasy to debauchery in his poetry" (Tstud al-kaf ze 'l-fudurj fi shh'rhi), according to Abu 'l-Hudhayl al-Allâf, the Mu'tazili (Aghârî, viii, 15; concerning Ibn al-Ahnaf, the poet at the court of Harun al-Rashid, and his love poetry, see N. Tomiche, Réflexions sur la poétique de 'Abbas b. al-Ahnaf, in Arabica, xxviii/3 [1961], 273-99). In fact, poetry writing had become an expression of submissiveness to social prohibitions and a form of unattainable romantic desire. A poet like Ibn al-Ahnaf really tortured himself in order to tell of his desire in a way that none of his predecessors had. Probably it was at this stage of literary development that the myth of Madânîn, "the fool of love", became established (see Blachère, HLA, i, 122) and was anachronistically projected back to the beginnings of Islam. The poet makes an idyllic scene of his love for the free mother of the former slave, and then allowed much more boldness in their behaviour than their successors under the 'Abbâsid régime were able to tolerate (Lammens, Mow'awwa lî, 259, 440). Both groups display strong intellectual qualities, for countless passages from the Kitâb al-Aghârî represent free-women and slaves as being wise and good, firm advisers as well as well as mocking, insolent and cunning (i, 75, 76, 89, 126; ii, 86; viii, 133-4, 135, etc.). Again, this shows the dual image of woman described.

With the development of cities, these two female types finished on opposite sides of the social hierarchy. The urban Arabs adopted the values and ways of life of the peoples with whom they mixed, but they wanted to "preserve" their wives from them. This policy resulted in the practice of shutting up the so-called free townswomen of the wealthy and generally better-off social groups, especially after the transfer of the capital to Ta'rik. Consequently, the influence of the slave singer became greater since she alone could mix with the men of the élite classes. She was shrewd, witty, cultured and often a poetess. She frequented all the places of social entertainment and constituted herself as a civilising influence on the sensitivity, the mind and the tastes of an expanding society throughout the Muslim empire, from al-Andalus to Persia.

Perhaps it was under the influence of the Manichaean beliefs of Persia or of Satism and Tantrism in Hindu and Buddhist India, that these same women of such great cultural importance gradually became a source of spiritual joy and a way of life. For centuries there has been a fixed dual image of woman as an idol beyond man's reach, but also as an erotic yet passive object, flattering the fantasies of the poet and of the story teller. This is why she was also a passive object of physical pleasure for poets like Abu Nuwas or Ibn al-Hajjdâdî, who spoke of her in less mystical and less guarded terms. There was, therefore, an adoration and total submission of one group woman, and a libertine attitude, an ethical debauchery and a revolt against social prohibitions of another; all these characteristics feature in the "man of high birth", the zarîf, the ideal man of the most illustrious centuries of the empire.

For centuries there has been a fixed dual image of woman as angel and demon. In Arab literature of the modern era, since the beginning of the Nahda and in later audio-visual media, feminine characters retain some of their traditional aspects. In current art forms, like modern novels and the theatre, the mediaeval contrast between angel and demon appears in familiar guise with the mother and wife on the one hand, and on the other, the "femme fatale", with eroticism aroused by the female form. Sexuality may, of course, be used to stimulate a wider circulation (magazine stories and films taken from the works of Iskân 'Abd al-Kuddîn or Yâsîf al-Sîhâlî). In the avant-garde novels, however, or in the new poetry, it may also convey a message of revolt against Society and the Establishment. Eroticism has a structural function
just like that of violence in works like those of Ghitani or MadjTd Tubiya in Egypt or Haydar Haydar and Zakariyya Tm in Syria.

Old feminine images still persist. Sometimes they are compensated to guarantee the old established order (proud, strong mothers and wives who keep the man on the right path in social behaviour); but they may also have an evil effect, threatening the dominant position of man, his virility, the family and the social structure (mistresses of restaurants, and brothels, treacherous women, real Delilahs capable of stripping any Samson of his vigour). Details are borrowed from real life and known events in order to bring these images up-to-date and to allow the stereotypes to be used again and again. New images show the changing life experience of women and enrich the discussion of novels, poetry, theatre and the cinema. There is the woman who has regained part of her independence by working and becoming entirely responsible for her own affairs. Her autonomy is accompanied by portraying a sexual emancipation in the artistic image of her, which is on the whole badly tolerated by the writer and the media. There is also the female student who is potentially emancipated and who often preaches looser morals than she practises. In contrast, there is the peasant woman, the worker and the servant, who have left their familiar countryside, are exploited for their work and their sex, and have to fight to survive. And there is the freedom fighter, who struggles beside men for the liberation of the homeland in Palestinian literature. No judgment is made on her sexual behaviour, usually.

When issues of daily political and social life are involved, these images of woman are moulded to suit the artistic work in which they are used. Real events are mostly in a fictional world and then become symbolic elements within it. It is often difficult to discern what is true experience and what has been imagined, so they should not be taken seriously as historical documents. They do remain as important disclosures of their authors' aspirations and ultimately of the attitudes of their social groups, but not as a real description of the situation of woman in the Arab-Muslim society.

Woman in real life. It is hard for official laws and idealising images in literature to reveal the true life style of Arab women. We can obtain a much better description by observing how historians and biographers from the past portray her, and then how the press and audio-visual media of to-day continue to do so. In ancient texts, she only appeared when some noteworthy event occurred, like her being expelled from the harem. But in early Islam she could win a measure of respect and even evoke fear. There were frequent political alliances made between the powerful to ensure the loyalty of influential tribes; and when wives were selected from a tribe, it gave the woman a distinctive prestige and respect (see Lammens, Mo'dais, i, 324, 318). There seems to have been no need for her to be confined or veiled for several decades. One Amazon, who exposed the calves of her legs, took part in the horse racing at Medina, and when the press reported it, it was highly praised. There were remarkable qualities in order to dominate her husband (see Creasy, Histoire of the Ottoman Turks, repr. 1961, 225-6, 230-1; M. Gaudefroy-Demomblynes, Le monde musulmane, 387; Clot, i, 331). There was a mystery surrounding woman, her underhand activities and her ambitions, which produced in man a deep distrust of her and an imperious insistence on her local submission.

Lower-class women were not considered worthy of interest until the 19th century and afterwards. Then, many European travellers, especially in Egypt, gave precise information about their situation (see Mengin, Histoire de I'Egypte, ii, 305; Michaud and Poujoulat, Correspondance d'Orient, v, 13; vii. 83; 85-6; P.-S. Girard, in the monumental Description de I'Egypte, xvii, 56; Schoelcher, L'Egypte en 1845, 160-1, 305; Clot, etc.). Such a woman seemed lively and active, working in the factories of Muhammad ʿAli or as an alum, "dancing girl". She endured "a type of circumcision" performed in Egypt (Clot, i, 321-3) [see Khafif], and in the Sudan, infibulation, probably through the influence of pagan practices from black Africa. Following the occupation of Egypt by the French (1798-1801), the growing influence of the West, the development of the Arab bourgeoisie, the modernisation of towns and reformist ideas all had a disturbing effect on the family and social structures as well as on general attitudes. Any attempt to defend the earlier status quo brought about a deterioration in female segregation and increased restrictions. However, crises are sometimes salutary in the way they precipitate a liberation movement.

The year 1839 saw the beginning of the Panjimāt law, a period of social reform when many schools were opened for girls in Turkey, but not in the other Arab regions of the empire. There had been a school for girls in Beirut opened by the American missionaries in Beirut in 1835, but it was the only one of
its kind for a long time. The first primary school for girls in Egypt was opened in 1876, and in Irak in 1899; tuition was given in Turkish.

The First World War brought about a growing need for labour, especially female labour, in these countries: they worked in the spinning and weaving industries, in companies manufacturing cigarettes and in factories making preserves, matches, etc. Women used to work side-by-side with men for the same pittance. In 1921 the first proto-trade union organisations demanded equality for men and women before the law. These rights, though often only existing in theory, like the nine-hour day and maternity leave on half pay, were granted from 1933 onwards. They led in turn to the setting up of a legal labour code in Iraq (1936), Syria and Lebanon (1946). These laws and guarantees, rarely respected at first, gradually and slowly are becoming customary.

It was not only in industry that women were employed. They worked in greater numbers (as they always have done) in craft and family enterprises. The patriarchal structure of the family favours an almost closed economy, and there the woman's fight for independence has almost no room to develop. The development of female education and the formation of a female consciousness has undoubtedly been made possible because of the wealth generated by oil and commerce.

The Arab woman's evolution was inevitably accompanied by a development of conscience, in the absence of which, in spite of lengthy periods of common conflict, she finds herself excluded from trade union activities through what is in effect discrimination. Furthermore, because of ignorance she did not avail herself of the rights which the law allowed her. Perhaps the quickest stirring of female consciousness was brought about by the fruitful activities of the feminist organisations. They were formed after the First World War and were mostly philanthropic, although some were definitely political; they were constantly active despite the sarcasm of the media.

Of all the Islamic countries, Turkey had the largest population of literate women, and it led the way in major changes. Developments in female education led to the propagation of more liberal thought. With the revolution of Atatürk in 1923, the country was laïcised, and the wildest dreams of female liberation were realised—a model for other Arab states. At the end of the 19th century in Egypt, the first theorist of eastern feminism, Kāsim Āmin [q.v.], published a book entitled Taḥrīr al-mār'a, "The emancipation of the [Egyptian] woman" which, in the name of the law of the Kurān itself, protested against the breaking of the law, the obligatory wearing of the veil, unjustified polygamy, and repudiation without the arbitration of a judge. He claimed equality of teaching for both sexes. Egyptian feminists supported him. From 1911 Bāḥīyat al-Bādiya demanded that women should have free access to the mosques and that there should be compulsory primary education for everyone. After the First World War, Hūdā Schāfrāwī, a member of the Turkish aristocracy, opened her salon in Cairo and in 1923 appeared in public with an uncovered face.

At the end of the last century, feminist claims were expressed only by some women of the aristocracy, but now they have become increasingly urgent. They have been taken up by the upper and middle classes, by professional and journalistic both sexes and they have been organised into various unions or associations. The right to vote is now denied only to women in the Arabian peninsula, and since this right has become general, women's groups have assumed an electoral significance and have been recognised by the political authorities. In Egypt, the "Organisation of Arab Women" was formed by the female Minister of Social Affairs in 1962. In Syria, in 1968, the "General Union of Women" was directed by the Baʿth. The "Women's Union" was created by law in Libya in 1975 and in Irak the "General Federation of Iraki Women" is one of the organisations (munazzamāt) of the Baʿth party.

Trade unions and feminist activity have a value, but a general spread of education provides a much more favourable climate for female consciousness. Laws established after the achieving of independence have democratised education. The Declaration of Human Rights signed by the United Nations (art. 26) decreed that primary education should be free. Despite this, compulsory education is far from being generally accepted. Little schooling is available in the rural areas (in Morocco, Jordan, Irak and even Egypt, for example), but elsewhere only half the population of female school age reaches a primary school. In Saudi Arabia, the proportion is a third, with absolute segregation of the sexes (cf. Maqtubat-Madhkeb, Paris, Doc. française, no. 78 (Oct.-Dec. 1977); L'Islam, Doc. fr. photo. 27). The situation is the same in Iraq. The difficulty of creating and maintaining an insufficient number of schools and qualified teaching staff. There are added problems because families use their children to work in the fields, in small industries, or in the home to eke out their resources.

Even when they are given the chance of a place at school and they pursue their studies, girls are sub-consciously moulded by the cultural outlook fostered by the school and their view of the world is not necessarily different from that of their society, at least not until the final stages of secondary school. Official Syrian statistics for 1975 can act as a guide for the rest of the Arab world. In 1970, out of a population of 65,925 women who held certificates of primary education, 8,758 were pursuing an occupation other than that of housewife (13.4%); for vocational (secondary and technical levels combined) diploma holders, the figures were 7,176 out of 8,059 (89.03%); for higher education diploma holders it was 3,365 out of 4,482 (75.07%); and for doctorate holders it was 108 out of 151 (71.5%) most of whom came from the middle classes or were the wives of diplomats living abroad. Very often (in 38% of the cases), the women were working for relatives or private individuals without receiving any payment. In 1970, this was the situation for 64,088 of them. It is also interesting to compare figures for married and unmarried women in the same year; there were 1,067,073 married women and 515,751 single, divorced or widowed, but although there were nearly twice as many married women, the number of active unmarried women (71,996) was well over the number of active married ones (38,886).

Often women agree to sacrifice their career in order to respond to the wishes of a husband or family. Such behaviour cannot simply be explained as due to the state of her mind, but must be influenced by the almost complete lack of necessary social infrastructures like creches, canteens, etc. Pedagogic activity, therefore, cannot exist without educational activity, and they must complement each other. At the present time, there is insufficient integration of the different claims for equality of the sexes and for the liberation of women. Deep disturbances can be felt...
even in the socialist universities of Damascus and Mawsil concerning the actual segregation of women and concerning the wearing of the veil on the head or over the face. It has been an era of growing both legal and cultural, and also economic and political development, and any progress that has been achieved by the work of cultured women, heroines in the fight for freedom, and trade unionists have been followed by some unscrupulous steps backwards, even in the so-called progressive countries.

The struggle goes on in the Arab-Muslim world between the two groups, still called "integralist" or "fundamentalist" by some, "integrationist" and the liberals; old arguments have been rekindled. The rise of Muslim "integrationism" has been made possible by the new-found power of the ayatulislāh in Iran through the success of their revolution against the Shah's régime, and above all by their resistance against the unfortunate Irāk aggression. Even if the Arab-Muslim world accepts modern techniques in the hope of bettering its way of life, it still remains attached to the values and religious beliefs by which it hopes to preserve its identity. The threats and fulminations of the 'adāma' conservatives of Syria, Irāk, Egypt and Algeria exploit this religious attachment and encourage the observance of passivity and submissive attitudes in the societies concerned. This has led to a spectacular return to the very low status of women. In the "espirit courtois" of the syriac sources, as well as in the "integrationist" opposition. In Egypt, the law up to 8 January 1982) was still preserving the "family code" in Algeria maintains the legal inferiority of the woman: she is always considered a minor and must pass from the guardianship of her father to that of her husband, brother or uncle, or even to that of her eldest son. Polygamy and repudiation are allowed and any professional activity a woman undertakes must be sanctioned by her husband, as in Algeria (Le Monde, 14 February 1982). The project for a "family code" in Algeria maintains the legal inferiority of the woman: she is always considered a minor and must pass from the guardianship of her father to that of her husband, brother or uncle, or even to that of her eldest son. Polygamy and repudiation are allowed and any professional activity a woman undertakes must be sanctioned by her husband. In Kuwait, members of the assembly have refused to allow women the right to vote in February 1982, even though the Dean of the Faculty of Law at Kuwait University was a woman (Le Monde, 14 February 1982). The project for a "family code" in Algeria maintains the legal inferiority of the woman: she is always considered a minor and must pass from the guardianship of her father to that of her husband, brother or uncle, or even to that of her eldest son. Polygamy and repudiation are allowed and any professional activity a woman undertakes must be sanctioned by her husband.

Little is known about the customary status of woman in South Arabia before Islam. From the rich and varied material available, one could artificially bring into a unity an essentially disparate group of customs, which will then be treated with special care. It is even more important to remember that there is a serious gap in the material. Whereas the different sources all provide, by a sort of complicity between informants, information about the women of the North (the Bedouin), there is hardly any mention of the women of the South (sc. the Yemeni) ones, who have grown up in an environment appreciably different from that of Mecca or the desert, in religious texts, literature or ethnographic research work. Here and there references to customs which were fundamentally Bedouin. To identify the relics of the old matrilinear linguistic unity long before Islam. Furthermore, having identified the relics of the old matrilinear customs in particular tribes, he concluded that these customs which had survived until just before the Hijdra. The linguistic unity long before Islam. Furthermore, having identified the relics of the old matrilinear customs in particular tribes, he concluded that these customs which had survived until just before the Hijdra. The cultural and linguistic unity, which came much later than Robertson Smith suggested, would have followed the decline of the kingdoms of the South and the progress of desertification. The language of the North, close to but different from the South Arabian which it ended up by supplanting, finally imposed itself on the whole peninsula, spreading with itself the customs and manners of the desert.

Robertson Smith's serious error has finally led to a regrettable confusion. At the time of the Hijdra, Classical Arabic (that of the Qur'an) although not prevalent, was understood in almost all areas of Arabia. From this fact, he assumed that there was a linguistic unity long before Islam. Furthermore, having identified the relics of the old matrilinear customs in particular tribes, he concluded that these customs were prevalent in the whole of Arabia, without taking into account the question of migration.

What was the status of Arab women prior to Islam? It is quite clear from what has been said that the inhabitants of Southern Arabia (the "Southern Arabs") must be distinguished from those of the North. Even so, it is not necessary to agree with the genealogists who suggest a double lineage, Kahitani for the one and Madhun for the other, for they have merely translated into the language of their own particular discipline the ever-present rivalry between cultivators and pastoralists. Nonetheless, there were the well-established agricultural traditions of the southern Arab farmers. The Northern Arabs were traditionally dependent on a pastoral economy for their sustenance; they developed for themselves a distinctive nomadic civilization marked by the stamp of the desert. Research into the South Arabian area has proceeded, but there is still only fragmentary and inadequate information on many aspects of social life.

b. The status of the South Arabian woman

Little is known about the customary status of woman (♀ n t m r) in South Arabia before Islam.
In a recently discovered inscription, anyone of the Dhu Matara is forbidden to kill their daughter (Chr. Robin, *Mission archéologique et épigraphique française au Yémen du Nord et au Tihamah*, 1957, p. 110). The so-called harlots of Hadramawt, in their capacity of wād, always denote an inferior position of woman in pre-Islamic South Arabia, and it is similarly forbidden to hand over girls by way of reparation, which leads one to suppose that the man had control of the woman. As in other Semitic societies, so here it is probable that the husband regards his wife as a chattel. Some inscriptions group wives and possessions together (A. F. L. Beeston, *The position of woman in pre-Islamic South Arabia*, in *Proceedings of the 22nd Congress of Orientalists, Istanbul, 1951*, ii, Leiden 1957, 104). However, it would not be correct to infer from this that the wife was in a state of slavery.

In other inscriptions, it is stated that she had a rôle in questions of inheritance. Rhodokanakis even dared to suggest that in South Arabia, the women were financially independent. Beeston does not share this point of view, but he does admit that the widow could acquire economic independence in certain conditions, as, for example, when the male heir was too young to exercise his rights (Beeston, *op. cit.*, 105). He also draws attention to the fact that the woman could assume high office, especially that of priestess, a role in which she would have practised sacred prostitution (idem, *The so-called harlots of Hadramaut*, in *Oriens*, [1952]; cf. J. Ryckmans, *Les "heraldulinsisten" de Ma'āin et la colonisation mésardine*, [1952]). She also had access to high administrative offices. In one inscription, we find a woman with the title of maktawa, a senior official who came under the direct orders of the king. Could it be that a woman may even have held the office of the highest magistrature, as suggested by the legend of the Queen of Sheba? However, the inscriptions do not mention the name of any sovereign or kayla. Nevertheless, after the reëda, the Banū Mūsawiyā in the Hadramawt, who were called the royal Kinda, were ruled by four brothers as joint kings in association with their sister, the famous al-ʾAmarrada, who was a famous and despot as they (Ibn Hazm, *Djamlharr ansāḥ al-ʾArab*, Cairo 1962, 428).

Information provided by the inscriptions about the system of family relationships might well lead to confusion. In most cases, the line of descent is through the father. However, in every age there are isolated instances of descent through women. In one text there is even a case of both types of descent side-by-side (see the inscription on the statue in Chr. Robin, *L’Arabie du sud antique, in Bible et Terre Sainte*, 177 [Jan. 1976], 19). Two other inscriptions record a concession granted by a king to men and women of the same class. Now it seems that the transmission of the concession was made by the women to their descendants (Ahmed Fakhrī, *An archæological journey to Yemen*, ii, *Epigraphical texts*, Cairo 1952, inscrs. 3 and 76). In other inscriptions, women are mentioned only in terms of their lineage; even their ascendants are considered from the point of view of the female line. From there to the conclusion of the existence of a system of matriliny in South Arabia before Islam is one step; to prove it, it is another. One can even go so far as to affirm that polyandry may also have been known to the South Arabsians. The observations of Strabo already mentioned are relevant here, and certain scholars like Glaser, Winckler and more recently Müller, consider that the views of the Greek geographer have been confirmed by the inscriptions (for further discussion and bibliography, see J. Chelhod, *Du nouveau à propos du matrimonial arabe*, in *Arabica*, xxvii [1981], 99 ff.; Chr. Robin has drawn our attention to a Haseaean inscription where the line of descent is traced exclusively through women; it reads: “Burial place and tomb of Ḳḥbayy, daughter of Ḳḥayat, daughter of Shībaim, daughter of Ḳhāḏir, of the lineage of Yankhāl”). However, documents where this type of union is mentioned are rare so that it is wise to treat them with caution. On the other hand, it is clear that polygamy was practised in ancient Yemen and, according to Beeston, they even practised temporary marriage (*Temporary marriage in pre-Islamic South Arabia*, in *Arabian Studies*, iv [1978], 21-3).

The inscriptions so far discovered do not contain any reference to the existence of a system of maternal rights in ancient Yemen before Islam, but the discussion must necessarily remain open, for ethnographers have produced several examples of matrilineal succession in contemporary Yemen society. Some sexual freedom before and after marriage has also been noted as prevalent in some tribes in Yemen. This is no recent innovation but, as will be shown, has its roots in the past.

c. *The status of women in customary law in modern South Arabia.*

As a rule, the šarʿa governs the status of both men and women in the whole of South Arabia, with slight modifications in the case of South Yemen. Its successful application relies on the central government maintaining effective control. Outside the large urban societies of Sanʿāʾ, Taʾizz, Ḳadān, Sayʿūn, Shībaim, Ḳadma, etc., it is generally true that the semi-sedentary and village Yemenis observe customs which do not always conform to Islamic law. Girls are often disinherited and marriages are contracted by exchange. This customary practice is known as tāḥūl, or also ahām al-salaf. It is inspired by strongly-held desert values, and in accordance with Bedouin customs promotes an idea of honour among the Yemenis, related to the “whiteness of the face”.

The law decrees that woman should be completely submissive to the will of the man; father, brother, husband, uncle, paternal cousins, and even her own adult children. She is considered to be a feeble being, whose defence depends entirely on the man. In his eyes, she symbolises his own virility: every thoughtless action is interpreted by her strong protector as a challenge to his power, an outrage to his dignity. A whole mystique has grown up around the concept of honour which decrees that the modesty of the women whom he guards should be a sacred object. Any assault or attempted assault on their chastity is classed as murder and may be punished extremely severely. This is the conventional attitude to the love life of Yemeni women. Among the Humūn of the Hadramawt, however, despite her unfavourable position, the woman enjoys a certain amount of sexual liberty. Indeed, tradition even permits a girl to conceive a child outside marriage. If the child is not recognised by its natural father it will take the name of its mother or that of its maternal uncle. Even a married woman can take a lover without fear of her life and without the risk of being molested. A girl who wishes to take a lover would have to take him from among the people of her tribe. As a rule, the lucky man should exhibit all the physical and moral qualities which a woman would like to find in the father of her child. The aim of such a liaison is,
presumably, to produce an ideal child, but the custom is disappearing; it is called kasb or ikhtisāb. A similar type of union was known to the Arabs before Islam by exactly the same name. The Arabs were supposed to do this to raise children of pure Arab stock, so that the man who was to father the child should be especially good. There is some similarity between the two customs, but here it was the husband who asked the wife to have relations with another man, whereas among the Humūm it is the girl who takes the initiative. Within this tribe, as among the ancient Arabs, no one is at all embarrassed to announce the birth of a child conceived outside marriage. The child born this way is called al-farkh, “the chicken”, a harmless nickname which indicates the “illegitimate” nature of his birth, even if his father recognises him as his own. If he does not, he will take the name of his mother and be raised by her. She may subsequently be sought in marriage, and the intentions of her suitor will be judged by asking him if he will take her bi-hamili-hā wa-shamālikihā, “with her burden and her coat”. If he takes both mother and child, then the dowry would be more significant; but if he will take only the girl, the child will be brought up by her maternal uncles.

Custom likewise allows to Humūm married women the right to have affairs during the prolonged absence of their husbands; when a husband returns, he cannot inflict reprisals on the unfaithful spouse. He has the choice of accepting the situation or repudiating his wife. If he nevertheless ill-treats his wife, he risks legal proceedings by his parents-in-law, and this appears to be an old custom. According to Ibn al-Mudjawir, a woman among the Saru could take a lover called a makhfīf, “a replacement”, when her husband was on a journey. Ibn al-Mudjawir, Taʾrikh al-mustabsir, Leiden 1951-4, 26).

Whatever the cause of the trouble, the Humūm never punish an adulteress; but a woman who takes a lover while her husband is at home is severely condemned. Despite this, she is generally in a favourable position, for she can ask her husband to repudiate her so that she can start a new life, and he cannot deny her this privilege. As is necessary for the dowry and any wedding expenses to be returned. If she is repudiated at her own request, the unfaithful wife has no rights regarding her children; they will remain with their father and keep his name. Despite this freedom enjoyed by women in Humūm society, the family is patrilocal and patrilinear, as elsewhere in Yemen. How can these obviously matrilinear customs be reconciled with the prevailing patriarchal way of life? They seem to be the relics of a system of matrilinear rule which once was to some extent normal in South Arabia. It seems that neither virginity nor chastity was considered as important as modern Arabs unusually consider them. Ibn al-Mudjawir states that among the Bahmiyya, the “fiancée” was tried out by her suitor. If he was satisfied, he left his sandals behind at her father’s house and the marriage could then be settled; if he were to put them on when leaving the house, it meant that he did not want the girl (Ibn al-Mudjawir, op. cit., 54). The custom of giving a traveller a girl for the night goes back to the 3rd/9th century. The founder of the Zaydi state opposed certain sexual liberties practised in the village of al-Asām. It was situated in the high plateaus, and there a host would honour his guest by offering him his daughter or his sister after he had dressed her up in her most beautiful clothes. She would then be subjected to the most intimate caressing but not extreme sexual behaviour (C. van Arendonck, Les débuts de l’imamat zaydite au Yémen, 165). Similar observations were made by Ibn Mudjawir, but in his account the wife was offered to the traveller (Ibn al-Mudjawir, op. cit., 53). After fourteen centuries of Islam, it is only recently that a similar custom was observed in Yemen in the region of Mārib, though it is true that the guest there had made to respect his partner under the threat of reprisals (private investigation. Cf. K. al-Irājānī, L’organisation sociale de la tribu des Hashid, in COG, lxx [1968], 8).

This sexual liberty has ensured that sufficient scholarly attention has been paid to women in Yemen, and it seems that in some areas she has been able to impose her will on her husband. It is public knowledge among the Yemenis that in the Djabal Sabīr, the pleasant mountain overlooking Ta’izz, the village women rule the roost in financial matters. They have even gone so far as to send back lazy husbands. It is still only the man who has the right to repudiate, but he must nevertheless obey his wife’s commands. Among the Dhim in the region of the Djafl, a woman will put a piece of red cloth on the entrance to her tent when she is displeased with her husband. He knows from this that he is in disgrace, and does not dare to cross the threshold of his home until his wife has removed the sign of the quarrel with her own hand (A. Faqlī, al-Yaman maṣīḥa wa-bīh ruddhūrū, Cairo 1970, 110). A similar custom existed among the Tayy in pre-Islamic Arabia. To show Hātim that he should leave, Māwiyah simply moved the entrance to the tent (Aghānī, Beirut 1956, xvi, 207). She was thus mistress of her own fate, since she could separate at will from her husband when the latter displeased her. Among the ancient Arabs, a number of high-society ladies seem to have enjoyed the same privilege. There is, for example, the case of Sanūmah bint Amr from Medina, who belonged to the Nadījār, originally from Yemen. The chroniclers say that she agreed to marry her husband only on condition that she could leave him if she wished.

Other accounts confirm how common these matrilocal customs were. Ezēz, Botta’s guide, entered into a marriage contract, the principal clause of which stated that the woman could not follow the husband to his village (Botta, Relation d’un voyage dans le Yémen, Paris 1880, 125). According to Ibn Battūta, at ZabTd marriage to a stranger was freely accepted, but if the husband decided to leave the town the wife would not follow him under any circumstances (Ibn Battūta, Rihla, ii, 168). The child of such a marriage would be brought up by his mother or some other relative. Ibn al-Dayba of Zabīd, the Yemeni historian, was abandoned by his father in his infancy and entrusted to his maternal grandfather. When this relative died, the boy was looked after by his maternal uncle (Ibn al-Dayba, al-Fadl al-mazīd al-Aghānī, ed. J. Chelhod, San'a' 1983, 217).

When this discussion is analysed, the following facts emerge:
(a) A Yemeni woman is not required to follow a strict sexual morality, as is generally the case in the Arab East.
(b) The sexual freedom enjoyed by the women of the Humūm dates back to ancient times.
(c) In some tribes, the woman controls her own destiny, having the right to take a lover and to dismiss her husband.
(d) Children conceived apart from the husband belong to the maternal side of the family.
(e) Such matrilocal customs are still to be observed in some parts of Southern Arabia.

Although it cannot be assumed at all that South
Arabia exerted an influence on North Africa (Helfritz, *L'Arabe heureuse*, Paris 1961, 116), there are certain similarities between the customs described above and those observed in Kabylia. The Berber woman is generally known to enjoy more sexual freedom than the Arab woman, and many monographs have been devoted to describing her love life. Its luxuriance and diversity of customs make any attempt at synthesis problematical. Prenuptial chastity is certainly not expected of any girl, but once married they must be faithful to their husbands. But if they are freed from their marriage ties by widowhood, repudiation or the prolonged absence of the husband, they are allowed to take lovers. Their sexual freedom is even more marked than that of the Humûm. Many of them still work as prostitutes, and this is not thought in any way dishonourable. Many coutreurs belong to high-class families and subsequently end their lives with good marriage arrangements (E. Dermenghem, *Le pays d'Abel*, Paris 1960, 69). Children born of these temporary unions belong to the mother’s line.

When the life of the Yemeni woman is compared to that of her sister in the North, it seems very similar, except for the sexual freedom, limited in any case to certain districts, she enjoys. The Northern girl is also married by her father (before coming of age, even after her paternal cousin holds the right of preemption). She will not usually be consulted initially about her choice of husband; only after she has been widowed or divorced will she be free to reject a suitor. Analogies between her situation and that of the Bedouin women will be discussed later.

d. *The Arab woman in traditional law just before the Hijra* (during the first century of Islam).

The status of women in Western Arabia before the Hijra again raises the question of different customs in different areas. Clear differences in male attitudes can be detected, when comparing evidence from nomadic tribes, from the sedentary population, from a trading city or from a village community, even though at this particular time almost the whole peninsula was Bedouin in character. The word Bedouin clearly refers not only to the Arab of the steppe, al-ardâhi, but also to anyone who follows the desert customs and conforms to its code of honour. Poets like al-Akhtal and Djârir called themselves Bedouin (Aghdm, vii, 134), and from this point of view, just before the Hijra, the Meccans practised Bedouin customs.

Most of those Arab tribes which, by their nomadic and war-like life style set great store by their virility, consider that women are feeble and almost irresponsible beings and in need of constant help. At the same time, she embodies man’s ideals and is sometimes almost venerated as sacred. This ambivalence naturally leads to the paradoxical description of her as *awrâ* (LA, s.v. *awrâ*). The birth of a daughter was not welcomed at all, for women and obligations on men, and failure to observe them casts a slur on their honour. Female chastity together with conjugal fidelity, *inter alia*, constitute *qâri* (s.v. *qâri*). Licentiousness is severely condemned in Islam (Muslim, *Sâhih*, Cairo 1334, iv, 136), but nonetheless practised even to the present day.

The birth of a daughter was not welcomed at all, for families believed it could bring dishonour (Aghdn, iv, 248) or even poverty (Kur’dân, VI, 151; XVII, 31). Fathers sometimes buried their daughter alive, even though this custom was condemned in the Kur’dân (XVI, 58; LXXXI, 8). Among the Kuraysh, this custom was common, and they buried their daughters at a place called Abu Dulâma, a hill above Mecca (Aghdn, xi, 246). But for the most part, fathers seemed to accept the inevitable and to find consolation in counting up how much the infant girl would bring him in the future marriage of her brother (Aghdn, xvi, 245; *Kâhil* [s.v. *awrâ*] “excision” was practised everywhere. It is not certain whether this happened soon after birth or just before marriage, but if the latter, it can be seen as a rite of passage. The girl would be married when she was scarcely nubile, and often she was promised from birth; sometimes her father or brother would exchange her for a wife without spending any money. This type of union was known as *bikr* (LA, s.v. *shighdr*), this type of union was known as *bikr* (LA, s.v. *shighdr*), and even applied to married women. A man would repudiate his wife and exchange her for another man’s (Aghdn, xviii, 356). Marriage by exchange was forbidden in Islam (Muslim, *Sâhih*, Cairo 1334, iv, 136), but nonetheless practised even to the present day. This emphasises the lack of real concern shown for the girl’s own wishes, regarding her future partner. Her father, brother or guardian would draw up an agreement without even consulting her (Aghdn, x, 104; xix, 131-2, 275) which is not surprising considering how young she was when first married. *A‘ishâ was married to the Prophet at the age of six, and the marriage was consummated when she was nine* (Muslim, *Sâhih*, iv, 142). A widow or a divorced woman (*djaybîl*), not so much in demand as a virgin (*bikr*), would generally make her own arrangements. This was probably what happened when a woman offered herself to Muhammad (Kur’dân, XXX, 50); he declined the offer. The Kur’dânic reforms tried to protect the young girl when her parents refuse the right to be consulted (but see *Tâhir* in Suppl.).

Arab dictionaries use the same word *nikâh* to denote stable and temporary unions, which often do not last long and border on prostitution. According to *kâhil*, attributed to *A‘ishâ and recorded by al-Bukhârî, pre-Islamic society recognised four forms of marriage. (1) A man may marry the daughter or sister of another man on payment of a dowry. (2) A man asks his wife, after her menstruation, to have intercourse with someone he names so that she can have a child of good pedigree. He himself avoids all contact with her until her pregnancy is evident. (3) A group of less than ten men assemble at a woman’s house and all have intercourse with her. For the child which is subsequently born, the mother chooses one of the ten she prefers to be the official father. (4) A woman gives herself to any man as a prostitute. If she becomes pregnant, she

In fact, it would be unwise to make generalisations. Epinal’s picture of a humble Arab woman submissive to the wishes of her *ba‘l*, her lord and master, might well be the masculine ideal for a wife, but this is not the picture painted by our evidence. Many tales of the pre-Islamic and even the Islamic period show woman as a refined but mischievous creature, resisting supervision and enjoying sufficient freedom to enable her to embark on a few amorous adventures. The husband in the child sleeping peacefully in his mother’s bosom is the uncontested proof of this. We shall see later that, in sexual matters, traditional customs are not adhered to so rigidly as is often believed.

The birth of a daughter was not welcomed at all, for families believed it could bring dishonour (Aghdn, iv, 248) or even poverty (Kur’dân, VI, 151; XVII, 31). Fathers sometimes buried their daughter alive, even though this custom was condemned in the Kur’dân (XVI, 58; LXXXI, 8). Among the Kuraysh, this custom was common, and they buried their daughters at a place called Abu Dulâma, a hill above Mecca (Aghdn, xi, 246). But for the most part, fathers seemed to accept the inevitable and to find consolation in counting up how much the infant girl would bring him in the future marriage of her brother (Aghdn, xvi, 245; *Kâhil* [s.v. *awrâ*] “excision” was practised everywhere. It is not certain whether this happened soon after birth or just before marriage, but if the latter, it can be seen as a rite of passage. The girl would be married when she was scarcely nubile, and often she was promised from birth; sometimes her father or brother would exchange her for a wife without spending any money. This type of union was known as *bikr* (LA, s.v. *shighdr*), and even applied to married women. A man would repudiate his wife and exchange her for another man’s (Aghdn, xviii, 356). Marriage by exchange was forbidden in Islam (Muslim, *Sâhih*, Cairo 1334, iv, 136), but nonetheless practised even to the present day. This emphasises the lack of real concern shown for the girl’s own wishes, regarding her future partner. Her father, brother or guardian would draw up an agreement without even consulting her (Aghdn, x, 104; xix, 131-2, 275) which is not surprising considering how young she was when first married. *A‘ishâ was married to the Prophet at the age of six, and the marriage was consummated when she was nine* (Muslim, *Sâhih*, iv, 142). A widow or a divorced woman (*djaybîl*), not so much in demand as a virgin (*bikr*), would generally make her own arrangements. This was probably what happened when a woman offered herself to Muhammad (Kur’dân, XXX, 50); he declined the offer. The Kur’dânic reforms tried to protect the young girl when her parents refuse the right to be consulted (but see *Tâhir* in Suppl.).

Arab dictionaries use the same word *nikâh* to denote stable and temporary unions, which often do not last long and border on prostitution. According to *kâhil*, attributed to *A‘ishâ and recorded by al-Bukhârî, pre-Islamic society recognised four forms of marriage. (1) A man may marry the daughter or sister of another man on payment of a dowry. (2) A man asks his wife, after her menstruation, to have intercourse with someone he names so that she can have a child of good pedigree. He himself avoids all contact with her until her pregnancy is evident. (3) A group of less than ten men assemble at a woman’s house and all have intercourse with her. For the child which is subsequently born, the mother chooses one of the ten she prefers to be the official father. (4) A woman gives herself to any man as a prostitute. If she becomes pregnant, she confirms the pre-Islamic arrangements in everything touching her love life.
waits until the child is born and then consults a physiognomist to decide which of her clients is to be the father of the child. Once he has been selected, that man is his father by paternity. To those four types, others can now be added. (5) ṭabīḥu, a marriage by exchange described above. (6) nikaḥ al-mātik, a marriage to the father’s widow, which was prohibited by the Kurān (IV, 22). (7) nikaḥ al-mutʿa, temporary marriage, which was authorised at the beginning of Islam but forbidden by the sunna, apparently on the initiative of the caliph ‘Umar; tolerated however by the Shi’as. (8) nikaḥ al-dhun’ah, cousin marriage, which is also prohibited by the Kurān (IV, 25, 26).

On examination, the various types of ‘marriage’ listed show two different attitudes to the relationship. Types 1, 2, 5 and 6 clearly betray the influence of the patriarchal system. The woman is completely subjugated to the man and has apparently little freedom. He may use her as he wishes, even to the point of making her share another man’s bed; this is done either to honour the man or to raise a child of good stock. Moreover, he can ‘reserve for himself’ a close relation (a sister or a daughter for example), not to marry himself but to exchange for a wife. The domination of women by men in this family system is absolute, and it is nowhere illustrated better than in the Arab preferential marriage. Now as before, it occurs between a man and the daughter of his paternal uncle. The latter is entitled to a share of his freedom, and, not content to have his goods, wants to have his wife. He is therefore required only to pay a mahr [q.v.], for the dowry is paid by the deceased; or he can marry her off on condition that a new dowry is paid, which has now become synonymous with ‘wife’. Similarly ibn ‘amm means both paternal cousin and ‘husband’ (Aghānī, xv, 263, 275). The son of a father’s brother has by tradition a preeminent right over the daughter of his uncle. He is therefore required only to pay a symbolic dowry imposed by Islam. The madh [q.v.] recouped by the father-in-law is in inverse proportion to the degree of the relationship. Strangers to the tribe pay more than fellow tribesmen who are in an unfavourable position in regard to the khamila; the ibn ‘amm would be absolved from payment and could even compel his uncle to give him his daughter. More distant cousins were equally favoured, but could not press their demands. Nevertheless, this unwritten right is not absolute; the more sedentary the community, the more uncertain is the situation; there are many examples of an uncle refusing his nephew through greed. The fear of weak progeny is an equally common reason for advising against marriage to the ibn ‘amm. But the woman who is called to live in a strange tribe naturally evokes sympathy. She will be far away from her agnates, her natural protectors. Once relieved of the constraints imposed on her, the girl need no longer submit to the will of her cousin. When the poet al-Farazādak became the guardian of his ibn ‘amm Nawār, he had to devise a plan to get her to marry him after she had refused many times (Aghānī, xix, 12ff.).

Though the nomadic life, which condemns its followers to an indrawn existence, may favour endogamy, it does not explain a man’s domination of his ibn ‘amm. Robertson Smith likens this type of marriage to the right of inheritance. It is as though the woman forms part of the patrimony and many other customs confirm this point of view.

Marriage to the step-mother was quite widespread among the ancient Arabs. Al-Shahrastānī tells the story of three brothers who succeeded to their father’s widow. It was recorded in both Medina and Mecca, and can be connected with the levirate, which was known to the Arabs then and is known now. Greed was the main reason for marrying a father’s widow. The Kurān considered it an abominable practice (IV, 22), and contemporaries of Muhammad maligned anyone who resorted to it; they called him a dayyān, which means one who is callous to his father and, not content to have his goods, wants to have his wife as well. On this point the Kurān expressly says: “O you who have believed! You are forbidden to inherit wives against their wishes, or to prevent them marrying in order that you may appropriate from them a part of what you gave them” (IV, 19). Commentators have observed that when a man dies, leaving a widow, his heir covers her with his cloak to show the right he has over her. Having done this, he may either keep her for himself without spending any money, for the dowry was paid by the deceased; or he can marry her off on condition that a new dowry is paid, which will come to him. He can also prevent her from marrying until she has bought back her freedom with what she received from her husband; if she does not, she will remain in his possession until she dies, and he will become her heir. Such a greedy attitude is found not only in the son but in the other male agnate relations, especially when the deceased left behind very young daughters. Here again the Kurān (IV, 127) plainly refers to orphaned girls whose guardians refuse to give them what has been bequeathed to them; they would rather keep them in order to marry them or force them to buy their freedom. In the same way, the paternal cousin, who is the first claimant able to marry the girl without committing incest, tries to seize what will ultimately come to him by inheritance, even during the lifetime of his uncle. Al-Wāhīdī, in his commentary on verse six of the Sūra on Women, refers to this. A woman called Kubayyāh complained to Muhammad about the behaviour of her stepson who had inherited her; he did not support her financially, he did not cohabit with her nor would he grant her her freedom. Once they knew of her complaint, all the women of Medina searched for the Messenger of Allāh and told him, “All of us are in the same situation as Kubayyāh, except that the right to marry us is not inherited by our sons but by the children of our paternal uncles” (al-Wāhīdī, Aṣḥāb al-nuṣrāf, Cairo 1315, 108). Thus in the minds of the women of Medina, marriage to a parallel cousin was similar to that of a son to his father’s widow, sc. a right of succession. In neither case did the woman have any free will; at one time, she could belong to her husband’s heir, and at another to her father’s future heir.

All this raises the question of the status of the Arab woman regarding inheritance before Islam, a much-debated issue. It is generally thought that at Medina she was disinheritied for the same reason as children: “Only those who fight and defend property can inherit.” At Mecca. a trading town, the system of succession may have been more favourable, although the sources contradict each other. The words of the caliph ‘Umar are often quoted: “We Kurayışites dominate our wives; at Medina we find the men are dominated by their wives” (al-Bukhārī, Sāhīh, Cairo 1376, vii, 25). Obviously, the writer here is not concerned so much with the system of inheritance as with e.g. the behaviour of the women. It is difficult to imagine that a woman who behaves like a virago to her husband will display docility when her property is under attack. In any case, whether the woman was from Mecca or Medina, she would receive presents from her kāhid “friend”, her husband, and her relatives. She could even have a personal fortune and administer it as she pleased, as did Khadīja, who ran her own business. She might even receive part of the inheritance by will.
Many orientalists feel that the reforms introduced by the Qur'ān to help women were inspired by the system of inheritance used in Mecca; but that thesis has been challenged. We shall therefore assume that in several verses of the Qur'ān it clearly states that the woman, be she mother or wife, had wealth which on her death reverted to her husband or children (IV, 12, 37, 175). In the circumstances, the Qur'ān must only have recorded what was a known fact. It would be difficult to explain in any other way the compulsion brought to bear on a widow to make her buy back her freedom by giving up part or all of what she had received from her husband. Besides what money she could earn from her own work (weaving, husbandry, beauty care, singing and dancing), she had other opportunities to be materially independent, thanks to matrimonial customs approaching free unions.

The four other types of marriage mentioned above (types 3, 4, 7 and 8) could assure the woman of a more or less comfortable existence. They are rooted in a matrilineal conception of relationship, and assume that the woman enjoys a fairly large amount of sexual freedom. In a society founded on the code of honour of the desert, even prostitution would be interpreted as a sign of tolerance in sexual matters, since the woman could also engage in this activity for her life. Furthermore, she is able to take a khaban who pays for the services thus rendered by a sadak. Group marriage and mut'a also confirm the existence of matrilineal customs. In a temporary union, while still living within the group of relations, she grants her favour to a man and receives a payment in kind (a dress, a measure of dates or flour), and it lasts for a fixed time, usually three days (Muslim, Ṣāḥib, iv, 130 ff.). The texts say nothing about any child born of this union; probably he would belong to his mother's clan and take her name, as was the case with the child born to a prostitute. The famous Ziyād b. Abīhi [q.v.] was better known by the name Ibn Sumayya in Arab literature, and many men used their mother's name. One cannot for certain whether they were all born from cohabitation; it simply implies that the system of matriliney was well-known to the ancient Arabs. There are several examples: the king 'Amr b. Hind, the poets Sulayk b. Sufaka, Ibn al-Dumayna (Aghdni, xv, 350), Ibn al-Tahṣiryya (ibid. xv, 385), Ibn al-Haddāsiyya (ibid. xiii, 3), Ibn Dabba (ibid. vi, 307), etc.

Very many tribes have a woman as eponymous ancestor, such as the Āmila, Badjila, Khindif and Kayla. There are also numerous examples of matrilocality. The poet Ma'in b. Awṣ [q.v.] took advantage of a visit to Bṣra to marry a woman whose guest he was. He spent a year with her and then asked her permission to go back to his first wife (Aghdni, x, 352).

Whatever interpretation is put on these customs, they certainly show that the pre-Islamic Arab woman enjoyed much more freedom, even in sexual matters, than is generally supposed. Whenever the outcome of a battle seemed uncertain, the chief would place his daughter in a litter among the warriors in the hope that it would stimulate their excitement, and the prospect of such a marvellous reward would lead to victory. On the day of tālāk, the two daughters of Fīlād al-Zimmānī, like she-devils, undressed among the warriors and sang love songs to give them more courage (Aghdni, xx, 345). On the day of Uḥd, the same song was taken up by Hind bint 'Uṯba among the ranks of Kūra'ysh (Aghdni, x, 238).

It was the custom, especially for the tribes from the South, like the Kinda, the Ḍharm and the Banū ʿUḏhrā, to let a man speak to the girl he loved of his sentiments (e.g. Aghdni, vii, 218, 219, 234, 263). However, when the suitor pressed his claim, the girl's father, feeling a scandal, might ban him from the house and decline his offer of marriage. The most famous example is that of Tawba b. al-Ḥumayyir and Laylā al-Ākhyāyiyya [q.v.]. Imruʿ al-Ḳays celebrated his love affairs in his Mu'allaḳa. Al-_FARAZDĀK once surprised some girls bathing in a pool and exclaimed, 'By God! It's like the day of death!' (Aghdni, xix, 52). Men and women might meet on many occasions, in the pasture lands, at wells and even in the tents. A woman would converse with men and have guests when the master of the house was away. The big annual fairs, which served well for arranging marriages, were frequented by women, poesettes, trades-women, inquisitive women and those eager for a sexual relationship, whether regular, temporary or licentious. In the first century after the Hijra, while pursuing beauty, ʿUmar b. Abī Rabīʿa took advantage of the pilgrimage season to embark on some amorous adventures. On the question of the veil, see muḥājib. Not only could the pre-Islamic woman converse with men (cf. Aghdni, xix, 306) but by tradition she had the right to protect them. Fugitives from the ranks of the Banū Anṣār found sanctuary in the tent of Subayya b. Ḥassān al-Shams (ibid., 161). When harried and pressed and in danger of his life, the well-known yaʿtik Sulayk b. Sulaka sought refuge with a woman who belonged to his enemy's clan. Without hesitation, she defended him from his pursuers, covered him with her mantle and took up a sword to drive off those pursuing him; but, being outnumbered, she uncovered her hair and managed to get herself and others to the rescue. The fugitive thus escaped death (Aghdni, xviii, 320; cf. xx, 380 ff.).

However a man might behave himself towards his wives and female relatives, he expected strangers to show them the greatest respect. To cast a slur on a woman's honour was to throw down the gauntlet. Chroniclers say that the cause of the war of the Fitḏjar (Aghdni, x, 152) can be attributed to a joke in very bad taste. The victim of the joke was a woman of the Banū ʿĀmir who let herself be courted by the young men at the sīk of ʿUkaz.

There is considerable evidence of a considerate attitude to women, but nevertheless they did not escape the hazards of war with the risk of captivity. Her conqueror would rarely spare her the ultimate humiliation of making her grace his bed (Aghdni, xix, 340 ff.). Islam permits sexual relations with prisoners of war (Muslim, Ṣāḥib, iv, 158; 170; cf. Aghdni, xii, 370); married women are not excluded (Aghdni, xix, 25, supported by a verse of al-_FARAZDĀK); but pregnant women must not be approached (Muslim, iv, 161).

Even before Islam repudiation (tālāk) was known to the Arabs. A man could send away his wife simply by unilateral decision. All he had to do was to recruit the formula anti ṣāliḥa. Another formula, with incestuous overtones, lent more gravity to the situation, but it belonged to the zīhr and was forbidden by Islam (Kūrān, LVIII, 2). The man would say to his wife, anti ʿalayya ke-zahrī ummi, "To me you are like my mother's back". When the woman desired to separate, the man had recourse to ḥūl; he would agree to restore her freedom on condition that she gave him back all or most of the property he had given her (cf. Kūrān, II, 229); the arrangement by the rescuer (if provided the financial agreement is mutually acceptable). There were two other ways, rather more exiguous, by which a man could force a woman to
return to him what she had been given by him. The 
ild3 was a temporary interruption of the marriage and
could last for up to two years. The Kur‘an reduced the period to four months (II, 226). There was also the
‘adl, which was prohibited by the Kur‘an (IV. 9).
In the face of all this oppression the woman seemed helpless, yet there are records of women wanting to
safeguard their independence, who only agreed to marry if they were granted the right to leave their
husbands. Such women appear to have belonged to the higher social levels, and appear at Medina as well as at Mecca, among the sedentary communities as well as among the nomads. One cannot speak in this
connection of polyandry, but they certainly changed their husbands very frequently. Al-Maydání has
recorded the names of some of them, the most famous one being Umm Khāridja, who is said to have
married about forty times and whose hardiness in marriage became proverbial (Amthdl, proverb no. 1871, Cairo 1959, 1, 348; according to Ibn Habih, Mubahhar, 436, she married only about eight times).
Islam, it is true, allowed only men the right of
repetition, but the women of the Kuraysh aristocracy sometimes behaved like their independent sisters of the old régime. Because of their nobility, they were much in demand, and so they married many times; in this way, they were able to amass large fortunes and establish themselves as one of the better families of Mecca. This made it hard for their husbands (Aghani, xviii, 468). One of these women, the famous ʿAilha bint Talha [p. v.], even repudiated her husband by using the ancient formula of the zihār; she would not go back on her
oath until she was convinced that it was invalid (Aghani, x, 106).
In the pre-Islamic period, a widow would observe a delay before remarrying. When her husband died she
would be shut away, wear her oldest clothes and use no perfume. After a year, she would come out from
her place of withdrawal and throw a clod of mud. From that time onwards, she could lead a normal
life (al-Bukhari, Sabil, vii, 52). This period was shortened by Islam to four months and ten days (Kur‘an, II, 254), during which she might not use perfume or go out. When she received condolences, if she wished to remarry she remained seated; otherwise she
would stand (Aghani, x, 114).
These details have been given so that the status of
women during the period of the Hidjra can be understood in the light of tradition, but these customs
do not necessarily have any legal force. There are many problems still to be solved about the position of
women in traditional law, and the pre-Islamic material is too scanty to help in solving them. The
Kur‘an and the early fiqh accord a considerable part to traditional customs, but Islam also provided a new
outlook here by giving women a legal position, even though it is a diminished one, for she only counts as
half the value of a man. It is not clear whether this is
new legislation, or merely an adoption of old customs. Rather than waste time in conjecture, it seems worthwhile to study the behaviour of pre-Islamic Arab nomads.
Being Muslims, they have probably been influ-
enced by that faith, notably in regard to what concerns their personal status, even though its influence
may not be very deep. More than one modern custom is in direct contravention of the gharr. Woman is systematically disinherited and her evidence is often disregarded; marriage by exchange is frequently prac-
tised, and in blood revenge, equality is demanded. Clearly, the permanence of pre-Islamic customs here proves the lasting influence of the fighī. Traditional
rights are still decided this way in the Yemen. Not all
the pre-Islamic customs still thrive in Bedouin society, but the prevailing legal framework observed by them has been inspired by that tradition. They bear the mark of the desert, the same influence that has shaped all the Semitic nomads.
c. The legal status of Bedouin women.
The birth of a daughter is no cause for rejoicing. She is of so little account that if a Bedouin is asked how many children he has, he deliberately misses out the females. For the same reason, the strength of a tribe is measured purely by the number of warriors it
can muster.
A girl’s education is left entirely in the hands of her
mother. From the time she is able to be of the smallest service, she is made to help with the domestic chores. From infancy onwards, excision is practised; some-
times it occurs just before marriage, which can take place when the girl is very young, often before she is ten. This occasion is of great importance for the father, for it falls to him to fix the amount of the dowry which he generally keeps for himself. It usually happens that the girl, whose opinion is rarely sought, has been promised from birth to an agnate relative, notably to her first paternal cousin, who has a pre-
emptory right over her. He often uses this right and
abuses it, for he can carry off his bent “am” on the day she is married, and so take life for life from the culprit. If they catch him, he does not usually escape away. It is severely condemned in Bedouin society, even when it is done with a view to marriage. When it becomes known that a woman has been taken off, all the agnate relatives set off in pursuit of the culprit. If they catch him, he does not usually escape death, and the ravished woman may suffer the same fate. In fact, the treatment they each receive depends on the intentions of the abductor and the civil status of the woman he has taken.
A man who wishes to marry may encounter opposi-
tion from the girl’s parents, and so he may, with her consent, resort to abduction. Provided it is carried out in good taste, his actions are looked on somewhat indulgently, but it must take place in the presence of
a trustworthy witness who has been enlisted to help in the operation. He must guard the girl, bring her to a safe place until vouch for the fact that everything was conducted honourably. With such assurance on the father, the latter will usually give his consent but ask for a high dowry. If the abduction is followed by illicit sexual relations, the man and the girl will be punished with the same severity as lovers who are caught in the act. If the abduction has been carried out against the wishes of the girl, the action is treated as rape. The man must offer to make amends by marrying the girl, and considers himself lucky if it is accepted. A dowry will then be required of him equal to the price of her blood. In addition, he is required to offer in marriage a girl who is a close agnate relative to the father, brother or paternal cousin of his future wife without a dowry.

To abduct a married woman, even with her consent, brings severe disapproval from Bedouin society. It can lead to reprisals, often violent from the husband in the first place, but also, and above all, from the agnate relatives of the unhappy wife. Death awaits the lovers. They will escape their fate only if they can find refuge with some powerful person or influential leader. In order to save his guests, this person must bring the husband to recite the repudiation of his wife, and to allow the girl to remain in his possession. He will also have to offer his parents the consent to the marriage. The abductor in turn must give one or more girls in exchange for the wife.

If any woman is suspected of having an illicit sexual relationship, whether she is a girl or a married woman, widowed or divorced, she finds herself in great danger. If gossip about her continues, she runs the risk of being killed by a close agnatic relative. Absence of proof of the alleged misconduct is not regarded as proof of innocence. It is customary to exonerate her or to condemn her by adopting one of the following procedures. Her father or guardian may request that a court of justice summon her lover, about whom the rumours are circulating, and that they make him swear that the accusations being made against him are untrue. It is remarkable that the woman stays away from this judicial action, even though her life depends on it. Her presumed partner must stand before the judge, and it is he who must take the oath. Women are considered to be legally incapable, and so are seldom authorised to appear before a Bedouin court even as simple witnesses. Certainly, if it should happen that there are no male witnesses in a particular case, a judge might agree to hear a woman's evidence, but solely for his own information. A woman's evidence is only acceptable in law when it concerns another woman. A quicker way to judge a woman's guilt is by subjecting her to the ordeal of bugh'a. If the evidence according to this procedure is against her, it is not uncommon for her to be put to death by a close agnatic relative.

The reputation of a woman for whom he is responsible evokes an uncompromising attitude among the Bedouin. Abduction, adultery and rape all taint her honour, and their guilt can be washed away only by a blood-bath. But it always appears to be the woman who pays the price, and there is a quick, private system of justice to punish any girl who has compromised her reputation. Traditional Bedouin law relating to illicit love affairs is so complex that it is impossible to survey the main features briefly and accurately. Consideration must be given to the civil status of the woman or girl, whether she is married, widowed or divorced, her religious status, her connivance with or opposition to her ravisher, the resistance she displayed, the circumstances under which the crime occurred, and the time and place of the rape or attempted rape. It would obviously be tedious to dwell on these points. However, the culprits caught in the act are generally put to death. Their blood has been spilled, which means that the one exacting justice will not be pursued for that action and the dya will not have to be paid. The agnate relations may be less severe with a young girl who is seduced, and may let her off with her life, but the abductor must then marry her and must give a girl from his close family without asking for a dowry. He will also be forbidden to repudiate his wife because of these special circumstances.

It is probably unnecessary here to struggle through the labyrinthine procedure of the 'urf on matters of illicit love affairs, but two of the previously-mentioned points are worthy of note: the place and the time of the crime. It may have been committed near the camp at dusk after the flock had returned; or in grazing land when the shepherdess was naturally far away from her family. In the first case, the woman is described as 'akhirat al-sarh,' 'the one who returns behind the livestock' and she is entirely responsible for what has occurred. At that time of day, it is possible that the girl was being pursued by a sexual instinct. He who was so far from her house proves that she was conniving with her seducer. But if she was away at her place of work, then her guilt is somewhat lessened, but she must cry for help (hence the expression mutayyibat al-dahh 'the girl who cries in the morning'). She is therefore spared by her family.

In several places previously, we have mentioned that an illegitimate marriage must be exchanged for a near family, without a dowry, to a member of the injured family. This custom is sometimes observed in a case of murder, when the blood relative forgoes his right of vengeance and accepts a compromise. The wergeld that the family of a murderer must give as compensation may include a young girl, called a ghara in these circumstances. She must be a virgin, white and free. She is given in marriage without mahr to a near relative of the victim, and is reduced in effect to a state of semi-slavery. Although she is legally united to the man whose life she shares, she is not completely granted the status of a wife. She is liable to all the oppressions that a husband metes out to his womenfolk and endures his ill-treatment without being able to have recourse to the protection of her family. The most she can do is to seek refuge with an influential person and ask for his help. Her role is to correct the wrong inflicted on the injured family, by giving birth to a male child to replace the deceased. When the boy is old enough to bear arms, her mission is completed. At that time she ceases to be a ghara, a servant, and becomes barra, free. She can leave her husband, who has no further right over her; if he tries to keep her he must pay the dowry. She is not thought of as belonging permanently to the man who takes her, but is handed over by her family against a guarantee that she will be returned to them when she has finished her task. Even when the conditions of a woman's marriage are perfectly normal, she is still legally dependent on her own family. It is their responsibility to defend her, and it also falls on them in the end to avenge her blood.

One point of interest here is often passed over in silence, but deserves to be mentioned. Although by marriage a woman must be entirely submissive to her new master's will and must follow him and live together with him, for all that, she is not his property.
She is like a precious investment placed in his hands and which is entirely at his disposal. He may rebuke her, he may even hit her, but he is not allowed to injure her or attempt to take her life, for he is answerable to his parent-in-law for his conduct. He is perfectly within his rights to kill her if he actually catches her in the act of adultery, but then he may not ask for the return of the dowry he has paid. He would be entitled to a return of the dowry if he simply repudiated her, and he would then leave her relatives to wash away their shame in the culprit’s blood.

The married woman depends, legally speaking, on her own family in most situations. It falls to her father, brother, uncle or paternal cousin to chastise her if she is at fault, and to avenge her blood if she is a victim of murder. Unless the husband is also the paternal cousin, he must restrain himself from any violent action and be content to have the dowry paid back to him.

The Bedouin woman is not handed over defenseless to the despotic rule of her husband. It is even probable that she often exerts a good influence on him. In his absence, she may offer hospitality and shelter to a fugitive. Even if her natural defenders, her agnatic close relatives, disappear or are at a distance, she is not left entirely without defence. If she is ill-treated by her husband she can put herself in the protection of a distinguished person as a dakhila, a refugee. It is then up to her husband to ask her if she will resume married life. To do this, he arranges a delegation of at least three witnesses to inform her of his wishes. This procedure can be repeated three times. If, despite his insistence, his wife remains obstinate in her refusal the husband then has the right not to support her financially any more, if he does not want to dissolve the marriage. If he does not make any of these customary approaches, a Bedouin court can condemn him to pay his wife substantial financial compensation.

The dissolution of a marriage contract may occur in two different ways: repudiation or widowhood. Only the man has the right to divorce his spouse. If he does this without an adequate motive, he cannot reclaim the dowry, as custom enables him to if the fault is the wife’s. This financial aspect to marriage plays an important role when the woman seeks to regain her independence and her husband refuses to recite the liberating formula on his own. There is, however, one circumstance where he is obliged to grant her her freedom, sc. in the case of his impotency. Since a woman’s legal incapacity forbids her to appear before a law court, a relative representing her brings the action against her husband. The latter then has the right to only one-half of the dowry he paid. The divorced woman, like the widow, must observe a period of restraint before remarrying. The 'idda for the Jordanian Bedouin is normally one hundred nights, but often the woman is put back into circulation before the expiry of the minimal legal delay, for she is considered a source of wealth.

Like repudiation, widowhood grants a woman some freedom in her choice of further husband. She may return to her own family, leaving behind all the property left by her husband, or she may stay with her husband’s family and her children. If she is of remarriageable age, the dead man’s brother may marry her. But if the widow has the role of guardian according to the wishes of the de cujus, in which case she cannot also receive his paternal home nor remarry. It is her responsibility to remain at home looking after the children and ensuring the prosperity which she inherited and which will pass to them when they attain the age of majority. Since remarriage is unavailable, she may ensure that she enjoys a normal sexual life by taking a zawjd musarrib “visiting husband”. This type of union is very rare and runs counter to the principle of patriarchy on which Bedouin society is built. Instead of following her new partner, the widow receives him at her house almost as a guest. Whether the man is married or single, he must have his own home to which he returns after visiting her. In this way, the woman retains her freedom since she can dismiss her visiting husband if she no longer wants him. However, it is still he who has the right of repudiation. This is one of the very rare times that a Bedouin woman enjoys much economic independence.

The ‘urf is very strict with women in financial matters. It especially disregards the teaching of the Kur'an which decrees that a daughter shall inherit exactly half the portion inherited by a son. It says that the only people who are allowed to inherit are the agnate males. On the father’s death, the sons possess the property. The heirs must first attend to the needs of the mother and the widows of the deceased.

Daughters are in their brother’s care until their marriage. They must also help their sister both financially and morally if she is divorced, widowed or ill-treated. In return for these services, not only do these brothers exclude them from the inheritance but they also keep their dowries and exchange their sisters when they barter for wives. Custom is no more favourable to daughters in the case of a subsequent inheritance from the mother’s side. No matter how important the total, they receive only the jewelry and the clothes. Even if the price of their mother’s blood is involved, they do not receive anything more.

The problem of the diya for the murder of a woman brings many related complexities. From a purely formal point of view, the ‘urf decrees that a woman’s blood is worth half of a man’s. It is exactly the diya of an unemancipated slave. In reality, this applies when the murder was committed by a person of the same sex or when it happened purely by accident and not as the result of war or raid. A complete diya is required when a woman is unfortunately hit by a stray bullet or in a brawl between two women. Contrarily, in the case of a man, the blood money can in effect quadruple in nominal value, i.e. double that for a man, when the death follows a struggle with a man, even if that man was only defending himself. If a woman dies at or after an attempted rape, the diya becomes from eight to twelve times its original value. In addition, the ‘urf makes a subtle distinction between a single and a married woman. In the latter case, it seeks to establish whether she is pregnant or not. If her pregnancy is confirmed, the sex of the foetus must be determined. Whatever the cause of death, a pregnant woman counts as two people. The culprit will have to pay either the diya for two women or for a man and a woman; of course, the case can be made worse depending on the circumstances and prevailing conditions at the time of the crime.

In conclusion, two comments should be made on the legal status of the Bedouin woman. First, it would be erroneous to pretend that the situation is the same for all the desert Arabs. Customs more or less local may vary, and important variations may be seen from one region to another. But there is good reason to suppose that these variations reflect differences in the letter of the traditional law rather than in its spirit, the perpetuity of the law being firmly guaranteed by its environment. The ‘urf represents one kind of mentality, that of the nomadic Semite, and there are
many similar customs to those described above attested among the ancient Hebrew nomads. Secondly, it would be equally wrong to suggest that this law, even though not enshrined in any written form, is as alive today to the extent it was at the opening of this century. The evolutionary process, less or more active according to the different regions, seems to develop in two directions. There is a marked return to the 'urf, and many persons have tried to prove, in a contradictory fashion, that there is no break in the continuity of tradition between 'urf and sharī'a. On the other hand, central governments have, in a rather more discreet manner, endeavoured to move towards a more modern conception of justice to accord with the general trends in the country. Despite all this pressure, there appears to be a part of sharī'a which seems secure against all modern reforms: that of whiteness of the face, honour and which in its essence is symbolized by woman.


3. In Persia. a. Before 1900. The following will not be concerned with the legal position of women—this has been discussed above in sections 1 and 2—but will focus on their position and role in society. The sources are meagre. Women did not normally leave written accounts of their lives. We know their roles and motives and characters from their own accounts, and it is not to be expected that others should write of them except in very general terms. So far as women are mentioned, they belong for the most part either to the ruling classes or to those who are believed to have made some contribution to the religious life of the community. Among the latter are women of the family of the Prophet and saints. Their lives are recorded in biographical dictionaries and hagiographical works. Their characters are seldom delineated in any but the broadest terms, and the virtues ascribed to them are usually characteristic Islamic virtues. This is to some extent true of the women of the ruling class also. They are mentioned in histories and chronicles because they either played a prominent part in events as regents or in some other capacity and because marriage alliances were an important element in state policy. Women of the middle and lower classes were seldom associated in history, and peasant women are virtually ignored. Much incidental information on women is, however, to be found in the historical literature of the 5th-8th/11th-14th centuries. The anonymous Tarikh-i Shah-i Kirdan written in the 7th/13th century (ed. Muhammad Ibrahim Bastani Pariisi, Tehran Shahin- shahi, 1335/1976-7), and the Sekil-i ult of Nasir al- Din Mungi, written between 715/1315-16 and 720/1320-1 (ed. Abd al-Ikhb, Tehran AHS 1327/1949-50) contain lively accounts of the women of the Kirdan (Kutlugh-Khânîd) dynasty of Kirman, and the Darâmî al-tawârîsh of Rashid al-Dîn Fadl Allah gives much information on the women of the Ilkhanîd family. The sources for the later centuries are less rich, until the 19th century, when there are several important works which give a picture of the activities of women of the ruling class, notably the Tarikh-i 'Adudi of Sulân Ahmad Mirzâ 'Adud al-Dawla b. Fath 'Ali Shah (ed. Abd al-Husayn Navâ'î, Tehran Shahinshahi, 2335/1976-7) Yaddâgîh-ye az zindagi-i manzûs-i Nâsir al-Dîn Shah by Dast 'Ali Mu'ayyir al-Mâmâlik, which grew up as a page in the Kirdan court (Tehran n.d.); and vol. i of Sutâni az zindagi-i man by 'Abd Allah Mustawfi (3 vols., Tehran AHS 1324/1945-6), which gives an intimate picture of life in an upper class family in Tehran; while Taj al-Saltana, the daughter of Nâsir al-Dîn Shah, who was born in 1301/1883-4, wrote an autobiography entitled Khâtirât-i Taj al-Saltana in 1343/1924-5) (ed. Mansûra Ithîhâdiyya and Sirîs Sa'dîwandîyân, Tehran AHS 1361/1982). From the 16th/16th century onwards, Persian sources are supplemented by the accounts of European travellers. These, by the nature of things, are the accounts of outsiders, but as inter-course increased in the 19th century and European women began to come to Persia, the information on the position of women and their daily life becomes fuller. At all periods, there was a difference between townswomen, peasant women and tribal women. The general consensus of the settled population was against the participation of women in public affairs. Townspeople were secluded and played no part in public life; and little is revealed of their influence in family affairs. All houses, other than those of the very poor, were divided into the women's apartments, the andarun, public apartments, the hiran, where business was transacted and male guests entertained. In the richer households, it was customary for eunuchs and female slaves to be employed in the andarun. Peasant women worked in the fields. They did not, however, usually appear unveiled in public before the opposite sex.

In tribal society, great weight was given to the bond of blood relationship, and the woman's role in establishing this was of great, perhaps paramount, importance. Marriage alliances consolidated tribal federations and marked the entry of new tribes into existing federations. The exchange of women was also a method of terminating blood feuds. The nature of tribal society was such that women enjoyed a status and function which was, on the whole, denied to them in settled society. Tribeswomen did not normally veil. They played an active part in the daily life of the tribe and often in the management of tribal affairs (cf. Sir John Malcolm, Sketches of Persia, London 1845, 154-5).

In all classes and sectors of society, child marriage and the marriage of cousins were normal practice.

Encyclopaedia of Islam, VI
Among the richer classes, polygamy was common. Rivalry between the inmates of the haram to secure favour for their own sons was of frequent occurrence. Remarriage of widows and divorced women was also common [see mut'a and nikah].

With the rise of the Saljukids [q.v.] in the 5th/11th century, women of the ruling class began to play a more active role in political life. The reason for this is probably to be sought in their Turcic tribal background, even though the Saljukids were to some extent separated from this once they had become the rulers of an empire. From the time of Toghril Beg onwards, marriage alliances with local ruling families became common and with the caliphate was an important aspect of Saljuk policy. This was also true of the succession states. The sons of Saljuk mothers do not appear to have had precedence over the sons of other wives, nor, in general do the sons of free women appear to have had precedence over the sons of slave women or concubines. Some of the wives of the sultans had their own amirs and establishments; some held abdo's [q.v.] and landed property; and some disposed of considerable wealth. The office of wasir to the wife of the sultan was sometimes a stepping-stone to an important office under the sultan. Several "royal" women played a prominent part in public life. Toghril Beg is reported to have consulted his chief wife Atun Qdah in affairs. Sibt b. al-Djawzi states that she was a regress of the Ilkhan and given to charitable works, of good judgement and firm determination (Mir'ai al-zamàn, ed. Ali Sevim, Ankara 1968, 75; cf. also Ibn al-Djawzi, -Muntazam, Haydarabadd, Deccan 1938-40, viii, 218). Terken Khät'un, the chief wife of Malikgäh, was a masterful and ambitious woman. She and Zubayda Khät'un, another of Malikshâh's wives, vied with each other in order to secure the succession of their respective sons after the death of Malikgäh. The former appears to have had a sizeable force of military slaves at her disposal.

Some of the wives of the amirs and atabegs were also prominent women of the ruling class. The Ilkhanids, for the most part, appear to have taken their wives from the Mongols, tribes and through them to have retained their links with the Mongols in Central Asia and China. They also concluded marriage alliances with local ruling families, whose daughters they took into their harams. Such alliances had benefits for both parties: the local rulers assured their own positions, even if only temporarily, while the Ilkhanids were able through such unions to bring outlying provinces more closely under their control. But while local women were taken into the establishments of the Ilkhanids, women of the Ilkhanid family and of Mongol nobility are seldom recorded as having been given to local rulers. The women of defeated enemies, so far as they escaped massacre, were regarded as part of the booty and were taken into the establishment of the Mongol princes and army commanders.

The wives and daughters of the Ilkhanids and Mongol princes enjoyed a privileged position vis-à-vis the rest of society. They received a share of the booty and took part in the kurultays [q.v.] held to acclaim or appoint a new Ilkhan. Many of them accumulated great wealth. Ögedei's chief wife Torgene and Guïyk's chief wife both acted as regent on the death of their husbands. Sultana Kamkâh Toghril, who was married to the Ilkhan Hulegu, was put on the throne with the help of Shaykh Hasan, the grandson of the Amir Öçan, in 799/1338-9, on the grounds that the right of the throne was hers since no male member of the house of Hulegu remained. In fact, however, the kingdom passed to the Öçanids and the Öçali tribes. In spite of the prestige and authority enjoyed by the women of the Ilkhanid house, their freedom was limited by custom and their position was, in many respects, one of subjection. On the death of an Ilkhan, his wife passed to his successor or to one of his uncles, brothers or sons. If accused of plotting against the Ilkhan or of some other misdeemour, Ilkhanid women were not immune from trial by yargh [q.v.], the bastinado and even execution, whether guilty of the crime of which they were accused or not.

The senior wives of the Ilkhanids had their own ords. Junior wives were often placed in the ordu of a senior wife. Imperial concubines were distributed among the ordu of the Ilkhanid's wife. Some were in due course promoted to the status of a "full" wife. On the death (or disgrace) of their wives, the Ilkhan would remarry with a daughter of his emirs or of his ordu, and it proved difficult to determine exactly the composition and size
of the ordus of the Mongol princesses. By the time of Ghazan, many of them were large and powerful establishments. The Mongol princesses also sought to bring the ordus of the princesses under their control and to use their revenues for military and other expenditure (see further Lambton, Continuity and change in medieval Persia: aspects of administrative, economic and social history 5th/11th to 8th/14th century, forthcoming; Spuler, Die Mongolen in Iran, Berlin 1968; see index under Frans; Shirin Bayangi, Zan dar Iran-i 'Ushdi-i Maghul, Tehran AHS 1352/1974).

The position of women under the Timurids resembled in many ways their position in the Ilkhanate. Timur himself seems to have chosen wives mainly of Mongol origin for himself and his family (H. Hookham, Tamburlaine the conqueror, London 1962, 72). They had their own quarters in the royal camp (Clavijo: embassy to Tamerlane, tr. G. Le Strange, London 1928, 242-3, 268, 271). They appeared in public at royal feasts and on occasion gave banquets themselves, at which they appeared only lightly veiled before their male and female guests (ibid., 237, 244 ff., 275; cf. also Mu'in al-Din Natanz's account of a great feast given by Timur in 806/1403-4 at which women were present, Mantaddab al-tawarikh ed. J. Aubin, Tehran AHS 1334/1956, 398 ff.).

Under the Kara Koyunlu and Ak Koyunlu, women of the ruling class continued to play an influential role, especially through the establishment of kinship links (see J. E. Woods, The Aygunylu: clan, confederation, empire, Minneapolis and Chicago 1976). Marriage alliances in the early Safavid period also were an important means of consolidating the ruler's influence. Tahmasp was allied in this way with powerful amirs and local rulers (see Iskander Munshi, A'tlamara-yi 'Abbas'i, Tehran AHS 1334/1956, 2 vols., i, 125 ff., for mention of his wives); his sister was married to the religious leader, Islam Shâh Ni'mat Allâh Yazdi, and a daughter of this union was married to Tahmasp's son, Ismâlî Mirzâ (ibid., 132). Zaynab Begum, one of Tahmasp's daughters, whose mother was a Georgian woman, was, according to Iskander Munshi, highly intelligent and acquired great influence with 'Abbas I, into whose harem she passed. She was known for many charitable works and benefactions (ibid., 135). Pari Khân Khânâm, another of Tahmasp's daughters, played an influential part on her father's death in promoting the accession of Ismâlî Mirzâ. After his accession, she fell from favour, but after his death, on the accession of Muhammad Mirzâ, she exercised great influence in the government of the country. Great rivalry existed between her and Muhammad Shâh's wife, Mahdî Awiâyâ? Khâyir al-Nisâ? Begum. Pari Khân Khânâm's high handed behaviour aroused the enmity of the Kizilbash amirs and she was eventually murdered by them. Khâyir al-Nisâ? Begum then took upon herself the government of affairs because of her husband's defective eyesight. She too was murdered by the Kizilbash amirs, who resented her interference (see ibid., index under Pari Khân Khânâm and Mahdî Awiâyâ? Khâyir al-Nisâ? Begum, and Mahmûd b. Hidayat Allah Afuhaqâ; Nânakâvit al-âshrâ', ed. Isbân Ihsânî, Tehran AHS 1350/1971-2, 21, 72, 250). Khadija, another of Tahmasp's daughters, was married to Dâmghân b. Sultan Ahmad, the rival of Biya'i Pas in Gilân (see 'Abd al-Fattâh Fumini, Tarikh-i Gilân ed. M. Sotoodeh, Tehran AHS 1349/1970, 51-6).

As the Safavids moved away from their tribal background, the influence of their women was increasingly confined to harem intrigues. Already under Tahmâsp, large numbers of concubines and slaves, especially Georgians and Circassians, were introduced into the royal harem. This trend continued, and with it the power of the eunuchs of the palace greatly increased. The general deterioration in the position and status of the royal women in all probability spread among other ranks of society also (cf. Jean-Baptiste Tavernier, Voyages en Perse, Geneva 1970, 282-4; Du Mans, Estat de la Perse, Paris 1890, repr., 1969, 27-5; Chardin, Sir John Chandos travels in Persia, with an introduction by Brig. General Sir Percy Sykes, London 1927, 222). The status of the mother appears to have had little influence on the choice of the wa'idh. The mother of the shah was the most important lady in the harem; after her came the shah's wives and then his favourite concubines (E. Kaempfer, Am Hofe des persischen Groischen 1684-1685, tr. W. Hinz, Tübingen and Basel 1977, 232). When the ladies of the royal harem went out, the district through which they were to pass was declared tmruk (a reserve), and those who inadvertently strayed into the road were beaten and sometimes done to death by guards and eunuchs (cf. Tavernier, op. cit., 284; Du Mans, op. cit., 95-6; Chardin, The coronation of Soylamy the III, published with The travels of Sir John Chandos into Persia under the reign of Tahmasp, and the travels of Monsieur de Thevenot into the Levant, London 1687, repr. 1971, pt. 2, 99). The practice of tmruk continued in a modified form under the Kâdgârs. Males were expected to turn their faces to the wall when the royal women passed by (see Curzon, Persia, 2 vols., London 1892, i, 404).

The accession of Shâh Sultan Husayn (1105/1694-1722), the last of the Safawids, was largely secured by his great aunt Maryam Begum, a masterful lady who exercised great influence. The shah took an inordinate pride in his harem, the scale and magnificence of which became a drain on the treasury. It was not uncommon for beautiful women to be seized by his officers and sent to his harem, as they had been in the reign of his predecessor, Shâh Sulayman (1101-17), who ordered the fall of the Safavid dynasty and the Afghan occupation of Persia, Cambridge 1938, 36, 41, 47-8). Muhammad Hâghim A'ash Rustam al-Hukamâ alleges that there were nearly 1,000 beautiful girls of varying provenance in Shâh Sultan Husayn's harem (Rustam al-tawarikh, ed. Muhammad Muşhirî, Tehran AHS 1348/1969-70, 70-1).

Akâ Muhammad Khân (1193-1211/1779-97), the first of the Kâdgârs, took the daughters and women of defeated enemies and rebels into the royal harem as hostages to lessen the likelihood of rebellion and to consolidate his rule. He also sought to heal the breach which had occurred between the Koyunlu branch of the Kâdgâr tribe, to which he himself belonged, and the Develu branch, by the marriage of his nephew and successor Fath 'Ali to the daughter of Fath 'Ali Khân Develu [see KADJAR]. On one occasion, when Akâ Muhammad Khân, was absent from Tehran, it was arranged that his sister should receive an envoy from one of the khans of Turkistan, sitting behind a curtain to do so. This, however, gave great offence to the head of the Afsâr tribe, either because of its supposed impropriety or because he had not been consulted (Mustawfi, op. cit., i, 23-4).

From the reign of Fath 'Ali Shâh onwards, there was a great increase in the size and expenses of the royal harem, the numbers in the various sections of the eunuchs employed in the palace ('Adud al-Dawla, op. cit., 54 ff. See also Malcolm, Sketches of Persia, 220; J. AL-MAR}
Morier, A journey through Persia, Armenia, and Asia Minor to Constantinople, in the years 1808 and 1809, London 1812, 225, 259; Mustawfi, op. cit., i, 40-1. Mu'ayyir al-Mamalik mentions the imprisonment of Nāşir al-Dīn Shāh (1848-96) at over 3,000; when the shah moved to summer quarters in the hills near Tehran, he was accompanied by a vast cavalcade (Yādaḵāt-hār-e ʿaz zindagānī-i khashyāt-i Nāṣir al-Dīn Shāh, 106, 127. See also Docteur Feuvrier, Trois ans à la cour de Perse, Paris 1906, 142). Fath ʿAli apparently abandoned the practice of reigning the princes in his audience according to the hierarchy of the royal harem and the rivalries of the royal ladies (Tūrīḵ-e ʿAdudī, 12 ff. Cf. also Malcolm, History of Persia, 2 vols., London 1829, ii, 394, 396; Morier, op. cit., 369. See also the introduction by ʿAbbās ʿĪblāṭ to Shāh-i hāl-i ʿAbbās Mīrzā Mulk-Ārā, ed. ʿAbd al-Husayn Nawāṭ, Tehran AHS 1243-4 (1827-8), and the jealousy and rivalry between the mother of Nāṣir al-Dīn Shāh and the mother of his half-brother Mulk-Ārā.

The female establishment of Fath ʿAli Shāh is in some ways reminiscent of that of the ʿIlkhāns. One of his wives, the daughter of Imām Kūli Kān ʿAfšār Urūmi, gave Fath ʿAli several of her serving maids with appropriate outfits and in due course they bore him children (ʿAdud al-Dawla, op. cit., 15). Lady Shīlī relates how one of the wives of Muhammad Shāh, when he was still ʿāmil ʿashr, bought a Circassian slave-girl as a present for her husband (Glimpses of life and manners in Persia, London 1856, 203-4). Several of Fath ʿAli Shāh’s wives were very rich and had their separate establishments outside and independent of the royal harem, notably Šādī al-Dawla Tāwūs ʿAbduʾl-Karim ʿIṣlāḥī (484), Nātyr al-Dawla (op. cit., 18-19) and Diyāʾ al-Saltāna. The latter’s mother, Maryām Kānānum, was a Jewess. She had been in the harem of ʿĀqā Muḥammad Kān, and after his death was married to Fath ʿAli. Diyāʾ al-Saltāna was a good calligrapher and copied many books of prayers and ziyārat-nāmas. She enjoyed Fath ʿAli’s confidence, and during his lifetime remained unmarried. She often acted as his scribe and wrote his secret letters (ibid., 25). Another of Fath ʿAli’s wives, Sunbul Kānānum, was among the prisoners taken by ʿĀqā Muḥammad Kān during his Kirmān campaign. She enjoyed great favour with Fath ʿAli, and repeatedly interceded with him for the subjects (ibid., 20). Her daughter, Husn Dāhān Kānānum, was a poetess and a ʿūṣīfī. She was married to Amān ʿAlāʾ Kān, the governor of Kūrdistān, and for several years exercised great authority in that province (ibid., 67). Another of Fath ʿAli Shāh’s daughters, Zubayda, who was married to ʿĀli Kān ʿNuṣrat al-Mulk Kārā Gūzūlā, was also a ʿūṣīfī. She lived for many years in Hamadān, where she enjoyed great authority. She went on the pilgrimage and made several visits to shrines in ʿIrāq and Māshhād. She gave many gifts to the poor, ʿayyāb, and mullaṣ, and was noted for her charitable benefactions. Every year, she set aside a sum for her personal expenditure, and for the poor and orphans (ibid., 30-2). Badr-i Dāhān Kānānum, the mother of Fath ʿAli Shāh’s sons Hasan ʿĀli and Huṣayn ʿĀli, the former of whom became governor of Fārs and the latter governor of Tehrān, lived principally in Šīrāz, where she exercised great influence. She interfered in the administration of affairs and enriched her family greatly by commerce and monopolies. She was believed to have made a corner in corn with an accomplice in ca. 1810. Nevertheless, she was reputed to be charitable to the poor and ready to do justice for the oppressed. From time to time, she negotiated a visit to the capital, for which she was generally obliged to make an advance in a considerable present to the king, who then permitted her to return and reside with him as a wife (Morier, A second journey through Persia, Armenia, and Asia Minor to Constantinople, 1810-16, London 1818, 61; idem, A journey through Persia ... in the years 1808 and 1809, 154-5).

Mustawfi describes in detail the harem-khana of Nāṣir al-Dīn Shāh and the discipline exercised in it (op. cit., i, 510 ff.). Nāṣir al-Dīn Shāh’s mother, who presided over it, was a capable woman. She was a granddaughter of Fath ʿAli Shāh; her father was Muḥammad Kāsim Khān b. Sulaymān Kāḏar (see Mu’ayyir al-Mamālik, 172-6; Sheil, op. cit., 9). Munir al-Dawla, one of Nāṣir al-Dīn Shāh’s wives, used to hold a feast for women in Tehran on the birth-day of Fāṭima, after her son Kāmān Mīrzā ʿAlī b. Pir ʿAbbās al-Saltāna became governor of the city in 1277/1860-1, (Abu Ḥasan Buzurg ʿUmd, Az màst khār marṣ, Tehran ASH 1335/1957, 79). On the occasion of Nāṣir al-Dīn’s first journey to Europe, which took place in 1873, it was finally agreed that only one of his wives should accompany him. In the event, the lady returned to Persia from Moscow. The other of his wives to go to Europe was Amān ʿAlāʾ Khān, one of his favourite wives, who went blind towards the end of her life. She was sent to Vienna for treatment, which, however, proved fruitless. She was accompanied by the eunuch Bahram Khān Khāṇādžâ and several women nurses and attendants (Mu’ayyir al-Mamālik, op. cit., 159; Feuvrier, op. cit., 185).

Although women might exercise great authority within the harem, their liberty outside was gravely restricted by the practice of veiling. This enabled them to move freely in the streets, the princess being indistinguishable from the peasant (Glimpses, 212; cf. also Feuvrier, op. cit., 144). She also notes that the mission doctor’s door and house was crowded with women of all ages and ranks (Glimpses, 212-13). Women, other than tribal women, when they went on journeys normally travelled in panniers carried by mules or in litters suspended between two mules. The panners carrying women of the higher classes were canopied by semi-circular tops covered with cloth hanging down like a curtain (Sir Robert Ker Porter, Travels in Georgia, Persia, Armenia, ancient Babylon ... during the years 1817, 1818, 1819, and 1820, 2 vols., London 1821-2, i, 398-9). Tribal women and some of the royal women rode and were often accomplished horsewomen (cf. ibid., 259; Mu’ayyir al-Mamālik, op. cit., 127).
home by private tutors (cf. Mustawfi, op. cit., i, 296–7, 298). Girls up to the age of seven were allowed to attend a makṣah, but the number who did so was small; when they were then too old to go unveiled, their education was sometimes finished at home by female mullās. Girls in well-to-do households were taught to sew and embroider and such other accomplishments as were necessary for the running of the haram. Spinning was the ubiquitous occupation of the poorer classes. Carpet weaving was also carried on by women and children, mainly as a house industry, in many districts, and also in tribal areas. Textiles were also woven by women in many towns and villages. Little is known of the condition of those so employed until modern times [see asār, in Suppl.].

The recreation of women was largely confined to visiting relatives. Marriages, births, deaths and other anniversaries also broke the daily round. The weekly visit to the bath was an occasion which offered the opportunity of intercourse with female friends. Visits to shrines and cemeteries, especially on Thursday evenings, were other recognised outings (see Du Mans, op. cit., 93–4; Sheil, op. cit., 145 ff.; Morier, A second journey, 137, 166). Raasda-khādījān, especially in Saffar and Mubarram, were other occasions for visiting and recreation. Female raasda khādījān usually consisted of groups of young women (Naqsh-i dawlat, 373, 711-12) and also the assemblies for women in Ramādān (Mu'ayyir al-Mamalik, op. cit., 111, 113). So far as women attended mosques, they sat curtained off from the men. They were also segregated at tā'zīyas. In the Tīkīya-yi Dawlat in Tehran, the shāh's women and women of the upper classes had their own separate boxes, while poorer women sat in a separate part of the 'yāt' (Sheil, op. cit., 127 ff; Buzurg Umīd, op. cit., 157–8, and see p. 106 for a description of the procession taking the shāh's standard ('ulāmā) from the royal haram to the Tīkīya-yi Dawlat). Women of the Prophetic family figured prominently in several of the passion plays, but their roles were normally played by men and boys (see P. J. Chelkowski, ed., Ta'ziyeh: ritual and drama in Iran, New York 1976).

Gradually in the second half of the 19th century, changes took place in the position of women, partly as a result of increased intercourse with Europe. Emancipation was slow, but women began from time to time to take part in public demonstrations (cf. the account of a bread riot in Tehran in 1861 during the famine, E. B. Eastwick, Journal of a diplomat's three years' residence in Persia, London 1864, repr. Tehran 1976, 2 vols., i, 288–91). The most notable case was their participation in the movement against the Tobacco Concessions in 1893 was a watershed for their political activities; for the first time women, a hitherto invisible sector of society, had managed to take part in Iranian street politics. In these demonstrations, women proved themselves valuable to the 'ulāmā, who subsequently encouraged them to participate in the uprisings that led to the 1906 constitution. Women mobbed Ṣōrīr al-Dīn Shāh's carriage, organised public meetings and even marched to the Maglis brandishing guns and weapons. But although their activities provided actual and moral support, women were not granted the vote by the constitution. The opposition of the 'ulāmā to female suffrage was extreme: when Ḥādīj ji Wakil al-Ra'āyā proposed their enfranchisement in 1911, the President of the Maglis moved that no record be made "of this unfortunate incident" (Mangol Bayat 1978).

The active participation of women in the constitutional revolution, however, served to heighten their political consciousness and in the years that followed, women formed a number of secret societies and organisations seeking three main objectives: access to education, freedom from the hijāb (veil) and suffrage. It was in the field of education that women had their first success.

Since women were physically and socially confined to the sphere of domesticity, few had had the opportunity of obtaining any formal schooling before 1900. There were, however, exceptional women, some related to the 'ulāmā, who had been educated at home, or, in a few cases, attended schools and were thus able to educate other women. In 1910 one of these, Mrs Ĥubā Azimādā, opened the first private girls' school in Iran, Namūs. Three years later Mrs Vazdi, the wife of a leading mujtahid, opened a second girls' school, 'Iffatīyā. Despite considerable hostility and repeated attacks by mobs, more schools were set up, and finally in 1918 the government capitulated and opened ten state schools for girls as well as a women's training college, the Dār al-Mu'āallimat. This college was subsequently expanded and its courses extended from three to five years. In 1934 it was renamed the Preliminary Teachers' Training College for Girls, Dānīšgāh-yi Makaddamati-yi Dukhāriān. Much of the material taught in the 1920s at the college was subsequently compiled in text books and used for teaching in secondary schools (Badr-ol-Moluk Bamdad, From darkness to light, ed. and tr, Thēvēnōt, op. cit., pt. 2, 293–4; Ker Porter, op. cit., i, 202, 239. 396, 499; Scott Waring, A tour to Shirdi, London 1807. 61–2; Morier, A second journey, 61; Kay Kāwūs b. Iskandar, Kābāš-nāma, ed. Gholām Husayn Yūsūfī, Tehran 1967, 129–31; Nasīr al-Dīn Tūsī, Āfghān-i Naṣīrī, ed. M. Minovī and 'A'īr Rīdā Haydāri, Tehran ASH 1356/1976, 215–22, 229–30; Fāṭhir Kawīmī, Kārnāmā-yi zanān-i makṣār-ī Īrān, Tehran AHS 1353/1974–5; Dāhīb al-Dīn Māhālīt, Rāyshūn at 'ardrār dar tārīqā-yi dawlati-yi Ḥādūs-ndma, 5 vols., Tehran 1375/1955–6; Abu ʿI-Hasan Buzurg Umīd, op. cit., 21–2, 39–40; Mustawfī, op. cit., i, 689 ff. On marriage customs see murrā and nikāh; see also Ker Porter, op. cit., i, 345; Malcolm, History of Persia, ii, 426–8, 440–3; Sheil, op. cit., 143 ff; 'A'dūd al-Dawla, op. cit., 59, 68–9; Mustawfī, op. cit., i, 287 ff, 436 ff. (A.K.S. Lambton)

B. After 1900

The end of the 19th century marked the beginning of a long struggle for emancipation by Iranian women, which culminated in a short-lived success in the 1970s. The participation of women in the public demonstration against the Tobacco Concessions in 1893 was a watershed for their political activities; for the first time women, a hitherto invisible sector of society, had managed to take part in Iranian street politics. In these demonstrations, women proved themselves valuable to the 'ulāmā, who subsequently encouraged them to participate in the uprisings that led to the 1906 constitution. Women mobbed Ṣōrīr al-Dīn Shāh's carriage, organised public meetings and even marched to the Maglis brandishing guns and weapons. But although their activities provided actual and moral support, women were not granted the vote by the constitution. The opposition of the 'ulāmā to female suffrage was extreme: when Ḥādīj ji Wakil al-Ra'āyā proposed their enfranchisement in 1911, the President of the Maglis moved that no record be made “of this unfortunate incident” (Mangol Bayat 1978).

The active participation of women in the constitutional revolution, however, served to heighten their political consciousness and in the years that followed, women formed a number of secret societies and organisations seeking three main objectives: access to education, freedom from the hijāb (veil) and suffrage. It was in the field of education that women had their first success.

Since women were physically and socially confined to the sphere of domesticity, few had had the opportunity of obtaining any formal schooling before 1900. There were, however, exceptional women, some related to the 'ulāmā, who had been educated at home, or, in a few cases, attended schools and were thus able to educate other women. In 1910 one of these, Mrs Ĥubā Azimādā, opened the first private girls' school, Namūs. Three years later Mrs Vazdi, the wife of a leading mujtahid, opened a second girls' school, 'Iffatīyā. Despite considerable hostility and repeated attacks by mobs, more schools were set up, and finally in 1918 the government capitulated and opened ten state schools for girls as well as a women's training college, the Dār al-Mu'āallimat. This college was subsequently expanded and its courses extended from three to five years. In 1934 it was renamed the Preliminary Teachers' Training College for Girls, Dānīšgāh-yi Makaddamati-yi Dukhāriān. Much of the material taught in the 1920s at the college was subsequently compiled in text books and used for teaching in secondary schools (Badr-ol-Moluk Bamdad, From darkness to light, ed. and tr,
F.R.C. Bagley, New York 1977, 60). The increasing secularisation of education and the growing power of the state in this field proved an important factor in enabling women to gain access to education. The next major campaign was directed against compulsory seclusion and the veil.

In the 30 years that followed the constitutional revolution, many dedicated women participated in the prolonged battle for emancipation. Middle-class and upper-class women, some of whom had been educated at the foreign schools in Iran and many of whom were taught by their male relatives at home, formed secret societies and women's groups such as Andijanan-i Azadi Zanân (“Women's Freedom Society”), which included a member of the royal family. In 1910, one of these groups published the first journal to be edited by a woman, Dâniâ, and other journals followed. Some, such as Shûkhâ, edited by Maryam Umîd Muzayyin al-Sulûtân, which began publishing in 1913, were devoted to literature and education. Others were more overtly committed to political emancipation. One such was Zahân-i zanân edited by Siddîka Dawlatbâdî which began publication in Isfâhan in 1919. Despite repeated threats to her life and attacks on her newspaper, Dawlatbâdî continued to oppose the religious establishment and was unable to get to such law enforcement agencies.

In 1910, there were a number of women literary figures, the best known among whom were Parwîn Pitsâmî [q.v.] (1906-41) and Simîn Dângîwhâr, as well as more than 10 women publishers and journalists. In the face of hostility, exile and imprisonment, women such as Shahnâz Azâd, editor of Nâma-yi banâvist (“Women’s letter”) and Afak Parsâ, publisher of Dâhân-i zanân (“Women’s world”), continued to oppose the religious establishment and its move to restrict the freedom of women. In the event, finally found an unexpected ally in Ridâ Shâh Pahlâwî. (For a detailed discussion of women journalists and writers, see Pari Shakhî al-Islâmî, Zanân-i râznâmâgân va andîşgân-dârî-yi Iran (“Women journalists and women intellectuals of Iran”), Tehran 1935/1972, and in Elizabeth Sansarian, The Women’s rights movement in Iran, New York 1982, 32-7).

After the overthrow of the Kâdjars in 1924, Ridâ Shâh embarked on an extensive programme which initially did not benefit women very much. For example, the Civil codes of 1930, although intended to curtail the judicial control of the Shâri’a, incorporated much of the Twelver Shi’i Shâri’a which was the stipulation of a minimum marriage age of seven. Divorced women were required to keep the custody of their sons at the age of two and daughters at seven. Divorced women were required to keep the ‘idda and remain unmarried for two months in case of zigha and three for permanent wives. The only departure from the Shâri’a was the stipulation of a minimum age for marriage: 15 for girls and 18 for boys.

The Penal Code of 1940, though almost wholly European in conception, retained the Shâri’a laws for adultery. The killing of one’s wife, daughter or sister caught in zigha was no longer a capital offence but a misdemeanour and carries either no sentence at all or a short discretionary term of imprisonment. Retribution against an adulterous husband, father or brother, however, is not sanctioned in the same way.

Nevertheless, by 1936 Ridâ Shâh felt sufficiently confident to include women’s education and the banning of zigha into an educational and craft training process. He began in 1935 by giving state recognition to women’s groups and setting up a women’s centre, Kânûn-i bâhunâwân, with a budgetary allocation from the Ministry of Culture and under the patronage of his daughters Aghraf and Shams, and headed by Hadîjar Tarbiyat. In 1937 Siddîka Dawlatbâdî was appointed as the head of the Kânûn and it was reorganised into an educational and craft training centre for women. In 1936, Tehran University began admitting women. It was, however, the outlawing of the veil in the same year and rigorous enforcement of this measure until Ridâ Shâh’s abdication in 1941 which proved a historical landmark for Iranian women. Along with access to education, the abolition of the zigha finally ended their physical and mental segregation and enabled them to participate more openly in the public sphere (see Bamdad, op. cit., 80-3; Sansarian, op. cit., 62-6; Avery, Modern Iran, London 1965, 291-2).

After the departure of Ridâ Shâh, there was something of a backlash against women. Nevertheless, organisations such as the Women’s League, Damîyat-i Zanân, and the Tudeh (Communist) party’s Tasbîkh-i zanân, in Iran, continued to agitate for legal reforms and female suffrage. One of the first things they did, with the resolute opposition of the Majlis, in which they had been enfranchised, the campaign for legal reforms and female suffrage was finally ended their physical and mental segregation and enabled them to participate more openly in the public sphere. In 1936, Tehran University began admitting women. Middle-class Iranian women, many of whom had been educated abroad, saw the religious establishment as the main opposition and sought to circumvent the legislature by taking to the streets. In this they had the tacit support of the Shah’s mother, Aghraf Pahlâwî, who headed the influential High Council of Women’s Organisation, Shûkh-i ‘Aliyî Damîyat-i Zanân.

In January 1963, women organised a widely-publicised and well-supported one-day strike, refused to celebrate the anniversary of the unveiling of women, marched to the Senate and insisted on voting in the Shah’s White Revolution referendum. Although their vote was counted separately, the high turnout, the extensive publicity given to the women’s protests and royal patronage finally enabled them to obtain the vote in February 1963. A year later, there were two women senators and four women deputies in the Majlis. In the struggle between the secular and the religious establishment, the state scored a temporary gain and acquired the wholehearted support of middle-class women.

Once enfranchised, the campaign for legal reforms was intensified. Assisted by the Women Lawyers’ Union and the newly formed Iranian Women’s Organisation (Sâzâmân-i zandân) headed by members of the royal household, Iranian women succeeded in securing radical changes. By 1978 abortion was legalised and, through the Family Protection Laws of 1967 and 1975, the husband’s right to zigha and polygamous marriages was curtailed, as was his discretionary right of divorce and custody of children.

Family Courts were set up and empowered to allow divorced women to claim an alimony over and above the customary mahra. Conditions for working women were also improved, and they gained an entitlement to twelve weeks’ maternity leave and nurseries in work places with more than ten nursing mothers.

On the political level, it was unusual to see middle-class women who benefited from these measures; rural women, though theoretically entitled to nurseries and legal protection, were generally unaffected by these laws and were unable to get to such law enforcement agen-
cies as the town-based Family Courts. There were, however, a number of programmes intended specifically for rural women. For example, the Literacy Corps, the Extension Corps and the Health Corps, were set up in 1968, and despatched women contracept to teach village women respectively to read, produce handicrafts and instruct them in family planning. Of these, by far the most successful was the Extension Corps which taught women to improve their traditional crafts of weaving and sewing and embroidery and which facilitated the marketing of these products through a network of urban shops. Ironically, the ability of rural women to gain their livelihood as craft workers reinforced the parental reluctance to allow them to go to school, since schooling merely deprived the family of their daughter's all-too-valuable labour without giving them any substantial returns (for a case study on this, see Haleh Afshar, The position of women in an Iranian village, in Feminist Review, no. 9 [Autumn 1981], 76-8). Thus despite numerous literary campaigns, nearly 95% of rural women remained illiterate. J. Rudolph Toubia, Relations between urbanisation and the changing status of women in Iran, in Iranian Studies, v/1 [Winter 1972], 29, and Borrass Sáslivári, in Amádá-í Djanábdi-í Tóxiq-í-í Yéf, in [New York, Summer 1357/1978], 191.

Even for urban women, successes of the 1970s were short-lived. Although the Shah appointed one women minister, an ambassadress and nearly 40 women judges, his modernisation policies did not benefit the mass of the poor rural and urban dwellers, male and female. Welfare legislation remained unimplemented and the bulk of Iranian women continued working in the informal sector without security and for minimal wages. It was the combination of poverty and illiteracy that kept rural women so responsive to the extensive campaigns waged by the religious establishment against the Shi'a. In the early seventies, Ayatollah Khomeyni emerged as the charismatic leader of this opposition. Khomeyni appealed directly to women to abandon their unrewarding tasks given the extensive campaigns waged by the religious groups, and to bestow the dignity of motherhood and domesticity to women as an important support base and secured them the vote (H. Afshar, Khomeyni's teachings and their implications for Iranian women, in A. Tabari and N. Yege, in The shadow of Islam, London 1974, 17-103; Nahid Yeganeh, in The shadow of Islam, in Islamic Republic in Iran, in op. cit., 30-7; Ayatollah Tálikání, Ínhaj, English tr. in op. cit., 103-7; Nahid Yege, Women's movement in the Islamic Republic in Iran, in op. cit., 26-74. 5. Women's movements, Táfat Básári, Zandáqiyí píshbarg-i níght-i-í-í azádi-yí bánumán-i-í Yéf, in Tehran 1345/1967; Kümátí bá-í-í azádi-yí-í-í dar Yéf, in Múbarzáí bá-í-í azádi-yí Yéf, in [New York, Summer 1357/1978], 28-9; Maryam Mirhádí, Zindáng-í-í zan, in op. cit., (ch. 3 includes a detailed discussion of the activities of a number of women's groups from 1297/1919 to 1325/1946; the Kümátí-í bánumán is discussed on 93-9); Azar Tabari and Nahid Yege, in The shadow of Islam (present women's organisations are discussed in part 4, 134-340). 6. Women's tribal areas, Lois Beck, Women among Qashqai nomadic pastoralists in Iran, in Lois Beck and Nikki Keddie (eds.), Women in the Muslim world, 551-73; Erika Friedl, Islam and tribal women in a village in Iran, in Nancy Falk and Rital M. Gross (eds.), Unpoken world, New York 1980, 159-73;
Nancy Tapper, The women's sub-society among the Shahsavan nomads of Iran, in ibid., 374-98; R. Tapper, Pastoral and politics, in G. Stoiber, Die Afghun Nomadisrnis in Raum Kermani, Marburg/Lahn 1978.


4. In Turkey [see Supplement].

5. In the Indo-Pakistan sub-continent.

The evolution of Muslim social polity in India, from the earliest date of advent of Islam in the sub-continent in the 2nd/6th century, has been constantly affected and acculturated by the indigenous cultural environment. In this process, the status and role of Muslim women also underwent significant changes throughout the ages. The earliest accounts indicate that among the Turkish settlers women enjoyed a respectable position; they even took an active part in state affairs. Seclusion was not strictly enforced during the earlier centuries, but began as a rigid practice during the 4th/10th century.

During the Dihll Sultanate period (7th/13th century), despite strict seclusion of women, ambitious ladies of royal households often played decisive roles in intricate affairs of succession to the throne. Shāh Turkān (wife of Ilutmīsh and mother of Rukn al-Dīn Frūz Shāh I) and Malik-yi Dāhān (wife of Djalāl al-Dīn Frūz Shāh II) had succeeded in effectively outmanoeuvring the male-dominated courts by installing on the thrones the princes of their choice and wielding absolute power in their behalf. Ilutmīsh's daughter, Rādiyya Sulţāna, even succeeded in ascending to the throne herself and ruled for four years (634-7/1236-40). The records of the Tughlūk and Lodi dynasties are also full of accounts of royal ladies often playing leading roles in state politics.

The harem life from the Sultanate period down to the Lodi dynasty (i.e. in the pre-Mughal era) was centred around the ladies of royal households, with their dependents, maids, slaves and eunuchs. Seniority in rank among royal ladies was a major factor in commanding both respect and power. Seclusion was so strictly observed that even outside women were not permitted to enter the harem enclosures. The princesses and girls of higher classes received Kur'ānic and literary education at home from learned tutors (ladies as well as elderly men). In regard to literary and artistic talents, there are numerous instances of outstanding achievements by ladies. Rādiyya Sulţāna was a noted poetess; Dhūghtar Khāṣṣa, Nusrat Bibi and Mīhr Afruz had mastered the art of dancing; Fūţula and Nusrat Khaṭṭān were famous musicians of their times.

During the Mughal period (1362-1428), although the practice of seclusion had become more intensive and was considered as a sign of respect— even royal decrees were issued for observing strictly the rules of purdah (seclusion)—women of the royal households and upper classes played perceptible roles in state politics and achieved high merits in literary accomplishment. On occasion, Nur-i Dāhān (wife of Djalānī) broke the purdah convention and did not mind coming out in public. In fact, she was the real power behind the Djalānī throne. She also led an army expedition against Mahāhābat Khān [see].

In southern India, during the same period, Sulţāna Cānd Bībī personally defended the fort of Ahmadnagar against the mighty forces of Akbar, and Mahāhābat-yi Dāhān ruled the Deccan as a regent on behalf of Nizām Shāh of the Bahmani family.

In literary achievement, the Mughal period provides a long list of ladies of distinction. Dāhānārā (second wife of Shāhdāhān) was a noted biographer; Gulbādān Begaq was the author of the Ḥumayūn-nāma, and Dījān Begaq (daughter of Khānī- Khānān) wrote a commentary on the Kur'ān, for which she received from Akbar an award of 50,000 dinārs. Among the famous poetesses of this period, Salīma Sulţāna, Nur-i Dāhān, Sitt al-Nisā' and Zīb al-Nisā' (eldest daughter of Awarangzīb) were outstanding.

The decline of the Mughal dynasty towards the middle of 12th/18th century heralded the emergence of the modern era in Indian history. The incoming European powers (Portuguese, Dutch, British) were in the process of consolidating in the subcontinent their political and military powers, which eventually weakened the power bases of Muslim courts in northern as well as southern India. With this shift of power, the practice of seclusion had become more intensive and was considered as a sign of respect— even royal decrees were issued for observing strictly the rules of purdah (seclusion)—women of the royal households and upper classes played perceptible roles in state politics and achieved high merits in literary accomplishment. In this process, the status and role of Muslim women also underwent significant changes throughout the ages. The earliest accounts indicate that among the Turkish settlers women enjoyed a respectable position; they even took an active part in state affairs. Seclusion was not strictly enforced during the earlier centuries, but began as a rigid practice during the 4th/10th century.

During the Dihll Sultanate period (7th/13th century), despite strict seclusion of women, ambitious ladies of royal households often played decisive roles in intricate affairs of succession to the throne. Shāh Turkān (wife of Ilutmīsh and mother of Rukn al-Dīn Frūz Shāh I) and Malik-yi Dāhān (wife of Djalāl al-Dīn Frūz Shāh II) had succeeded in effectively outmanouevring the male-dominated courts by installing on the thrones the princes of their choice and wielding absolute power in their behalf. Ilutmīsh's daughter, Rādiyya Sulţāna, even succeeded in ascending to the throne herself and ruled for four years (634-7/1236-40). The records of the Tughlūk and Lodi dynasties are also full of accounts of royal ladies often playing leading roles in state politics.

The harem life from the Sultanate period down to the Lodi dynasty (i.e. in the pre-Mughal era) was centred around the ladies of royal households, with their dependents, maids, slaves and eunuchs. Seniority in rank among royal ladies was a major factor in commanding both respect and power. Seclusion was so strictly observed that even outside women were not permitted to enter the harem enclosures. The princesses and girls of higher classes received Kur'ānic and literary education at home from learned tutors (ladies as well as elderly men). In regard to literary and artistic talents, there are numerous instances of outstanding achievements by ladies. Rādiyya Sulţāna was a noted poetess; Dhūghtar Khāṣṣa, Nusrat Bibi and Mīhr Afruz had mastered the art of dancing; Fūţula and Nusrat Khaṭṭān were famous musicians of their times.

During the Mughal period (1362-1428), although the practice of seclusion had become more intensive and was considered as a sign of respect— even royal decrees were issued for observing strictly the rules of purdah (seclusion)—women of the royal households and upper classes played perceptible roles in state politics and achieved high merits in literary accomplishment. On occasion, Nur-i Dāhān (wife of Djalānī) broke the purdah convention and did not mind coming out in public. In fact, she was the real power behind the Djalānī throne. She also led an army expedition against Mahāhābat Khān [see].
mothers, religious education, domestic economy, and light social fiction. Hidjab Imtiyaz CA1T was the...

During the Second World War, India witnessed an unprecedented political upheaval which had its bearing on Muslim women's increasing participation in political activities and literary expressions. Saleha Abid Husain, Rasheed Jahan and Ismat Chughtai emerged as leading Urdu writers of that time. Begam Mohammad Ali, maintaining her seclusion, fought and won a seat in U.P. legislature in 1946. Rasheed Jahan and Ismat Chughtai began their literary activities; both of them were among the organisers of several industrial strikes, and were imprisoned for a considerable time in 1949.

In 1947, after Partition, two separate commonwealth states came to exist: India with Hindu majority provinces, and Pakistan consisting of Muslim majority regions. The North-West Frontier Province, Sind, West Punjab (as the western wing) and East Bengal (as eastern wing). Among the remaining Muslim population in India, after independence, Muslim women came out of seclusion in greater number; they started entering the institutions of higher education in ever-increasing numbers and competed for specialised jobs. Although up to higher secondary level, the fusion of education has been maintained in college and university education, the predominant majority of Muslim girls have been enrolling in institutions of co-education. Their participation in active educational, professional and political fields has been of great significance. At Aligarh Muslim University, several Muslim women professors have chaired various academic departments. There have been a number of Muslim women holding administrative positions in various government establishments. In the political sphere, the traditions of Muslim women's participation have been continuous. Begam Anis Kidwai was the first Muslim female minister appointed in the 1970s in the Uttar Pradesh cabinet, and later on she was elected as President of Congress (I) for several months.

At present, Muslim women are found throughout India as eminent medical practitioners, educationists, administrators, and political activists. In all these fields their status for all practical purposes is equal to men without significant discrimination. Soon after the establishment of Pakistan as a Muslim state in 1947, women's emancipation became a key factor in all walks of life and especially in the provinces of West Punjab and Sind. Muslim women of the Punjab were already far advanced in education; a large number of well-educated families from the U.P. and Hyderabad had migrated after the partition to Sind province, and women of these families demand opportunities for themselves in the newly-established state. Muslim women in the North-West Frontier Province and East Bengal had not been able to advance beyond average primary education in those early years. Thus the establishment of the All-Pakistan Women's Association (APWA) during early 1930s drew upon female activists mostly from Lahore and Karachi. It remained a middle-class dominated organisation which aimed at a better deal for women: it organised meetings and demonstrations against polygamy and the maltreatment of women, and it presented a mild programme of social reforms in favour of women. But any active participation of women in politics was at least two decades away.

In literature, however, several women writers rose to prominence: Hajira Masroor, Khadija Mastoor, and Jilani Bano in short story writing; Qurat-ul-Ain Hyder as a novelist and Zohra Nigar as a poet. During the early 1960s, Begam Liaquat Ali Khan was appointed as the first woman ambassador of Pakistan; she was accredited to Belgium. Her appointment was not due to her own active participation in political or social life but was honoured as a recognition of Begam Liaquat Ali Khan's assassination first Prime Minister of Pakistan, Sahibzada Liaquat Ali Khan [see liyākāt 'alī khan]. It was mostly during the 1970s that women came to prominence in Pakistani politics. Begam Nasim Wali Khan had emerged, side-by-side with her husband, Khan Abdul Wali Khan, as a political activist against the rule of Zulfiquar Ali Bhutto. Soon after Bhutto's execution, his widow—Begam Nusrat Bhutto—and daughter—Benaiz Bhutto—took up the leadership of the Pakistan People's Party and have become the focal point of opposition to the Martial Law Authority. More and more women are becoming involved in political activity; thus Hinda Gilan, a lawyer by profession, has recently emerged in Lahore as a dynamic political activist.

Bibliography: Most of the works referring to the status and role of Muslim women in the Indo-Pakistan subcontinent from the earliest times down to the end of the Mughal period comprise the standard historical sources, see the Bblls. to hind. iv. History and vi. Islamic culture. For a summary treatment of the status of Muslim women in pre-Mughal times, see I.H. Qureshi, Administration of the Sultanate of Delhi, n.d. Calcutta, 190; Rekha Misra, Women in Mughal India, Delhi 1967, 5-15; R. P. Tripathy, Some aspects of Muslim administration, Allahabad 1936, 29; and Ishwari Parasad, History of Qaraunah Turks in India, Allahabad 1936, 132. Accounts of the status of Muslim women during the Mughal period are available, mostly written in Persian: Gulbadan Begam, Humayun-nama, tr. A. S. Beveridge, London 1902, provides an elaborate account of female life inside harems. Other important references to Muslim women's life can be found in 'Abd al-Kādīr Bādū'ī, Mastāqāb al-tawzī'ī, Calcutta 1884, 404-6; Abu 'l-Fadl, Akhbar-nāma, tr. H. Beveridge, Calcutta 1912, i, 43, 114, ii, 114, 149-51, 212, 230, 288-93, 317-19, 324-30, iii, 212-13, 215, 536, 1140; Mu'tamid Khān, Ikhāl-nāma-yi Damaqgiri, tr. Elliott and Dowson, Calcutta 1865, 345-6, 424-8, 430-1, 435-6. There are numerous studies in English on this period; see Rakha Misra, op. cit., chs. 2-8; P. N. Chopra, Society and culture during the Mughal age, Agra 1963, ch. 5, 103-31; B. Andrea, ed. L. Binyon, The life of
The Bedouin economy is based essentially on animal husbandry, sometimes linked with land cultivation of a more or less intermittent nature. These two activities could not be developed without the same time creating a certain number of rules, determined by custom and relating in particular to the ownership of land and of wells. It might be supposed that the desert, on account of its aridity and particularly severe living conditions, is free territory belonging to anyone who has the courage to dwell there. This is not at all the case. An expert on the subject, T. E. Lawrence, states correctly in this regard:

"Men have looked upon the desert as barren land, the free holding of whoever chose; but in fact each hill and valley in it had a man who was its acknowledged owner and would quickly assert the right of his family or clan to it, against aggression. Even the wells and trees had their masters, who allowed men to make firewood of the one and drink of the other freely, as much as was required for their need, but who would instantly check anyone trying to turn the property to account and to exploit it or its products among others for private benefit. The desert was held in a crazed communism by which Nature and the elements were for the free use of every known friendly person for his own purposes and no more" (The seven pillars of wisdom, London 1935, 83-4).

Each tribe, even the most itinerant, possesses a fixed centre which serves it as a place of resort and as a rallying centre where its various clans assemble during the months of greatest heat. At this time of the year, everything in the desert has been scorched by the sun. Then the Bedouin returns to his summer camp, situated close to an oasis or a major source of water. When the ferocity of the climate is alleviated, and with the slopes of the first rains, he goes back to his natural habitat in search of grazing for his flocks. But he cannot wander at will. Each tribe has its pastures which it frequents periodically. The vast extent of its nomadic range enables it, in a good or a bad year, in spite of the rigours of the severest climate, to find adequate nourishment for its livestock. In this manner, the Ruwāla spend the summer, especially in the month of August and the first days of September, in Damascus. With the alleviation of the temperature, they travel to their winter pastures situated in Saudi Arabia, crossing the Jordanian desert by way of Wādī Sīrhān. It can happen, however, that a persistent drought consumes the hardy desert vegetation, roots and all, in spite of its legendary resilience. The Bedouin is then constrained to leave his ancestral territory in search of a more fertile zone. But he is evidently obliged to take into account the attitude towards him of the lawful owner of the coveted pastures. The latter, however, can in fact refuse to accede to his request or may offer him grazing rights only in exchange for the payment of rent. If the supplicant considers himself strong enough to confront him with force, he will be inclined to reject any compromise. Otherwise, he must submit to the conditions prescribed, or search elsewhere. In Jordan, a nanny-goat, known as šīlāt al-riḥāt'a, is offered to the owner of the pastures.

The territory of a Bedouin tribe is jointly owned; it is communal property, the exploitation and tenure of which are reserved for its occupants alone, the members of the group and their protégés. It is divided into lots, of unequal size, corresponding to the number of clans belonging to the tribe. Even strangers, even foreigners properly introduced, may move about there freely and use the wells. But the grazing right is accorded only to fellow-tribesmen and their clients.
Even at this level of social organisation, pastures are a cause of dispute, the best being appropriated by the strongest clans. Consanguinity and solidarity impose upon all an obligation to accept here, with apparent enthusiasm, the least prosperous among them, especially in times of drought. But the latter would be wrong to consider an acquired right which is in fact a duty for mutual aid. The collectivism of the desert is located essentially at the level of the hamula, the members of which may pasture their livestock in any part whatsoever of the communal lot. The members of another hamula are admitted to it only with the authorization of the shaykh, and by reason of their links of kinship, geographical proximity and good relations with the titular proprietors.

Among the Kabilis of the high plateaux of the Yemen, although this people has long been sedentarised, the pastures of a tribe are reserved for its members, but also for those who are admitted on account of being refugees: rašî, matî or katîr. The stranger who ventures there without authorisation is tolerated for three days; this is the right of tenure (mat'sa) accorded to a friendly clan. Once this interval is passed, pressure is exerted on the unwelcome visitor to force him to leave. He is harassed, he is threatened, his mount may even be seized. But no attempt is made on his life, even if he insists on remaining; it will be enough to prevent him from being an enigma. The latter is obliged to compensate the proprietors and force his subordinate to leave the place. If the demand is refused, serious conflict may erupt. To avoid this, the group of outsiders which has suffered drought must come to an understanding with more fortunate neighbours to pasture its livestock on their territory, in a place and for a period of time prescribed, in exchange for the payment of an indemnity in kind or in cash. Henceforward it will not be troubled. Furthermore, it enjoys the right of protected neighbour status (gušwar [g. e.]), according to which the lessees are required to act as official protectors.

There also exist in the Yemen, as among the Arabs of the desert, treaties of friendship between tribes which allow each contracting party to use the pastures of the other in return. This is the case e.g. with the alliance known as sabha or sabhā which is based on a kind of fraternal relationship (ta'ākhā). It is an agreement, both defensive and offensive, by which two tribes undertake to take up arms on one another’s behalf. To conclude the agreement, there is no need for bloody sacrifices, except for the purpose of celebrating the event, nor for oaths; this is a pact that goes beyond sworn pledges. The agreement is set out in writing and signed by the leading shaykh. Such documents (marātkim) state explicitly that the contracting parties consider themselves henceforward “as a single member, a single arm, sharing the same fear and the same tranquillity, sharing the loss and the gains, however meagre they may be, accruing from a common action against the enemy” (al-Hamdānī, Ilkī, ed. Khāshīb, x, 70). Henceforth, the members of a tribe may go to live on the territories of the other and also take advantages for its pastures. Excluded from this treaty are the fornicator and the thief.

It will be understood that here it is the perspective of an essentially nomadic tribe that is under discussion. When the process of sedentarisation is initiated, the community of proximity tends to take the place of consanguinity. Arabs residing in the same region exploit the pastures in common, even where they belong to different tribes. But a group from a different area which seeks to install itself there cannot do so before obtaining the consent of the leading shaykh. The latter can even exact the payment of tribute.

The ownership of land, among the Arabs of the desert, is controlled by the law of the strongest. For this reason, it is often definitive. Until recent times, the Bedouin, even if sedentarised, despaired any kind of bureaucratic administration of land and seldom had recourse to it. To defend his rights, he trusted his sword. The demarcation of territories operated in the most rudimentary fashion, since each clan knew its own domain, as well as that of its neighbour. For marking boundaries, very simple means were employed: a shallow ditch, stakes, mounds, piles of stones and, more recently, barrels. Those who occupied themselves with agriculture planted strips of onions to mark boundaries. Such an administrative system, clearly precarious and imprecise, often gave rise to disputes. Litigation was submitted to the jurisdiction of an ānīja.

**Bibliography.** A. Jaussen, Coutumes des Arabes au pays de Mouk, 235-40; J. Chehlohd, Le droit dans la société bedouine, ch. viii; idem, Le droit intertribal dans les hauts plateaux du Yemen, in Al-Bahār (sic), Studia Institutti Anthropos, xxvii (1976), 49-76; Ruks al-Uzayy, Kāmūs al-Muhadd ... al-urduyya, 2 Anniimah 1973, i, 339.

2. In Persia.

The terms marte (pl. marstāt), šalafkar, šalafghar, šalafgar, mardāz, and šarīf are used interchangeably in Persian literature to mean pasture. In early works, gāvāh-šarīf is also found (cf. Hudūd al-ṣīlah, tr. Minorsky, 94, 85 and Ibn al-Balkhi, Fārs-nāma, ed. G. Le Strange, London 1921, 155). Marghzar is also used to mean meadow-land, while the word čaman is restricted to this meaning. Mārta, šalafghar, and šalafgar are also used in the sense of pasture tax.

The wide variation in temperature in Persia is highly important in shaping the general plant geography, and coupled with the variations in the annual distribution of precipitation is responsible for the differences of Persia’s plant cover and pasturage. Relief is also a decisive factor and affects both climate and soils; and a striking feature of Persia, especially the central plateau, is its micro-relief. The bulk of Persia’s vegetation lies in the eastern Turkish region, receives its rains in autumn, winter and spring; summer rains are negligible in most regions. This affects the development of pastures and results in their exploitation being largely seasonal. In Islamic times the phytogeographical boundaries have probably continued broadly the same. Changes in microclimates may have been experienced, but the overall macro-climate has probably remained unaltered.

Millenia of human activity have left their impress through the cutting of trees and grazing. In many regions it is probable that the primary vegetation was a kind of Artemesietum which included perennial grasses. Centuries of overgrazing and steady grazing would appear to have reduced the original vegetation of much of the plateau to a state of barrenness. In some places, it has led to the disappearance of perennial grasses from the steppe vegetation and their replacement by anti-pastoral non-palatable components, such as Amygdolus, Anabasis, Astragalus, and Artemisia herba-alba. The movement of flocks has also resulted in the severe cropping of trees, as, for example, in the oak forests of Luristan, Pusht-i Kūh, Īlam and Kurdistan, and the disappearance of Quercus brantii from hillsides in the neighbourhood of Kirmānshāh. The natural vegetation along the travel routes of nomad and semi-nomad tribes has also been disturbed in recent centuries.

Another factor which has led to change in the make-
up of vegetation is the collection of plants for industry, fuel, drugs and food. Fuel collection, especially, has affected not only the forest regions but also the steppes and led to the occurrence of some barren, almost unvegetated areas. At the higher altitudes on the plateau, the climate is often too cold and water too scanty to produce anything more than a thin vegetational cover of short grass and low scrub. Large areas of the country are sterile or almost sterile hamadas due to very low rainfall or to an excess of salt in the soil or both. The ecology of hill-sides varies greatly with respect to latitude, altitude, exposure and soil. Many slopes of low ridges and hills are bare because of their exposure to wind, heat and drought. Perennial grasses survive only in the high mountains beyond the limits of agriculture and in places inaccessible to grazing, on slopes too steep for agriculture and in those districts which have a long snow cover (approximately at an altitude of 2,400 m. to 2,600 m.). Seasonal grasses are found in the steppe areas and a periodic or episodic growth of grasses in some semi-desert regions (see further E. Ehlers, Iran: Grundzüge einer geographischen Landeskunde, Darmstadt 1980, 63-127).

Drought, demographic movements, disease, invasion and war have all at different times affected the local distribution of arable and pastoral land and dead lands—sometimes temporarily and at other times permanently. Frontier regions, in particular, tended frequently to be laid waste, presumably with the destruction of, or damage to, local pastures. In the predominantly pastoral regions the maintenance of a balance between pastures, animal population and human population was maintained, on a short term, by the dispersal or concentration of flocks according to the productivity of the pastures and the utilisation of widely separated pastures at their different periods of productivity. If the balance between pastures, flocks and human population was upset, conflicts between different groups over pastures and encroachment upon neighbouring arable land would be likely to occur. If the settled population increased and productivity rose, more land would be brought under cultivation and grazing land would be reserved. Changes in land use, usually on a small scale and sometimes of a temporary nature, have also occurred from time to time when nomad tribes have adopted a settled life.

Since most pastures were exploited seasonally, it is difficult to arrive at any realistic estimate of the number of animals carried per acre in the different regions. Masson Smith's estimate that "a sheep required something like 10 acres of steppe pasture" (Turvan nomadism and Iranian politics, in Iranian Studies, xi [1978], 62) does not appear to take the seasonal factor into consideration. B. Spooner puts the stocking rate in the Turān district, east of Sīmān, which was declared a biosphere reserve in 1977 and in which pastoralism of various types was the dominant form of land use, at 8.6 acres per animal for the period October/November to May (The Turan programme, in Margaret R. Biswas and Asit K. Biswas (eds.), Desertiification, Oxford 1980, 192). Similarly, it is difficult to determine the relative distribution of sheep and goats.

The matter is to some extent obscured by the fact that the term gūsfand in Persian literature covers both. In modern times sheep predominate; they probably did so in the past also. Goats are numerous, especially in areas where the vegetation is less abundant. They voraciously crop all green plants and are largely responsible for the deforestation and decrease in plant and grass cover which has taken place. Oxen are widely used as draught animals, but herds of cattle are not important except in a few, mainly lowland, districts. Herds of camels are put out to pasture in the tragacanthic steppes, often in areas where the vegetation is unpalatable or too sparse for either sheep or goats. Herds of horses are (or were) bred and turned out to pasture in some tribal districts (cf. Sādār Asad, Tārīkh-e Bābīyāri, lith. 1333 AH, 20-1). Rulers needed large numbers of horses for their armies. Royal herds and army remounts were grazed in special reserves and elsewhere (see Sir John Chardin, Travels in Persia, London 1927, 169-70, on the horses of the Safavid shah). Flocks of sheep kept to provision the royal establishments were similarly pastured in royal reserves.

Seasonal pastures in cool upland regions (sārdīn, pāyālak) are exploited mainly by tribal groups. Some of them make long-range migrations from their winter quarters in lowland regions (garmisn, kīdālak); others travel short distances, sometimes only from valley bottoms to the upper mountain slopes. Most villages are surrounded by many square miles of waste land in which the villagers are able to keep a few sheep and goats and donkeys. Some, in the more fertile regions, keep flocks which they take to graze either in the neighbourhood of their villages or farther afield. Stubble grazing is an important form of land use. In many upland regions, notably in the Alburz, villagers practise a form of stubble grazing in which they send their village flocks to summer pastures in the neighbourhood of their villages. There is also some winter migration of village flocks to the coastal plains of the Caspian from higher regions (see also A.K.S. Lambton, Landlord and peasant in Persia, Oxford 1953, 354-5, and Ilfāt).

With the contraction of the frontiers of Persia in the 19th century, the Muḥādān steppe in the north-west and the Turkmān steppe in the north-east, both regions in which there were good pastures, became frontier districts and tribal groups migrated annually across the Perso-Russian frontier. The Perso-Ottoman frontier in Kurdishān also traversed pasture land and seasonal migration across it took place, and continued in the 20th century after the creation of 'Irāq.

A survey made by H. Pahlot in 1967 shows 25% of the total land as range-land (Pasture development and range improvement through botanical and ecological studies, in Report to the government of Iran, FAO 3211, Rome 1967, quoted by E. Ehlers, Agriculture in Iran, in Encyclopaedia Iranica, i, fasc. 6, 613). It would, however, be rash to assume that this percentage was constant throughout Islamic times, but because of the inadequacy of the sources for a historical survey it is not possible to discuss changes in the extent of the land under agriculture and pasture land at different periods except in the most general terms.

Pasture was an important resource for villagers, and for nomads it was vital, while for those dynasties which relied on the support of tribal and nomadic forces the ability to ensure the availability of pasture for their followers was also of critical importance. This was especially the case during and after the Mongol invasions, which resulted in a large and permanent increase in the number of nomads. Throughout the Ilkhanate (654-736/1256-1335), the demand for pastures was insatiable. The wars between the Ilkhanate and the Golden Horde were, in part, over the acquisition of the rich pastures of Aḡārbāyādīn (C.J. Halperin, Relations in the Mongol Empire under the Ilkhanate, in HAJ, xi [1963], 250-1). The war which broke out between the Ilkhanate and the Mongols of Central Asia in A.D. 1270 was in part over the pastures of Bādğīs (W. Barthold, An
The possession of pastures was also important for the succession states to the Ilkhanate, with the possible exception of the Mughal emperors, who observed, to some extent, the traditions of settled government. It was also the case under Timūr (d. 807/1405), the Turkoman dynasties of the Ak Koyunlū and the Kara Koyunlū and the Safawids when they first came to power in the early 10th/16th century; while one of the reasons which led Aḥā Muhammad Khān K̄̄djar to choose Tehran as his capital was that it was within easy reach of Gurḡān, where the pasture grounds of the K̄̄djar tribe were situated.

A comparison of the accounts of the early Islamic geographers with later accounts will reveal some changes in the distribution of pasture land. The accounts of later writers must, however, be used with reserve unless they are known to be writing from personal experience. Sometimes they merely repeat the information available in the works of their predecessors. What an author records does not necessarily refer to the time he was writing.

There is little evidence that the Arab invasion had much effect on the distribution of pastures, though there probably was some displacement of those who had previously exploited them. There are references to the extensive reserves of tribes (kumbā) and to reserves in which the cattle and flocks of the caliphs and their governors and army remounts grazed. Al-Baladhurī mentions the pastures of the flocks of the caliph al-Mahdī (158-69/775-85) in the neighbourhood of Hamadān (Fatūs al-bulūd, 310-11). The Tārikh-i Kumm also mentions that pastures (zirāgihā wa ʿalāfazārā) were reserved in every village in the neighbourhood of Nihawand and Karadāj for the beasts (dawdbb) of the caliphs and were called ḥijāzāt (Hasan b. Muhammad b. Hasan Kumī. Tārikh-i Kumm, Persian tr. by Hasan b. Abī b. Hasan b. Abī al-Malik Kumī, ed. Djalāl al-Dīn Tīhrānī, Tehran AHS 1311, 185).

It is perhaps significant that Dinawar, the centre of Māh Kūfā, was within easy reach of rich pastures. Kūfā was also part of the tribal lands of the Māh Kūmī tribe, similarly a district with plentiful pastures. Ibn Hawkal, writing in the second half of the 4th/10th century mentions that it had abundant pastures where numerous flocks grazed and much water (K. Sūrat al-ʿard, ii, 359). Similarly, the availability of pastures in Khūrāsān would have facilitated the settlement of large numbers of Arabs in that province and may perhaps have influenced the choice of the centres where they established garrisons. Even if they were not accompanied by flocks and herds, they would have required pastures for their remounts and baggage animals (on Arab settlement in Khūrāsān, see further M. A. Shaban, the Abassid revolution, Cambridge, 1970). Elsewhere, so far as the Arabs settled in Persia as tribal groups, they would have required pastures for their flocks. But on the whole, there do not appear to have been many conflicts with local groups over pastures. The Tārikh-i Kumm, 243-4, states that the Aḥārī leaders ʿAbī Allāh Yaḥyā was appointed in 102/720-1 to Yazdān-fādhar, who had allocated to them the villages of Māmāqān and Dīmar near Kumī in 99/718-17, saying that the pastures were too small for their camels, horses and sheep. Yazdān-fādhar accordingly allocated to them the village of Fārāba also.

The geographers of the 3rd/9th and 4th/10th centuries give, on the whole, a picture of a prosperous countryside practising arable and pastoral farming. There is mention of pastures and meadow lands in some districts and of the presence of large flocks in various regions, which implies the existence of pastures and grazing land (see ilāt). Transhumance was practised in Fārs, and al-ʿIṣṭāḵwī puts the number of nomads at 500,000 tents (Masdlik al-mamālik, 97-9, ilāt), which suggest that pastureage was extensive. Yākūt, writing in the early 7th/13th century, also states that they were estimated at 500,000 tents (Barbier de Meynard, Dictionnaire géographique et historique de la Perse, Paris 1868, 412). It seems likely that he was merely copying al-ʿIṣṭāḵwī, unless it is to be assumed that large flocks of pasturage, flocks of which the population were in a state of absolute equilibrium.

There were extensive pastures and grazing grounds on the borders of the dār al-islām occupied by the Ghuzz (cf. Hūdūd al-ṣālam, 100, and ghuzz). One of the factors behind their migration in the 5th/11th century into the dār al-islām may have been pressure on pastures in Central Asia and tribal movements which resulted therefrom. One of their needs on entering Persia was to secure pastureage for their flocks. However, the numbers of the Ghuzz coming into Persia, first as independent groups and then under the leadership of the Saldjūqs, were not large, and there is little evidence of major displacements by them of those exploiting existing pastures (see further Lambton, Aspects of Saljuq-Ghuzz settlement in Persia, in J. D. S. Brewer et al., Iran: Pre-Islamic and Islamic (Oxford 1975, 121 ff.), nor, with the exception of Gūrgān, does there seem to have been much change in the distribution of arable land and grazing land as a result of their advent into Persia. Whereas Gūrgān in the 3rd/9th and 4th/10th centuries appears to have been a well-cultivated countryside, in Saldjūq times much of it was pasture land. By the reign of Sandjār (511-52/1118-57), large numbers of Turkomans occupied pastures in Gūrgān, Dihistān and the neighbourhood of Marw (ibid., 110), and pasture land was probably encroaching on arable land.

Fārs continued to be rich in pastures in the Saldjūq period. Ibn al-Balkhī, who wrote in the reign of Muhammad b. Malikshāh (496-511/1104-18), mentions by name extensive pastures in Fārs, and states that it was the main centre of the horse (dawdbb) (Masdlik al-mamālik, 97-8, ilāt). The whole of it was pasture land (gūvd gūvd-dī), which was composed in 372/982-3, had mentioned the woods, trees and meadows of Rudbar (124). Afdal al-Dīn mentions that land in the neighbourhood of Marw was within easy reach of rich pastures. Whereas Gūrgān in the 3rd/9th and 4th/10th centuries appears to have been a well-cultivated countryside, in Saldjūq times much of it was pasture land. By the reign of Sandjār (511-52/1118-57), large numbers of Turkomans occupied pastures in Gūrgān, Dihistān and the neighbourhood of Marw (ibid., 110), and pasture land was probably encroaching on arable land.

Similarly, the availability of pastures in Khūrāsān, which was composed in 372/982-3, had mentioned the woods, trees and meadows of Rudbar (124). Afdal al-Dīn makes no mention of woods. When the Ghuzz invaded Kirmān after the death of Sandjār, there appears to have been a temporary contraction in arable land. Afdal al-Dīn mentions that land in the Rāwar district was not cultivated because of the encroachment of nomads (K. ilāt al-ṣālam, 29) and that crops were grazed by the flocks of the Ghuzz (al-Mudīf ilā budayfū al-azmān, ed. Aʿīsā ibn Abī Bakr, Tehran AHS 1311, 180). The Mongol invasions in the 7th/13th century resulted in widespread destruction and depopulation. Standing crops were ruthlessly grazed by the Mongol hordes; much land went out of cultivation. There was
a permanent increase in the numbers of the nomadic population and the flock population and consequently in the demand for pastures; it is likely that much arable land was converted into pasture. Hülegü, according to Dhuwayj, when preparing his expedition to Persia, declared pastures in the districts through which it was expected that the army would march to be reserves (kuruk) and forbade any grazing in them other than by the army (Tārīkh-i Dughmān, ed. Muhammad Kazwīnī, London 1912-32, iii, 93). Later rulers also sometimes declared pastures to be kuruk. After their invasion of Persia, the Mongol hordes continued to practise transhumance. Atabeg ʿUmarT, who lived in Mamlūk territory in the first half of the 8th/14th century, states that their summer residence was in the Karābāgh region, which had many pastures, and that their winter quarters were in ʿUdjan, which also had extensive pastures, and sometimes in Baghdād (Masālik al-abār wa-mamlāk al-ansār, ed. and tr. K. Lech, Wiesbaden 1968, Ar. text, 86). Many of the Mongol settlements in Persia were within easy, or fairly easy, reach of rich pastures. Marāḡa, the first Ilkhanid capital, had good pasture in the neighbourhood and further afield at ʿUshnī and other districts in Kurdistān. Tabrīz, the capital of Abaqa (663-80/1265-81) and later of Ghiyān Khan (694-703/1295-1304), had good pastures nearby in ʿUdjan and summer pastures in Mt. Sabānī and Mt. Sahand. Ghiyān also built a city, Muhmūdābād, in the Mughān steppe, where the Mongols pastured their flocks and herds in winter (see Le Strange, Lands of the eastern caliphate, 176). Arghun (673-80/1284-91) founded the city of Sulṭānīya, which was completed by Oldjeytī (703-15/1304-16) where there were very rich spring pastures. Another foundation built by Oldjeytī was Sulṭānābād-i Cihatmāl at the foot of Bisūrīn, which, because of its excellent pastures, was a regular camping ground of the Mongol establishments (Hamd Allah Mustawfī, Nashat al-sulbā, ed. Le Strange, London 1915, 107). One of the biggest changes in the distribution of pasture land brought about by the Mongols was the expansion of land under pasture in the Mughān steppe and in the country round Sulṭānīya. Some of the pastures had probably been under cultivation. Both regions continued to afford pasture to nomadic groups and army remounts down to modern times. Marco Polo on his journey south-east from Alamūt towards Yazd and Kirmān wrote, ‘When you leave this castle (sc. Alamūt), you ride across beautiful plains and valleys and charming hill-slopes, rich in fine grass and excellent pasture, and with abundance of fruits, and all other good things. Armies are glad to stop there on account of the great plenty’ (Travels, tr. A. Ricci, London 1931, 53). Pastures in Gurgān, on the other hand, do not appear to have been important in Ilkhanid times: Mustawfī states that Gurgān and Kabūd Djiʿma were in a state of ruin (Nashat al-sulbā 160). It is possible that, apart from the destruction brought about by the Mongol invasion, they had been overgrazed. The pastures in Fārs of which Mustawfī gives a list were still extensive. He follows Ibn al-Balḥī’s account but adds one or two details. He remarks that the pasture of Ḫīd and Miḥkān was extremely large (135) and that the grass of the Shīdān pasture was beneficial (ibid.). He omits any reference to the pasture of Darābfir, but mentions an extensive spring pasture near Kāzūrīn (136). Mustawfī also mentions that there were excellent pastures in Khūlkāl (82) and a large pasture near Karagāi-i Abū Dula (69). He states that the pastures of Kāzūrīn were especially rich in fodder for camels (58), and that the pasture lands of Isfāhān were good for fattening animals (49). Round Tustar and in the neighbourhood of Dīzful there were also many excellent pastures (110, 111). Curiously, he does not mention the pastures of Ḫūrān or Ujgerd. There is not much information on the pastures of Lūrāstān. In the early Islamic centuries there was presumably some exploitation by transhumant herding, but this may have been more regularly organised in Ilkhanid times with benefit to the pastures. Muʿīn al-Dīn Natanzī states that when Hülegū gave the governorate of Lūrāstān to the Atabeg Shams al-Dīn Alaʾ Arghun (d. 670/1271-2), the province was in a state of ruin and the subjects dispered. The Atabeg brought the province back to prosperity by various measures. One reason for its renewed prosperity was, according to Muʿīn al-Dīn, the fact that Shams al-Dīn adopted the custom of the Mongols of moving from summer to winter quarters, spending the winter in Shīḵū and Iṣfahān and the summer in the Zarda Kūh (Murastāb al-wāṣāl-i muʿīnī, ed. J. Aubin, Tehran 1957, 43-4). Initially, the basis of the Mongol economy was the produce of their flocks and herds, hence their primary need was for pastures; but once they had become the rulers of a settled empire some more stable basis was required. Ghiyān Khan, towards the end of his reign, sought to bring about an agricultural revival, and his efforts may well have restricted the availability of pasture. One of the measures he took to provide for the upkeep of the military forces of the state was to issue a yarlīq in 703/1303-4 to allocate ikṭās to the soldiers. One of its provisions forbade the ploughing up of permanent pasture (Rashid al-Dīn, Tārīkh-i mishrāb-i ghdzdī-i ḡizānī, ed. K. Jahn, 306). The reason for this prohibition can only be guessed at: perhaps, since land capable of cereal growing gave a higher yield in terms of foodstuffs per unit of area than land under pasture, it was due to a fear that the soldiers might plough up all the land allocated to them and as a result would not be able to keep their horses. Ghiyān’s reforms were shortlived and the agricultural revival ephemeral. With the emergence of new federations of tribes at the end of the Ilkhanid period and the apparent resurgence of nomadism in Khurasan from about 747/1346 (see Muʿīn al-Dīn Natanzī, op. cit., 197 ff.), it is likely that the need for pasture again became paramount. Timūr and his successors appear to have been in the habit of allocating pastures to their followers (cf. Abd al-Razzāk Samarkandī, Maʿlaʿ al-ʿaḏgān, ed. Muhammad Shafīʿ, Lahore 1360-8 AH, ii, 1337). From the account of Clavijio, who travelled through Persia in the time of Timūr, there does not seem to have been undue pressure on pastures, in spite of the new influx of nomads. He states that a certain Caghatai tribe, who served as Timūr’s bodyguard, was allowed by him to seek pasture and to sow its crops in all districts, and he mentions meeting between Andīkuyy and Balkh parties of Caghatai nomads in search of pasture, who encamped in all places where there was pasture and water (Embassy to Tamerlane, 1403-1406, tr. Le Strange, London 1928, 196). He also describes extensive pastures in the neighbourhood of Khūwy (148), meadow lands in Lār in the Alburz (169), rich pastures along the Tedjen River (186-7) and round Samarkand (233) and the winter pastures of the plains of Karābāgh (309). We know from the Maʿlaʿ al-ʿaḏgān that in 866/1461-2 the Dūlāyder tribe [see Boldimir, DULAYDER TRIBE] had “long since” (az dir baz) had its yurt, or tribal pastures, in Astārabād and had innumerable flocks (op. cit., ii, 212).
1253), which suggests that there had been an improvement in the pastures there since Ilkhanid times.

The period from the 8th/14th to the early 10th/16th centuries was one of tribal movement and resurgence under the Ak Koyunlu, Kara Koyunlu and the early Safavids, and it is unlikely that there was any reduction in the land under pasture, with the possible exception of the reign of Uzun Hasan (871-83/1466-76), more land may have been brought under cultivation. Already before this in the reign of Tahmasp (930-84/1524-76) one of the Sā'īn Khānī Turkoman tribes from Khāzār, which had come from there to Astaraābād, are said by Iskandar Mūnshī to have engaged in agricultural activity along the Gūrgan River (Shamār-yi Shāhī, Isfahān AHS 1334, i, 590). The pastures of ʿArabistān, ʿUrmistān, Bakhtiyārī, Kurdistan and many of the frontier regions, which were under provincial governors and befargara, were presumably exploited by their tribal followers. The shahs themselves owned large herds of horses and sheep, for which they needed pasture in the neighbourhood of the capital and elsewhere. Taver- nière, who visited Persia several times between 1652 and 1668, states that the shah kept 40,000 horses (Tavernier, 258). The movement of tribes to border districts and elsewhere by the Safavids and later by Nādir Shāh and Aḥam Ṿahān Khān, short-lived spring grass pastures. In the region round Mashhad, Turbat-i Radkan there were also good but not very extensive fine pastures at Cinarud at the head of the R. Kashaf, which continued to be exploited by various tribal federations. Kinneir mentions the rich pasture lands of Sulṭānīyā (A geographical memoir of the Persian empire, London 1813, 124), the rich soil and pastures of Mūḥāfāz (153) and the luxuriant pasture of Luristān (138). In Kirmāngāh the pasture was very good but inferior to that of Ardalān (141).

Failure of rains resulting in a partial or total lack of pasture occurred frequently in different localities. In the late 1860s and early 1870s there was widespread drought. From the winter of 1865-64, the rains were below average for some nine years, with the exception of 1865-6. In 1869-70, hardly any snow or rain fell in the valleys. In the south, particularly, there was little or no grazing, and lower prices for wool and flocks. Losses in flocks and herds (O.B. St. John, Narrative of a journey through Baluchistan and Southern Persia, in F. J. Goldsmed (ed.), Eastern Persia, an account of the journeys of the Persian Boundary Commission 1870-2, repr. London 1976, i, 95). From 1869-72, there was severe famine in almost all regions, accompanied by a country-wide outbreak of cholera; but what the effect of the resulting decline in population was on the distribution of arable and grazing land is not well documented. In the last decades of the 19th century, there appears to have been some sedentarisation of nomads, on a fairly small scale, which may have resulted in the conversion of pasture land into arable land in some districts (see G. G. Gilbar, Demographic developments in the late Qajar period, 1806-1906 in Asian and African Studies, xi [1976], 146-7). In the latter part of the 19th century, there was also an expansion of cultivation in the piedmont zone round Tehran and Kārāql; as a result of this, various tribal groups which had formerly grazed this land were forced to extend their annual migration and farther south towards the heart of the Central Lāt, in order to make use of very inferior and short-lived flushes of pasture that follow sporadic rainfall (W. B. Fisher, Physical geography, in Camb. hist. of Iran, i, 58). Similar events may have taken place elsewhere.

It will have become clear from the foregoing that much grazing land was situated either in the karim of villages, i.e. in the land surrounding the cultivated lands of a village, or in waste or dead land, and so far as the law books discuss pastures they do so chiefly under the headings of hīnā and mawāt [q. v.]. A hadith of the Prophet is recorded to the effect that all Muslims are partners in water, fire and grass. In the light of this, Abū Yūsuf lays down that although the meadows belonging to a village were similar to other private property, their owners could not prevent others from the free use of water and grass unless they had no pasture apart from such meadows and unless no common land was available to them in which they could graze their flocks (Le livre de l’impôt foncier, tr. E. Fagnan, Paris 1921, 155 ff.; see also N. P. Aghnides, Mohammedan theories of finance, repr.
Most MalikTs and HanafTs, however, apparently gave the villagers the exclusive use of the pasture lands in the haslime of their village, but they nevertheless granted the Imam the right to make concessions of such lands to individuals should the public interest required it (ibid., 514). In practice, a wide variety of usage seems to have prevailed. In modern times, the pastures round a peasant proprietor village were usually held in common by the villagers, while in landlord villages the villagers usually had a customary right to graze their animals in the village pastures (Lambton, Landlord and peasant, 355-7).

In privately-owned land (mulk, mulk), the pastures followed the ownership of the rest of the land and could be transmitted by sale, gift or inheritance in the same way. Many pastures constituted, or were situated in, crown lands (see KHALISA), and could be granted to individuals as permanent, temporary or life grants like other crown land. Ibn al-Balkhl states that the pastures of Dagh-i Rùn in the Kühglúa were partly išÁ (“and partly mulk (“Pasture lands”) in its 8th clause that farming in areas that have been used from time immemorial as pasture is forbidden for a certain town or village; (2) pasture lands could be transmitted by sale, gift or inheritance in the same way. In some cases they were transmitted by inheritance, but in others they were subject to re-allotment by the chief of the tribe. Information on these matters is to be found in modern anthropological studies (see especially R. L. Tapper, Pasture and politics, London 1979, on the Shahsivan of Adhar-i bāyādān; F. Barth, Nomads of South Persia: the Bāsi tribe of the Khanschí confederacy, London 1961; W. G. Irons, The Yomud Turkmen: a study of social organisation among a Central Asian Turkic-speaking population, Anthrop. papers, Museum of Anthropology, no. 58, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor 1975; idem, The Turkmen nomads, in Natural history, lxvii [1968], 44-51; and G. R. Garthwaite, Khans and shaks: a documentary analysis of the Bakhtri in Iran, Cambridge 1980).

On the basis of the hadīth of Muhammad quoted above, al-Māwardi states that no governor could exact anything for the use of pastures in dead or reserved land (al-Abkām al-sulūt-iyya, Cairo 1966, 187, tr. Fagnan, Les statuts gouvernementaux, Algiers 1915, 401). In practice, however, there was a wide variety of usage in the matter of pasture taxes generally, and they are not always easily distinguishable from flock taxes (see Kharādž). In Persia, the owners of pastures also levied dues on those who grazed their flocks in them (for modern usage, see Landlord and peasant, 290, 355-8).


3. In Turkey.

The legal practice on the pastures appears from the ancient legal texts, to have been influenced by custom and tradition. The Aydîn Edict of 935/1528, issued during the reign of Suleymân the Magnificent, states in its 8th clause that farming in areas that have been used from time immemorial as pasture is forbidden as being against public interest. Likewise, the 13th clause of the Kütyâha Edict of the same year indicates that the ploughing and private ownership of areas where cattle are pastured is forbidden on the interests of both the urban as well as rural population.

In fact, similar provisions existed even earlier: the 16th clause of the Bursa Edict of 892/1487 suggests that the arrangements concerning pastures were much the same previously. It says that “It is forbidden to cultivate and to establish private property on pastures where both city and village dwellers graze their herds because it brings harm to the public.”

Hence we conclude from these measures of the 9th/15th and 10th/16th centuries that:

(1) acceptance of a given stretch of land as pasture is contingent upon its being used for this purpose from very old times and its having been allocated as a pasture for a certain town or village; (2) pasture lands should not be used for grain production, and frequent references to this prohibition in the laws of different periods show that this rule was implicitly admitted by society as an unchanging principle; (3) pastures cannot become private property; and (4) only the dwellers of the village or town to which the pasture is allocated may use it for this purpose.

The Land Edict of 1274/1858 is by far the most significant Ottoman legal text on this subject of the 19th century. Though it was a product of the Tanzimât [q.v.] era when western influence was being felt in an increasing degree, this Edict combined custom and tradition with the tenets of the formal Islamic land law. Articles 91 to 102 of this Edict contained provi-
sions regarding the aradi-yi matrafa “assigned lands”, though the normal term of Islamic law in which such stretches which are allocated to the use of town or village dwellers as pastures and winter grazing [see KISHLAK] is aradi-yi mahmiya “protected lands”. Now according to this new law, there were two kinds of aradi-yi matrafa. The first included areas of public utility such as roads, and recreational areas, while the second covered pasture, summer and winter grazing grounds, and scrubland where firewood might be gathered. Their salient features may be summarised as follows: (1) title deeds cannot be released for such lands; (2) they are not subject to taxation; (3) prescription is not applicable to them; (4) ex officio settlements of conflicts on these areas are not admissible; (5) such areas cannot be increased or decreased; (6) they cannot be made the subject of gifts; and (7) proof of collective use of such areas prevails over that of individual use in conflicts regarding their allocation.

Article 97 of the law defines pastures, concerning which the following points may be noted: (1) allocation is the conditio sine qua non for any area to be considered as pasture; (2) where allocation does not exist, it must have been used as a pasture from time immemorial; (3) the town or village dwellers to whom the allocation has been made alone can utilise a pasture for their herds; (4) pastures cannot be bought or sold; (5) buildings cannot be constructed on and trees cannot be planted in pastures, nor can they be converted into vineyards and fruit farms; (6) the surface areas of pastures may not be increased or decreased; (7) pastures cannot become private property through prescription; (8) the nature of the pasture cannot be altered, thus it cannot be used as arable land; (9) the offspring of animals grazing in the pasture are allowed there also; (10) summer and winter grazing grounds are accessible to dwellers of other town and cities, while the pastures are exclusive to urban or rural population to whom they are allocated; and (11) the use of summer and winter grazing grounds requires the payment of a certain fee, although the pastures are at the free disposal of the herds of towns and villages to which they are allocated.

There has been much debate among the Turkish jurists on whether the provisions regarding pastures of the 1274/1858 Land Edict were annulled by the 1926 Turkish Civil Code modelled on its Swiss counterpart. Though article 641 of this Code stated that ad hoc provisions would be introduced regarding the administration and utilisation of property for public use, such provisions have yet to be adopted, particularly concerning the pastures. Likewise, article 912 states that immovable property allocated for public use and not owned by individuals is in general not subject to the registration procedure. This does not appear to contradict the spirit of the 1274/1858 Land Edict or the practical implementation of the provisions concerning pasture lands. Article 43 of the Law on the Implementation of the Turkish Civil Code states unequivocally that the Medjelle-yi ahkâm-i ‘adilîye is rescinded, but without making any reference to the Land Edict; it merely mentions in a general fashion that the provisions of the previous laws contradictory to those of the Civil Code are deemed to have been repealed. Due to this uncertainty, the status of pastures has largely been governed by existing law and the Land Edict, even after the entry into force of the Civil Code in 1926.

Under article 639 of the Civil Code governing the acquirement of immovable property not entered on the land registry for an uninterrupted and legally unchallenged 20 years may request the registration of such property in his possession. Though this provision was used in a rather limited fashion in Switzerland, whence the Civil Code was borrowed, widespread use had been made of this article in Turkey in order to establish private ownership of land under state control and possession, including of pastures. This has been to some extent facilitated by the inadequacy of the land registry system and by the incompleteness of the cadastral survey work, not to mention the rapid population growth and the accelerating rate of agricultural mechanisation. Finally, when the matter appeared to have attained significant proportions, the legislative power felt the need to take action, and a modification of the issue appeared in article 639 of the Civil Code concerning the acquirement of immovable property whereby requests for registry were to be directed to
the treasury and the relevant public corporation. In 1972, Law 1617 limited the areas for which registra
tion as private property could be requested under
acquisitive extraordinary prescription to 20 donums.
Meanwhile, the over-use of pastures far beyond their possible
of natural regeneration has caused major
problems, such as soil erosion. Accordingly, the intro-
duction of a new legal framework for the regulation of
pasture lands in Turkey should yield considerable
benefits in developing livestock production and in
making the existing pasturage lands more productive.

Abbasid administration in decay, from the old capital of Adharbay-
djan to Tabriz, was not
characterised by a reputation for probity and avoidance of the grosser
forms of corruption like
wasdtd). Naturally, the vizier himself benefited from this, and
among the accusations against Ibn al-Furat at his fall
on the route was Kulsara (cf. below).

In the "Abbasid caliphate, this form of bribery became
institutionalised in the caliphate of al-
Mukhtadar (295-520/908-32 [q.v.]), when the vizier Ibn
al-Furât [q.v.] instituted a special office, the divîn al-
marâfîk [see diwân i] in which were placed bribes and
money from commissions collected from aspiring candidates for office, above all for the lucrative
finances, in return for a grant of such an office.
Naturally, the vizier himself benefited from this, and
among the accusations against Ibn al-Furât at his fall
was the one that he had kept back a proportion of the
monies received from confiscations (muşâdarat [see muşâdar])
and bribes for the grant of an office
(including the level at which it was recog-
nised that a vizier or secretary might by convention
keep back some part of the payment as a recognised
commission, the hâk al-xâlûnÏ). Even a vizier with a
reputation for probity and avoidance of the grosser
forms of corruption like ʻAli b. ʻIsâ [q.v.] was not
averse to accepting marâfîk as a normal perquisite of
office.

Bibliography: Material in such sources as
Tabâri, Miskawiyah and Hâlîl al-Sâbi‘ is utilised in
H. F. Amedroz, Abbâsid administration in decay, from the Tajabir-un, in: JFRAS (1913), 828-9, 834-5;
F. Lokkegaard, Islamic taxation in the classic period,
Copenhagen 1950, 190-1; D. Sourdel, Le vizirat
Abbasside, Damascus 1959-60, ii, 408, 510-11, 594,
610-13, 636, 741. See also Hîbâ and for a more
detailed treatment of bribery, RASHWA.

(C. E. Boeckwroth)

MARÂGAH, the old capital of Aţâr-bay-
djan.

Position. The town lies in lat. 37° 23' N. and
long 46° 15' E. at a height of 5,500 feet above
level of the sea on the western slope of Mount Sahand (11,800
feet high) which separates it from Tabriz [q.v.]. This
explains the very considerable difference in climate
between the two towns, which are only 30 miles apar
as the crow flies (by the high road 80 miles). The
climate of the river Sâfi (Sofâ) which runs there
is mild and rather moist (Hamz Allâh and Meccqueenem, 1904). The plentiful water
supply makes the vegetation rich. The fruit o
Marâga is celebrated in Persia and a good deal of i
is exported to Russia via Ardabil. The district i
watered by the stream which flows down from the
Sahand and then turns west to Lake Urmia which i
20 miles from Marâga. The town is built on the le
bank of the river Sâfi (Sofâ) which runs there
from the basin of the Caspian Sea

From the geographical point of view, Marâga i
quite independent of Tabriz. It lies a little off the great road from Tabriz to Kirmângâh which runs neare
Lake Urmia (via Binâb). The direct bridge-path Tabriz-Marâga by the passes of the Sahand is onl
practicable in summer. There is also a direct route
along the river and on the south coast of the
region crossing the Sâfi-rûd, 20 miles from Marâga. This road has always been of importance whenever Marâg
was the capital of Aţâr-baydjan. The important plac
on the route was Kûlsara (cf. below).

At the beginning of the 19th century, Marâga ha
6,000 families (Bustân al-siyahat); in 1290/1880 it ha
13,259 inhabitants, of whom 6,865 were men an
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2. Same formation as shown in Fig. 1 but in a still hotter and drier area near Isfahan. Dominants are antipastoral and antipyric plant species (*Artemisia* spp., *Astragalus* spp.). The white dots are plants of *Tulipa polychroma*; the flowering shrub to the right in the foreground is a thorny species of *Amygdalus*. (Photograph by M. Zohary, *ibidem*, 292.)
3. Slope grazed by sheep and goats near Kirmanshah originally covered by a low forest of Quercus brantii. (Photograph by M. Zohary, ibidem, 290.)

4. Detail from Fig. 2: Artemisia, probably herba-alba. (Photograph by M. Zohary, ibidem, 293.)

5. Another detail from Fig. 2: Astragalus sect. Tragacantha. (Photograph by M. Zohary, ibidem, 293.)
Ptolemy, vi, ch. ii, Ἐἰροδνωνίος, Dio Cass., xlix, 25, are variants of the same name, which was probably that of the ancient capital of Atropatene; cf. Ritter, Erdkunde, ix, 770. If the identification of Φράκτα (summer capital, Strabo) with Talšīrī Sulaymāni suggested by Rawlinson has been accepted (cf. Hoffmann, Auszüge aus syrischen Akten, 253; Marquart, Erinnerungen, 108; A. V. Williams Jackson, Persia, past and present, 136), the identification of Φράκτα is still uncertain. On general principles, it is improbable that a town like Marāgha so advantageously situated by nature was in existence in Roman times as the ancient name of Marāgha increases the probability of the identification Φράκτα = Marāgha (of course with a reservation as to the exact site of the ancient town).

A place-name Marāgha is mentioned in Arabic (Yākūt) and a little town of the same name is in Egypt near Ta'attār. The etymology "place where an animal rolls" *(from m-r-jh)* proposed itself to the Arabs here, but in Adharbājān (cf. also the village of Marāgha near Bakhrūsh, Nishāt al-sulāb, 122) the name is rather a popular Arabic etymology of some local name. It is to be observed that Ptolemy, vi, ch. 2, calls Lake Urmīya Margiāne (μάργιαν τῆς Μαργιανοῦ λίμνης) and gives the same name to the country along the coast of Assyria. Lastly, Marquart in Erinnerungen, 143, 221, 313, retains the variant Μαργιάνι, but Μαργιανῖον seems also to be based on a good tradition (cf. Ptolemy, ed. Wilberg, 1838, 391).

The Arabs. Marāgha must have been among the towns of Adharbājān conquered by al-Mughirā b. Shu'ba al-Thakāfi in the year 22 (al-Baladhun, 325; al-Yaʾkūbī, Balūdān, 271). Marwān b. Muhammad returning from his expedition to Mūkān and Gīlān in 123/740 (cf. al-Yaʾkūbī, Historiar, ii, 363) stopped here and erected a stone with the inscription (in Pers. script) the old village (karyā) was given the name of Marāgha (cf. above). Marwān did some building there. The town later passed to the daughters of Hārūn al-Rashīd. On the rebellion of Wādīnā b. Rawwād, lord of Tabrīz [q.v.], Khūzaym b. Khāzin, who was appointed governor of Adharbājān and Armenia (probably in 107/783, cf. R. Varthema, Καθημερινά της Α’ ἐποχῆς, in Zentralstelle Kolleg Vetokosovedov [1925], 1, 397), built walls round Marāgha and put a garrison in it. When Bābāk rebelled in 201/816-17, the people sought refuge in Marāgha. Al-Maʾmūn sent men to restore the walls and the suburb (rubād) became inhabited again (al-Baladhun, loc. cit.). In 221/836 Marāgha is mentioned as the winter quarters of Afshār in his campaign against Bābak (al-Tahārī, iii, 1186).

In 280/93 the Sādīq Muhammad Afshīn b. Dīwādād seized Marāgha from a certain 'Abd Allāh b. Huysayn, who was killed (al-Tahārī, iii, 2137; al-Mabsūdī, Marāği, viii, 143 = § 3281). In 296/908 the Sadjīd Muhammad b. 'Abd al-Razzāk is a record of the diseases which decimated them because they ate too much fruit in Marāgha. This reference to Marāgha is quite unexpected in the text, and Margoulouth has rightly proposed to read اَلْقَرْم in place of دَقَرْم. A coin struck at Marāgha in 337/949-9 by Muhammad b. ʿAbd al-Razzāk is a record of the brief conquest of Adharbājān by the general of the Būyid Rukn al-Dawla (Vasmer, Zur Chronologie d. Gegenwärtigen in Islam, ii/2 [1927], 170). Of 347/958 we also have drainages of Marāgha in the names of the two sons of the Daylamī Marzūbān, Ibrāhīm and Djasīrūn (ibid., 172).

The Rawwāds and the Saldūqs. After the disappearance of the Daylamī, we find in Tabrīz the family of Rawwādī Kurds who seem to have been related to the Musafāris by marriage only. On the other hand, it is very likely that the Rawwāds are the descendants of the Arab al-Rawwād al-Azdī, lord of Adharbājān (al-Baladhun, 331) who became assimilated by their neighbours in Adharbājān. The best-known of these Rawwāds is Wāhsūdān b. Mamlān (μωχίαν; the change of d to l in Kurdish is common) who is mentioned between 420/1029 and 446/1054 (Ibn al-Aṭhīr, ix, 279, 351, 410), and who in addition to Tabrīz possessed other strongholds in the mountains (Sahān). When in 420/1029 the Ghuzz reached Marāgha and executed there a governor, the latter was called al-Husayn b. Ḥadiyya, but in 42?/10? the latter was united under Wāhsūdān and drove out the Ghuzz (Ibn al-Aṭhīr, ix, 270-2). This incident shows that the district of Marāgha was within the sphere of influence of Wāhsūdān. In 446/1054 Wāhsūdān became a vassal of the Saldūqs, but Ibn al-Aṭhīr, ix, 410, says nothing about the extent of his possessions around Sahān. In 497/1104 the peace between the sons of Malīk-Shāh, Bākriṭuš and Wāhsūdān, was signed near Marāgha, and in 498/1105 Muhammad visited Marāgha.

The Aḥmadīs. In 505/1111-12 we have for the first time mention of the Aḥmadī b. Ibrāhīm b. Wāhsūdān al-Rawwādī al-Kurdi, lord of Marāgha and Kūtbāt (Kūlsāraʾ) (Ibn al-Aṭhīr, x, 361). He was the founder of a little local dynasty, which lasted till about 624/1227. We know very little of the history of the Aḥmadīs [q.v.], which has never been closely studied.

Aḥmadī was certainly the grandson of Wāhsūdān b. Mamlān of Tabrīz [q.v.], and this explains the insistance with which the Arā بهگ of Marāgha tried to retake Tabrīz. Only inscriptible hereditary rights can explain the strange fact of the presence of a Kurd among the amirs of the Saldūqs. The name Aḥmadī is a peculiar formation; the name of Mahadmī, a village to the south of Marāgha, belongs to the same category of diminutives. The Aḥmadīs, however, very soon adopted Turkish names.

Aḥmadī with a large army took part in the Counter-Crusade of 305/1111-12. During the siege of Tell Bābār, Joscelin came to terms with him ( tamburah) and he withdrew from the town (Kamāl al-Dīn, Tarāʾīk halāb, in Rec. des hist. des croisades, iii, 599). Aḥmadī soon abandoned Syria entirely, for he coveted the lands of the Shāhīr Arman Suḵmān who had just died. We know that Suḵmān had extended his sway over Tabrīz, and the reference is probably to this town. According to Sītī b. al-Djaṣwī, in ibid., 536, Aḥmadī had 5,000 horsemen and the revenues from his fiefs amounted to 400,000 dinars a year. In 510/1116-17 (or 508/1114-15) Aḥmadī was stabbed in Baghdād by the Ismāʾīlīs, to whom he had done much injury (ibid., 556; Ibn al-Aṭhīr, x, 361).
Ak-Sunkur I. In 514/1120 Malik Mas'ud, governor of Mawsil and A'dharbaydjan, rebelled against his son Malik Tughril and gave Maragha to his Atabeg Kasim al-Dawla al-Buruki, but the rebellion collapsed and in 516/1122 Ak-Sunkur al-Adhami (client of Ahmadil), lord of Maragha, who was in Baghdad, was authorised by Sultan Mahmud to return to his fief. As the amir KUN-toghil, Atabeg of Malik Tughril (lord of Arran; Ibn al-Athir, x, 399), had died in 515/1121, Ak-Sunkur expected to get his place with Tughril. The latter ordered Ak-Sunkur to raise 10,000 men in Maragha and set out with him to conquer Ardabil, in which enterprise, however, they failed. In the meanwhile, Maragha was occupied by Djuvoyeg Beg, sent by Sultan Mahmud. The Georgian Chronicle (Brosset, i, 368) mentions under 516/1123 the defeat of Ak-Sunkur (whom he calls "Aghsuntuul, Atabeg of Ran" = Arran) during a demonstration against the Georgians carried out by Tughril from his late master's treasure.

In 524/1129, and Ak-Sunkur took a part, but not a very active one, in the suppression of the intrigues of the Mazaydli Dubsays [see MAZAYDIS]. In 524/1130 he was one of the promoters of the election of Sultan Dawud, whose Atabeg he was. In 526/1132 Tughril, uncle of Dawud, defeated the latter and occupied Maragha and Tabriz (al-Bundari, ed. Houtsmans, 161). Dawud, along with his uncle Mas'ud and two other brothers, fled to Persia in flight in the interests of his ward Sultan Arslan, and Maragha was reoccupied by A'dharbaydjan. After the capture of Hamadan, Ak-Sunkur was killed there by the Isma'ili (527/1133), instigated by Tughril's vizier (al-Bundari, 169).

Ak-Sunkur II. The name of Ak-Sunkur's son is transmitted in different forms. Ibn al-Athir, xi, 166, 177, calls him, Ak-Sunkur (II); cf. also Ta'rikh-i guzida, 472. At-Bundari, 231, calls him al-Amir al-Kabir Nasrat al-Din Khasebek and, 243, Nasrut al-Din Arslan Abu (cf. al-Kashghari, Dizan Ullugh al-Turk, i, 80). The Rahat al-sudur, 241, 244, 246, gives him the name of Atabeg Arslan Abu. Al-Bundari treats him as an enemy of the great amir Ildeniz [q.v.], whose family finally triumphed over the lords of Maragha. Ak-Sunkur II, who was called Ildeniz [q.v.], is possibly the Palangeri (?), who was the favourite of Sultan Mas'ud and sought to establish himself in Arran and A'dharbaydjan. This Khasebek had besieged Maragha in 541/1146-7 (al-Bundari, 217). In 545/1150-1 Sultan Mas'ud took Maragha and destroyed its walls (bura), but a reconciliation later took place between Khasebek and Ak-Sunkur II under the walls of Ruytin-diz (cf. below). The execution of Khasebek in 547/1153 by Sultan Muhammad alienated Ildeniz and Ak-Sunkur II and they installed Sulayman on the throne of Hamadan. Muhammad on his return to power sent an embassy to restore good relations with the two lords of A'dharbaydjan (sab'ayb A'). Peace was concluded in 549/1154, and the two great amirs shared A'dharbaydjan between them (al-Bundari, 243). On his deathbed (554/1159), Muhammad entrusted his young son Malik Dawud, (cf. the genealogical tree in the Ruhat al-sudur) to Ak-Sunkur. As Ildeniz was furthering the interests of his ward Sultan Arslan, Pahlawan b. Ildeniz advanced against Ak-Sunkur II, but the latter with the help of Shahn-ir Arman defeated him on the Safid-rud. In 556/1161 Ak-Sunkur sent 5,000 men to the help of the governor of Ray, Ildeniz, who was fighting A'dharbaydjan. The latter gained the upper hand, and in 571/1162 Ak-Sunkur II took part in the expedition of Ildeniz against the Georgians (Ibn al-Athir, x, 189). In 563/1168, however, Ak-Sunkur II obtained recognition for his ward from Baghda'd. Pahlawan b. Ildeniz at once besieged Ak-Sunkur in Maragha (ibid., 218), but a peaceful end to hostilities was postponed.

In 564/1168-9, the amir of Ray, Inandj, was killed (Ibn al-Athir, xii, 230). The Tawqih-i guzida, 72, seems to suggest that the rebellion in Maragha of Kutlugh (?), brother of Ak-Sunkur (II), was due to Inandj's influence. He was punished by the Atabeg Pahlawan b. Ildeniz, and Maragha was given to his brothers 'Ala-al-Din and Rukn al-Din.

Under 570/1174-5, Ibn al-Athir (xi, 280) mentions that at Maragha Fadak al-Din, son of Ibn Ak-Sunkur (i.e. son of Ak-Sunkur II), to whom his father had bequeathed his estates. Pahlawan besieged the fortress of Ruytin-diz and Maragha. On this occasion, peace was concluded on the cession of Tabriz to the family of Ildeniz. This important detail shows that down to 570 the fief of the Ahmadilis comprised all the country round Mount Sahand, including Tabriz.

In 602/1205-6 the lord of Maragha, 'Ala-al-Din came to an agreement with the Atabeg of Arbil, Muzaflar al-Din Gokburi, to deprive the Ildenizid AbU Bakr of A'dharbaydjan of power, on the pretext that he was incapable of ruling. From Maragha they marched on Tabriz, but Abu Bakr called to his aid the former slave of his family Ay-doghmish (cf. Defremery, Recherches sur quatre princes d'Hamadan, in JA, 1895, 154). In 603/1206-7 Pahlawan returned to his own lands and Abu Bakr with Ay-doghmish came to Maragha. 'Ala-al-Din had to surrender the fortress which was the bone of contention, but was given in compensation the towns of Urmia and Ughun. In 604/1207-8 'Ala-al-Din, whom Ibn al-Athir, xii, 157, 182, here calls Kara-Sunkur, died and left one son, a minor. A brave servant of 'Ala-al-Din assumed the guardianship of the child, but the latter died in 605/1208-9, and Abu Bakr then took possession of all the lands of the Ahmadilis except Ruytin-diz, where the servant already mentioned had entrenched himself with his late master's treasures.

It is not clear if 'Ala-al-Din Kar-Sunkur is identical with the brother of Ak-Sunkur II mentioned in 564/1168-9. For the date of his accession and his importance in the history of Maragha and A'dharbaydjan, the preface of the Haft-piyar of Nizamih [q.v.], this poem (finished in 593/1197) was composed at the request of 'Ala-al-Din K. R.b. (?; Arslan (the Rûm and the Rus paid him tribute [kharaj]; the Georgians suffered reverses at his hands). This mamddl was definitely identified by Rieu, Catalogue, i, 567 and Supplement, 1893, 145, with 'Ala-al-Din of Maragha. Nizamih mentions two sons of 'Ala-al-Din, Nusrut al-Din Muhammad and Ahmad; but to reconcile this with Ibn al-Athir we should have to suppose that both died before their father.

The family of the Ahmadilis was continued for some time in the female line. In 618/1221 the Mongols arrived before Maragha, and the town was stormed on 4 Safar/30 March. The Mongols sacked and burned the town and massacred the inhabitants (ibid., xii, 246, 263), but the lady of Maragha (daughter of 'Ala-al-Din?), who lived in Ruytin-diz escaped the catastrophe. Djalal al-Din. In 622/1225, the Khwarazmshah Djalal al-Din came to Maragha via Dakhka. He entered it without difficulty, for the inhabitants were complaining of all kinds of oppressions and raids by the Georgians (Nasawi, Sina Djalal al-Din, ed. Houdas). Djalal al-Din tried to restore the prosperity of Maragha; cf. Ibn al-Athir, xii, 200, 202.

In 624/1227, while Djalal al-Din was in Persian I'tis, his vizier Sharaf al-Mulk was forced to recon-
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to the treasury at 70,000 dinars (Ardabil paid 85,000) and those of its wildyat at 185,000 dinars. The tuman of Maragha comprised all the southern part of Adharbāyjān; in the north it was bounded by the tuman of Tabrīz, in the west by that of Khoy (Urmia), in the south by the lands of Kūrdistān (Dinawar) and in the east by 'Irāk-i 'Adām (Zangān, Sudjās). All the lands now under the modern Sāvand-Bulāk or Mahābad were then ruled from Maragha. As dependencies of Maragha, Hamd Allāh gives the towns of Dih-i Kūh-arakan (in popular Turkish, Tashqorghan) to the south of Tabrīz. Lavānī on the right bank tributary of the Ḍajhaṭu (cf. Rawlison, 1841: 39; the ruins of Kal‘a-yi Bāhhta) and Paswē in Lāhīdān, in the valley of the Tigris [cf. sāwand-bulāk]. The tuman comprised six cantons (the names are much mutilated): Sarājūn (?); Niyażdūn (?); Dūzakhūrūd (?; cf. the mountain Dūzakh on the middle course of the Ḍajhaṭu); Gawdāwīk (at the confluence of the river of Laylān with the Ḍajhaṭu; the name is also read Gawdūl, Gawdawān. It is remarkable that Firdawṣī (ed. Moḥi, vii, 141, 151) mentions in these regions a Daḵič Dūk and Kūh-i Dūk where Bahram Čūbīn was defeated by Khvārsaw; Bihistān (probably the district of Bāhī on the Tatawu) and Hāghartūrūd (to the east of Sahand on the Karanghu). The district of Angūrūn on the Kīzīl-uẓūn was also a dependency of Maragha.

Christianity at Marāgha. In the Mongol period, Marāgha had become an important centre of Christianity. The celebrated Mar Bar Hebraeus [see Abū al-ʿAzīz Pāsta; cf. šuwal-kermān] of the same name which stretches as far west as Lake Urmia and contains four component sub-districts (bakhşis), Huma, ʿAbd al-ʿAdīs, Bāzūn and Malik Kard, the total population of the Šahristān being 232,067. As well as Sunnis and Shīʿīs, in the main Turkish-speaking district, the total population of the Šahristān of the same name which stretches as far west as Lake Urmia and contains four component sub-districts (bakhşis), Huma, ʿAbd al-ʿAdīs, Bāzūn and Malik Kard, the total population of the Šahristān of the same name which stretches as far west as Lake Urmia and contains four component sub-districts (bakhşis), Huma, ʿAbd al-ʿAdīs, Bāzūn and Malik Kard, the total population of the Šahristān
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Francis, South Arcot, Madras 1906; and H. R. Pate, J^innevelly, Madras 1917. S. Playne and W. ... same author, 382, mentions a direct road from Marand to Maragha (via Nurin [?], somewhere west of Tabriz?). Later, Djulfa). The road from Tabriz to Khoy also branches takes its name from the village of Waldiyan. To the east of Marand lies the wild and mountainous region historians is called Yam (Mongol = "post-station").

The altarmenischen Ortsnamen, wife (Hubschmann, the lands as far as Lake Urmiya. A legend of Arme- Karadja-dagh which is crossed by the defile of the pass to the south of Marand often mentioned by historians is called Yam (Mongol = "post-station"). The pass between the plain of Marand and Marand is surrounded by many gardens, occupies the eastern corner of a rather beautiful plain, about 10 miles broad and sloping slightly to the west. To the south, the Mishow range, a continuation of the central heights of the plain of Marand is separated from the Araxes by a slightly to the west. To the south, the Mishow range, a continuation of the central heights of the plain of Marand is separated from the Araxes by a

The town lies about 40 miles north of Tabriz, halfway between it and the Araxes or Aras in lat. 38° 25' 30" N. and 45° 46" E. at an altitude of ca. 4,000 feet/1,360m. (it is 42 miles from Marand to ca. 360 miles/579 km. It lies 40 miles north of Tabriz.) Djulfa). The road from Tabriz to Khoy also branches takes its name from the village of Waldiyan. To the north-east of Khoi. The length of the Zunuz is about 40 miles (Hamd Allah MustawfT: 8

Later history. The Arab geographers of the 4th/10th century (al-Istakhri, 182; Ibn Hawkal, 239; cf. Le Strange, 4th/10th century (al-Istakhri, 182; Ibn Hawkal, 239; cf. Le Strange, 166-7) mention Marand among the little towns of Adharbaydjan where the trouser-arrived with 180 prisoners at the caliph's court. Al- Mutawakkil ordered Ibn Ba'th to be beheaded, but the latter recited verses in Arabic and the caliph was astonished by his poetic gifts (inna ma'ruhu la-adabbin) and gave him his life. Ibn Ba'th died in prison and his sons entered the corps of mercenaries (al-ghadirjia). According to one of al-Tabar'i's authorities (iii, 1388), the shaykhs of Maragha who praised the bravery and literary ability (adab) of Ibn Ba'th also quoted his Persian verses (bi 'l-farziyya). This important passage, already quoted by Barthold, BSOs, ii (1923), 836-8, is evidence of the existence of the cultivation of poetry in Persian in northwestern Persia at the beginning of the 9th century. Ibn Ba'th must have been incarcerated to a considerable extent, and, as has been mentioned, he relied for support on the non-Arab element in his nástaks (tulad taille). During the 8 months that the siege lasted, 100 individuals of note (auwâd) were killed and 400 wounded. When Bughâ al-Şarâbî (al-Baladhuri, 330: Bughâ al-Şaghîr) arrived, he succeeded in detaching the men of the Rabî' tribe from Ibn Ba'th. Ibn Ba'th and his relatives were seized and his house and those of his partisans plundered. In Shawkâl of 235/April-May 850, Bughâ arrived with 180 prisoners at the caliph's court. Al-Mutawakkil ordered Ibn Ba'th to be beheaded, but the latter recited verses in Arabic and the caliph was astonished by his poetic gifts (inna ma'ruhu la-adabbin) and gave him his life. Ibn Ba'th died in prison and his sons entered the corps of mercenaries (al-ghadirjia). According to one of al-Tabar'i's authorities (iii, 1388), the shaykhs of Maragha who praised the bravery and literary ability (adab) of Ibn Ba'th also quoted his Persian verses (bi 'l-farziyya). This important passage, already quoted by Barthold, BSOs, ii (1923), 836-8, is evidence of the existence of the cultivation of poetry in Persian in northwestern Persia at the beginning of the 9th century. Ibn Ba'th must have been incarcerated to a considerable extent, and, as has been mentioned, he relied for support on the non-Arab element in his nástaks (tulad taille). During the 8 months that the siege lasted, 100 individuals of note (auwâd) were killed and 400 wounded. When Bughâ al-Şarâbî (al-Baladhuri, 330: Bughâ al-Şaghîr) arrived, he succeeded in detaching the men of the Rabî' tribe from Ibn Ba'th. Ibn Ba'th and his relatives were seized and his house and those of his partisans plundered. In Shawkâl of 235/April-May 850, Bughâ arrived with 180 prisoners at the caliph's court. Al-Mutawakkil ordered Ibn Ba'th to be beheaded, but the latter recited verses in Arabic and the caliph was astonished by his poetic gifts (inna ma'ruhu la-adabbin) and gave him his life. Ibn Ba'th died in prison and his sons entered the corps of mercenaries (al-ghadirjia). According to one of al-Tabar'i's authorities (iii, 1388), the shaykhs of Maragha who praised the bravery and literary ability (adab) of Ibn Ba'th also quoted his Persian verses (bi 'l-farziyya). This important passage, already quoted by Barthold, BSOs, ii (1923), 836-8, is evidence of the existence of the cultivation of poetry in Persian in northwestern Persia at the beginning of the 9th century. Ibn Ba'th must have been incarcerated to a considerable extent, and, as has been mentioned, he relied for support on the non-Arab element in his nástaks (tulad taille). During the 8 months that the siege lasted, 100 individuals of note (auwâd) were killed and 400 wounded. When Bughâ al-Şarâbî (al-Baladhuri, 330: Bughâ al-Şaghîr) arrived, he succeeded in detaching the men of the Rabî' tribe from Ibn Ba'th. Ibn Ba'th and his relatives were seized and his house and those of his partisans plundered. In Shawkâl of 235/April-May 850, Bughâ arrived with 180 prisoners at the caliph's court. Al-Mutawakkil ordered Ibn Ba'th to be beheaded, but the latter recited verses in Arabic and the caliph was astonished by his poetic gifts (inna ma'ruhu la-adabbin) and gave him his life. Ibn Ba'th died in prison and his sons entered the corps of mercenaries (al-ghadirjia). According to one of al-Tabar'i's authorities (iii, 1388), the shaykhs of Maragha who praised the bravery and literary ability (adab) of Ibn Ba'th also quoted his Persian verses (bi 'l-farziyya). This important passage, already quoted by Barthold, BSOs, ii (1923), 836-8, is evidence of the existence of the cultivation of poetry in Persian in northwestern Persia at the beginning of the 9th century. Ibn Ba'th must have been incarcerated to a considerable extent, and, as has been mentioned, he relied for support on the non-Arab element in his nástaks (tulad taille). During the 8 months that the siege lasted, 100 individuals of note (auwâd) were killed and 400 wounded. When Bughâ al-Şarâbî (al-Baladhuri, 330: Bughâ al-Şaghîr) arrived, he succeeded in detaching the men of the Rabî' tribe from Ibn Ba'th. Ibn Ba'th and his relatives were seized and his house and those of his partisans plundered. In Shawkâl of 235/April-May 850, Bughâ arrived with 180 prisoners at the caliph's court. Al-Mutawakkil ordered Ibn Ba'th to be beheaded, but the latter recited verses in Arabic and the caliph was astonished by his poetic gifts (inna ma'ruhu la-adabbin) and gave him his life. Ibn Ba'th died in prison and his sons entered the corps of mercenaries (al-ghadirjia). According to one of al-Tabar'i's authorities (iii, 1388), the shaykhs of Maragha who praised the bravery and literary ability (adab) of Ibn Ba'th also quoted his Persian verses (bi 'l-farziyya). This important passage, already quoted by Barthold, BSOs, ii (1923), 836-8, is evidence of the existence of the cultivation of poetry in Persian in northwestern Persia at the beginning of the 9th century. Ibn Ba'th must have been incarcerated to a considerable extent, and, as has been mentioned, he relied for support on the non-Arab element in his nástaks (tulad taille).
Marand must have shared the fate of Tabriz [q. v.]. According to Yakút, iv, 503, the town had begun to decline after it was plundered by the Georgians (Kurds), who carried off its inhabitants. This is valuable confirmation of the Georgian expedition to Persia, a detailed account of which is given in the Georgian Chronicle for 1208-10 [see Tábriz and Al-Kuréj].

Among the theologians born in Marand, Yákút mentions one who died in 216/831 and another who had studied in Damascus in 433/1041-2. In 624/1226, Marand, which had not sufficient defences, was occupied by the hādījī Abú al-Asráfí of Kakhâl. Sharâf al-Mulk, governor for the Khârazmshâh, retook the town and wrought great slaughter in it (Nasawi, ed. Houdas, 166).

The only historical monument in Marand is the old mosque, Salâdîg in origin, now in ruins, with a mihrâb in stucco bearing the dates of rebuilding 730/1330 (reign of the Il-Khânîd Abû Sa'id) and 740/1339 by Khâyda Husayn b. Mahmûd (cf. Sarre, Denkmäler persischer Baukunst, Berlin 1910, 24-5 and pl. xvii; the observations by E. Herzfeld, Die Gumbadh-i ʿAlawiyân, in the Volume ... presented to E. G. Browne, Cambridge 1922, 194-5; and D. Willber, The architecture of Islamic Iran. The Il-Khânîd period, Princeton 1955, 150). Marand was mentioned in the Byzantine sources as early as 270/882-3 (cf. E. Herzfeld, Byzan. Zeitschrift, iii, 1910, 794-6; St. Martin, Mémo. sur l'Arm., 200). The statement in a description of the district of Halab (B.N. ms. Arab., no. 1683, fol. 72a) that the Armenian name of the town was Nakinuk (Blochet, iii, 525-6, 6) is wrong; this is a mistake for Goynuk, a name later given to the town itself occupied only half this area (Nahat al-kullâh, 88, tr. 89). In the Timurid period, Marand appears as a mint-town (in 832/1428-9), see E. von Zambaur, Die Munzprägungen des Islam, zeitlich und örtlich geordnet, i, Wiesbaden 1968, 238.

Marand is several times mentioned in connection with the Turco-Persian wars. According to Ewliya Çelebi (in 1647), Sinâbîn-i nâma, ii, 242, Marand was a hunting-resort of the Timurid Shâhrokh. In spite of the damage done by the invasion of Sulṭân Murâd, the town looked prosperous and had 3,000 houses. Ewliyâ enumerates a number of celebrated theologians buried north of Marand.

In the autumn of 1724 Abûl Ālam Pâsha Kâprûlu sent the Kurdish Khân of Bîlis Muhammad Abid to occupy Marand, the inhabitants of which had fled. Resistance centred round the town of Zümûz (10 miles north of Marand) which had 7,000 (?) houses and a castle called Dîza by the Persians. To dispose of the threat to their flank, the Janissaries, before advancing on Tabriz, fought a battle here in May 1725 with the Persians, of whom a large number were slain. Dîza was taken and dismantled (cf. von Hamer, Götz, iv, 226, following Çelebi-žâde).

Marand has often been mentioned by European travellers since the time of Hans Chr. von Teuffel (1589), cf. the notices by Chardin (ed. 1811, i, 318) and by Ker Porter, Jaubert, Morier, Ouseley and Monteith, of which a résumé is given in Ritter, Erdkund, ix, 907. Marand has recently gained in importance since it lies on the modern high road from Tabriz to Dîflâ built by the Russians in 1906 and replaced by a railway in 1915-16.

In contemporary Iran, Marand comes within the third wîthin of Adharbayjân, and is the centre of a region of southern Anatolia, falling within modern Turkey and now the chef-lieu, as Marâş, of the i (formerly silâyet) of Marâş.

It lies about 2,000 feet/610 m. above sea-level on the northern edge of the hollow (ʿAmk of Marâş; now Çakal Owa and south of it Şeker Owa or Marâş Owa) which lies east of the Dîyarbâkîr and is watered by its tributary, the Nahr Harîl (Ak-Sû). As a result of its situation at the intersection of the roads which run to Antakîya, to ʿAyn Zarda and al-Mâšsîa, to Albitân (Abdustân) and Yarpûz, via Gökâtûn (Kokusos) to Kaysariyya, via Behesni (Bahamas) to Sumâysîât and via al-Hadâš and Zîbra to Malatya, Marâş was from the earliest times one of the most important centres of traffic in the Syrian frontier provinces. This importance was mentioned as early as the Assyrian texts as Markasi, capital of the kingdom of Gurgum [see ғârismâna], and several Hittite monuments have been found there (cf. Unger, Marâşi, in Ebert's Reallexikon d. Vorgesch., viii, 1927, 48).

1. History up to the Ottoman period. In the Roman imperial period it was called Germanikeia in honour of Caligula on the coins, Ceasarea Germaniæ, in the district of Halab (B.N. ms. Arab., no. 1683, fol. 72a) that the Armenian name of the town was Nakinuk (Blochet, ROL, iii, 525-6, 6) is wrong; this is a mistake for Goynûk, a name later given to the neighbouring al-Hadâš [q. v.]. The Emperor Heraclius passed through the town in 626 (Theophanes, Chron., ed., de Boor, 313; Ramsay, in Glasser's Review, x, 140; Gerland, in Byz. Zeitschrift, iii [1894], 362). The Emperor Leo III came from Marâş (Germanikeia); later authors (like Theophanes, op. cit., 391) wrongly called him the "Isaurian" (a confusion with Germanikopolis; cf. K. Schenck, in Byz. Zeitschr., v [1896], 296-8).

In the year 16/637 Abu ʿUbayda sent Khânî b. al-Walid from Manbij against Marâş, and the Greek garrison surrendered the fortress on being granted permission to withdraw unmolested; Khânî then destroyed it (Caetani, Annali dell' Isîm, iii, Milan 1910, 794, 806). Sufyân b. ʿAwf al-Ğamîdi in 30/650-1 set out from Marâş against the Byzantines. Muʿâwiya rebuilt Marâş and settled soldiers in this "Arab Cayenne" (as Lammens, in Annali dell' Isîm, iii, 525-6, 6) is wrong; this is a mistake for Goynûk, a name later given to the town itself occupied only half this area (Nahat al-kullâh, 88, tr. 89). In the Timurid period, Marand appears as a mint-town (in 832/1428-9), see E. von Zambaur, Die Munzprâgungen des Islams, zeitlich und örtlich geordnet, i, Wiesbaden 1968, 238.

The Emperor Heraclius passed through the town in 626 (Theophanes, Chron., ed., de Boor, 313; Ramsay, in Glasser's Review, x, 140; Gerland, in Byz. Zeitschrift, iii [1894], 362). The Emperor Leo III came from Marâş (Germanikeia); later authors (like Theophanes, op. cit., 391) wrongly called him the "Isaurian" (a confusion with Germanikopolis; cf. K. Schenck, in Byz. Zeitschr., v [1896], 296-8).

In the year 16/637 Abu ʿUbayda sent Khânî b. al-Walid from Manbij against Marâş, and the Greek garrison surrendered the fortress on being granted permission to withdraw unmolested; Khânî then destroyed it (Caetani, Annali dell' Isîm, iii, Milan 1910, 794, 806). Sufyân b. ʿAwf al-Ğamîdi in 30/650-1 set out from Marâş against the Byzantines. Muʿâwiya rebuilt Marâş and settled soldiers in this "Arab Cayenne" (as Lammens, in MFB, vi [1913], 437 calls it). After Yazid I's death, the attacks of the Greeks on the town became so severe that the inhabitants abandoned it.

After Muhammad b. Marâşi in 74/693-4 had broken the truce concluded by Abû al-Malîk with the Greeks, in Dîflâdî, 1 of the following year the Greeks set out from Marâş against al-ʿAmâk (= 'Amk of
Antakya; cf. Le Strange, Palestine under the Moslems, 391) but were again driven back in the 4th century. Marash was restored by al-Abbās, son of al-Walīd I, and fortified and repopulated; a large mosque was also built there.

The people of Kinnasrin [q.v.] (i.e. probably of the dūr of Kinnasrin) had to send troops every year to Marash. During Marwān II's fighting against Hims, the Emperor Constantine again besieged Marash, which — had finally to capitulate (1297/746) and was destroyed (al-Baladhūrī, 189; Theophanes, Chron., ed. Boor, 422; Georgios Kedros, ed. Bonn, ii, 7). The inhabitants emigrated to Mesopotamia and the dūr of Kinnasrin. After the capture of Hims, Marwān sent troops to Marash, who rebuilt the town in 1307/47; the castle in the centre of the town was henceforth called al-Marwān after him (Yākūt, iv, 498-9). But by 1377/74 the Greeks again sacked the town. Al-Manṣūr then had it rebuilt by Sālīh b. al-Walīd I, and fortified and repopulated; a large mosque was also built there.

The Arabs in the village of Gafina of Marash (Rohricht, 56), to whom it was allotted in the 16th century, as a leader of a robber band and ally of the Byzantine emperor, conquered a little kingdom for himself on the Syrian frontier, belonged to the village of Shirbáz in the district of Marash (Michael the Syrian, iii, 173, 173 n.).

After the Franks under Godfrey de Bouillon had taken Marash in 1109/1097, they installed a bishop there (Michael the Syrrius, iii, 191). Bohemund of Antioch seems to have been in possession of Marash on a fief consisting of Marash (Goisfridus Monachus) who took the town, fortified the surrounding small towns and villages and gave them garrisons and left Monasteria there as ṣūfū (Anna Comnena, Alexiad, ed. Reifferscheid, ii, 132, 11 ff; F. Chalandon, Les Comnene, i, Paris 1900, 234). The town of Marash was placed under the Armenian prince Thath, who had distinguished himself in its defence against Bohemund (Matthaeos Urahyets, ed. Dulaurier, ch. clxxvi, 229-30; Chalandon, op. cit., i, 104-5). But by 1104 he had to abandon it and surrender it to Joscelin de Châteauvert (Courtenay, lord of Tell Bāghrīr (Matthaeos, op. cit., 257; ch. cxxvi; Raoul of Caens, ch. 148; Röhrich, op. cit., 49, n. 8, 52, n. 4). This Thathūr is perhaps the same Armenian as had given his daughter in marriage to Godfrey's brother Baldwin (in William of Tyre, x, 1, he is called Tafroc; in Albert of Aix, iii, 31, v, 18, 1009; ed. Dulaurier, ch. cxxvi; F. Chalandon, Les Comnene, i, 104-5). By 1105 Baldwin of Antioch seems to have been in possession of Marash (Röhrich, 56), to whom it was allotted in the treaty of September 1108 (I Germánakon και το ὑπό τούτον πολέμιον; Anna Comnena, Alexiad, ed. Reifferscheid, ii, 217; Röhrich, 66). In 1114 the widow of the recently-deceased Armenian prince Kogh Vasīl (~ "Basil the thief") of Marash submitted to Aš Sunkur of Mawsīl (Weil, op. cit., iii, 199); on 28 Dūmādād II 508/27 November 1114, Marash was devastated by a disastrous earthquake in which 40,000 lost their lives (Michael the Syrian, tr. Chabot, iii, 200; Recueil hist. or. crois., iii, 607; Mattheos Urahyets, 289, ch. cxxvii). King Baldwin granted a monk named Godfrey (Goisfridus Monachus) a fief consisting of Marash, Kaysmūn and Raśbān (Michael the Syrian, iii, 211; Röhrich, op. cit., 161); in 1124 Godfrey was killed at the siege of Maṣṣūn in the battle of Joscelin of Edessa. The Dāhmarakhd Mūsā, and al-Abbās, son of al-Walīd I, in 531/1136-7 laid waste the villages and monasteries near Marash and Kaysmūn (Matthaeos, 320, ch. ciili). The Saldjūk sultan Maṣūd in 532/1138
advanced as far as Marash, plundering the country as he went (Michael the Syrian, iii, 246) as did Malik Muhammad of Malaya in 535/1141 (ibid., iii, 249) and Kilidj Arslan II in 541/1147 (ibid., iii, 275). The town then belonged to Raynal, son-in-law of Joscelin II of Edessa, who fell in 1149 at Innib (Rohricht, op. cit., 260). On 5 Dumâdâ I 544/11 September 1149, Kilidj Arslan and his father Mas'ud set out from Albistan against Marash, plundered the country around and besieged the town. The Frankish garrison capitulated on being promised a safe retreat to Antioch, but the Sultan sent a body of Turks after them, who fell upon them on the road and slew them. On this occasion, all the treasures of the churches of Marash was lost, which the priests who had rebelled against the bishop had appropriated (Michael the Syrian, iii, 290; Matthieos Urhayeci, 330, ch. clix; Chalandon, op. cit., 421; Rohricht, op. cit., 263). After the capture of Joscelin, Nûr al-Dîn of Halab in 546/1151-2 took a large part of the country of Edessa including the towns of Marash, Tell Bâghir, ʿAtinâb, Dûlûk, Kûrus, etc. (Recueil hist. or. crois., i, 29, 481, ii, 54; Weil, op. cit., iii, 296; Rohricht, op. cit., 265, n. 5). The district was then divided: the suzerain received Marash, Barzaman, Raʿbān, Kaysûm and Bahasnâ, the Arçukêd Kûra Arslan of Dhu zuyâ with the Gargar, Kîlûqâ and Marash, Nûr al-Dîn kept the district of Marash, Syria, iii, 297; William of Tyre, xvii, 16). When Masʿûd's son Kîlidj Arslan, lord of Marash (Michael the Syrian, iii, 318), attacked an Armenian village, the Armenians under Stephen, brother of the prince Thoros, in 1156 revived themselves by setting Marash on fire and carried off the whole population into captivity. He then became master of the Turks (ibid., ii, 314 [expanded from Barhebraeus, Chron. syr.]; differently in Abu Ṣâhîma, Rec. hist. or. crois., iv, 92, F. Chalandon, Les Comnene, ii, Paris 1912, 434). Among those carried off was the bishop Dionysios bar Sabîbi, who escaped to the monastery of Kilisûr (according to Chabot, loc. cit., the ʿAskorân Kauzâqan of Anna Commena, ed. Reiferscheid, ii, 219) and wrote three memoirs about the devastation of his former diocese of Marash (Michael the Syrian, loc. cit.; Baumstark, Gesch. d. syr. Lit., 298). Thores of Little Armenia in 1165 plundered Marash (Barhebraeus, Chron. syr., ed. Bedjan, 331; Rohricht, op. cit., 319, n. 8; Chalandon, op. cit., ii, 531, n. 1). Nûr al-Dîn again took Marash from Kîlidj Arslan II when he was on a campaign against the Dimînânan-dîd Dhu l-Nûn (Michael the Syrian, iii, 330) in the beginning of Dhu l-Kaʿâda 568/14 June 1173) and Bahasnâ in Dhu l-Hijdja (Rec. hist. or. crois., i, 43, 592, iv, 158, Matthias Urhayeci, ed. Dulavrier, 360; Abu l-Fidaʾ, Annal. musl., ed. Reiske, iv, 423; Rohricht, op. cit., 303, who is followed by Chalandon, Les Comnene, ii, 463, wrongly puts these events as early as 1155). Nûr al-Dîn perhaps handed Marash over to his ally Mîch of Little Armenia. When the dynast of Marash raised the district of Raʿbān, al-Malik al-Zâhîr in 592/1195-6 took the field against him, whereupon the lord of Marash sought forgiveness and recognised his suzerainty (Kâmâl al-Dîn, tr. Blochet, in ROI, iv, 212). The Armenian ruler Rupen III took Bohemund III of Antakya prisoner in 1185 and forced him to cede the territory from the Dûshân up to Kasûn (Michael the Syrian, iii, 396-7; Rohricht, op. cit., 403, n. 7, 661). Ghiyâth al-Dîn Kay-Khusraw, son of Kîlidj Arslan II, in 605/1208, when on a campaign against Little Armenia, took Marash (Abu l-Fidaʾ, Annal. musl., ed. Reiske, iv, 232), and made Husâm al-Dîn Hasan governor of the town. He was succeeded in this office by his son Tubshân, who in turn was succeeded by his son Nusrat al-Dîn, who ruled Marash for 50 years. The long reign of his son Muzaffar al-Dîn was followed by that of his brother ʿImad al-Dîn who however in 656/1258 abandoned the town, which was much harassed by the Armenians and Georgians, after failing to find support either from ʿizz al-Dîn Kay-Kâwîs of Kur or al-Malik al-Sâlih of Egypt. The town then surrendered to the Armenians ( Ibn al-Shihâb, Beirut 1909, 192).

Marash did not escape during the great Mongol invasion of Asia Minor. Baybars I of Egypt in his campaign against them in 670/1271 sent from Halab a division under Ṭâybars al-Wazîr and Ṭâs b. Muhîn to Marash, who drove all the Tatars from there and slew them (Rec. hist. or. crois., ii, 246; al-Makrizî, ed. Quatremerde, Hist. de Sultan Mâmulouks, i, 101). In the wars with the rulers of Little Armenia, troops from Halab went as far as Marash in 673/1274 and destroyed the gates of the outer town (Weil, Gesch. d. Chal., iv, 7). In the next few years, Baybars negotiated with envoys from Sis, from whom he demanded the surrender of Marash and Bahasnâ; but he was satisfied instead with a considerable sum of money (al-Makrizî, Recueil hist. or crois., iv, 673; hist., 104 [688/1299]). It was not till 692/1292 that Sultan Khâlîf by a treaty received Bahasnâ, Marash and Tell Hamdûn (Mufaddal b. Abî ʿl-Faqîlî, Hist. des Sultans Mâmulouks, ed. Blochet, in Patrol. Orient., xiv, 557; Weil, op. cit., iv, 186; S. Lane-Poole, History of Egypt in the Middle Ages, London 1901, 287). But the Armenians must have retained the two last-named towns for some time, for in 697/1297 Marash was again taken by the amîr Bilqan Tabâkhi, nâb of Halab, for Lâqîn. A treaty was then concluded with the ruler of Little Armenia, by which the Dâshân was to be the frontier between the two countries; Hamûs, Tell Hamdûn, Kûrâr, al-Nukây, (for its position, cf. L. Alîshân, Sixouan, 493-6), Hâqar Shûghân, Sirfandâkâr and Marash thus passed to Egyptians (al-Makriv, op. cit., ii, 63; Abu l-Fidaʾ, Annal. musl., ed. Chabot, v, 140).

In the second half of the 8th/14th century, Sayn al-Dîn Kârâdja and his son Khâlîf, the founders of the house of the Dhu l-Kadr-oghlu, conquered the lands along the Egyptian Asia Minor frontier with Malaya, Albistan, Marash, Bahasnâ and Kârâpet [see shi l-kadr]. In the mosque of Marash, one of his successors, Malik Arslân, was murdered in 870/1465-6; his portrait with the inscription "Sultan Arslân" and that of his sister Sittâ Khatun with the legend ʿAlif al-Dîn Kay-Kawîs are painted in the Codex Venetus 516 of the Geography of Ptolemy, which he apparently intended to dedicate to this father-in-law Mehmed II (Oehausen, in Hermes, xxv [1880], 417-42)
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2. In Ottoman and modern times.

In Ottoman times, Marâş lay on one of the major routes to Syria: in the early 11th/17th century, Polonyâlî Simeon passed through the city when returning from Aleppo to Istanbul by way of Kayseri. The pre-Ottoman or else 10th/16th century bridge, which still crosses the Ceyhan somewhat to the west of Marâş, must have served this traffic. If the surviving bridge is identical with the bridge mentioned in an Ottoman tax register of the second half of the 10th/16th century, this structure should have been the site of a toll gate. According to the kânî, applied in the region, nomads travelling with their flocks were exempted from toll payment, which was only demanded from traders.

Marâş was considered as lying on a bandaj or pilgrimage route, even though the "diagonal road" crossing Anatolia by way of Konya and Adana seems to have been much more popular. Ewliya Celebi passed through Marâş on his way to Hâratîz, and the suppression of robbery in the district of Marâş was always treated with particular urgency because of the danger it presented to pilgrims (cf. Başbakanîk Arşîvi, Istanbul, Muhimme defterleri, 40, p. 42, no. 98, 97/1579-80). Probably for the same reason, a number of guarded mountain passes (derbendî) was instituted in the area in the course of the 11th/17th and 12th/18th centuries.

In the second half of the 19th century, the old thoroughfare passing through Marâş had apparently lost much of its importance, for in 1891 Cuinet reported that no road suitable for wheeled vehicles existed in the entire sanâqizak. As a result, not much of an outlet existed for local industries. Only in 1948 was Marâş linked up with the Malatya-Fevzipasa railway, which in certain sections follows the area's historical routes. In addition, asphalted roads were built, so that by 1960, Marâş was easily accessible from Adana, Iskenderun, Gaziantep and Malatya.

Administrative structure and population. After the Ottomans had conquered the Dhu 'l-Kadr principality in 921/1515, the area was first governed by Dhu 'l-Kadrî Sîfî Beg b. Şâhuwûr under Ottoman suzerainty. However, after the latter had been killed in 928/1522, surviving members of the Dhu 'l-Kadrî family were appointed to governorships in the European provinces of the Ottoman Empire, and the Ottoman wilâyât-sanâqizak structure was established in the lands which this dynasty had formerly ruled. A tax register (tahârî) dating from the early years of Sultan Kânî Sulayman's reign (after 931/1525-6) refers to a wilâyât of Dhu 'l-Kadrîyya, governed by two sanâqizak beşîgî and divided into five kadâhîs (Marâş, Elbîstân; Kars or modern Kadrî, also referred to as a liwâh-sanâqizak; Şamanto; and Bozok). This wilâyât consisted of 523 villages, 665 nomadic tribes, and 3,412 mezârâs (sown, but not necessarily inhabited, agricultural land). The total adult male population of the wilâyât amounted to 76,101 men. Among the latter, 9,644 were exempt from tax payment, probably either because of their former position under the Dhu 'l-Kadrî dynasty or because of services rendered to the Ottoman administration. Total population registered in the wilâyât can thus be estimated at 230,000 to 300,400 persons.

During those years, the town of Marâş appears as an administrative centre with an unusually high proportion of tax-exempt inhabitants. Of the 1,557 adult males recorded in the town (this should have corresponded to a population of about 7,500, since only 85 persons were recorded as unmarried), 836 men were sipâhis and sipâhîzâdes, in addition to the usual contingent of tax-exempt religious functionaries. This would have left the town with a tax-paying population of only about 550 adult males, an anomalous situation which can be explained only by the fact that the count must have been prepared a short time after the conquest. At this time, Marâş was inhabited only by Muslims.

During Krânûni Sulayman's reign, the number of adult males registered in the tahârî as resident in Marâş almost doubled, and before 972/1564-5 had reached the level of 3,054 men. Of these, 370 were recorded as unmarried. Thus a total population of 13,000-14,000 is probable, apart from certain tax-exempt families which may have gone unregistered. This figure placed Marâş among the large towns of contemporary Anatolia. According to Ewliya Celebi, who passed through Marâş in 1058/1648 and again in 1082/1672-3, the town consisted of 11,000 houses, which would seem to point to a much larger settlement than that described in the 10th/16th century tax registers. However, the town seems subsequently to have lost population. Texier, who refers to Marâş as it was in the early 19th century, estimates its population at 5,000-6,000 inhabitants. Struggles between the family factions of the Dhu 'l-Kadrî and the Bâyezîdî were brought to an end only during the reign of Sultan Ahmed I (102/1613-17), and Marâş seems to have contributed to a decline in urban population. However, according to a British Foreign Office source, between 1830 and 1840 Marâş had again reached the level of 23,000 inhabitants.

Administrative structure between the late 10th/16th and the early 19th century showed relatively slight variations. According to a register containing appointments to provincial governorships between 975-82/1568-74, the wilâyât of Dhu 'l-Kadrîyya consisted of the sanâqizaks of Marâş, Malatya, 'Aynûtáb, Sîs and Kaşr (modern Kadrî). In 1041-6/1632-41, this wilâyât had been much reduced, and now consisted only of the sanâqizaks of Marâş, 'Aynûtáb and Kaşr. 'Ali, who wrote during the reign of Sultan Ahmed I (1012/1603-17) mentions the sanâqizaks of Marâş, Malatya, 'Aynûtáb, Kaşr and Šamisây as forming part of the wilâyât of Dhu 'l-Kadrîyya. This list has also been reproduced in the *Qâbûn-numâ* of Kâtîb Celebi (p. 598). Thus the wilâyât was apparently soon restored to its former size. Writing at the end of the 11th/17th century, Ewliya Celebi enumerates the following: Marâş, Malatya, 'Aynûtáb, Kaşr, Şmansâd and Niğûdê.

During the Ottoman-Egyptian conflict of the 1830s, the troops of IÎhrîmî Paşa, Muhammad 'Ali's son, temporarily held Marâş, which was returned to the Ottoman realm in 1840. Administrative structure as it existed during the second half of the 19th century has been described by Cuinet: the sanâqizak of Marâş then formed part of the eyâlet of Aleppo and consisted of the kadâhîs of Marâş, Elbistan, Andîrin, Paşardîk and Zevîtân (modern name: Süleymanh). According to the same author, the total sanâqizak population amounted to 179,853, of whom 52,000 lived in the town of Marâş (proper) (32,000 Muslims, 20,000 non-Muslims). These figures indicate that a substan-
tial number of non-Muslims must have immigrated into the town, probably mainly during the 19th century. For the early days of World War I, Besim Atalay reports 32,700 inhabitants for the town of Mar'ash proper including 8,500 non-Muslims. In 1927, when the first census of the Turkish Republic was undertaken, the impact of the World War, the occupation of 1919 (first British, then French), and the War of Independence had reduced population to 25,672. From this low point, the city expanded continuously (1940: 27,744; 1945: 33,104; 1950: 34,641; 1960: 54, 447, 1970: 110,761; 1980: 178,557), without experiencing the temporary contraction that many Anatolian towns went through during and immediately after World War II. Between 1960 and 1980, the vilâyet (later il) consisted of the following kazas (later ilâ:): Maras-merkez, Afşin, Andırın, Elbistan, Göksun, Pazarok and Türklogo. In 1980, the il of Kahramanmaras contained a total population of 738,032, of which 281, 382 (38%) lived in towns and cities. Economic activities. From the dues recorded in the tax register compiled before 972/1564-5, the importance of textile manufacture becomes apparent. Apart from a sizeable dyehouse, we hear of a tax payable by bakers. The provincial governor claimed the right to tax the weavers’ pits, (qullâh takarâ); at the end of the 11th/17th century, complaints on this score were addressed to the Ottoman central administration. In the late 12th/18th century, red cottons were particularly esteemed among locally manufactured textiles. Even in the last years of the 19th century, Mar'ash still possessed a reputation as a textile centre. Although by that time many looms lay idle, 281 workshops were still active in this sector. Apart from fabrics intended for everyday use, Cuinet mentions the manufacture of textiles embroidered in gold and silver thread. A certain revival has taken place in the second half of the 20th century; in 1960 a state factory for the manufacture of poplin and other cottons (Siimerbank) began to operate in Mar'ash. This iron must have been mined in the kada? of Suleymanli, for Cuinet records that, in the second half of the 19th century, soft iron from this district was being employed by local farriers and blacksmiths. From the tax register of Kâ纳米î Sulaymân’s early years, we learn that silver was being mined in Göksun; this latter mine, whose existence was also known to Cuinet, was apparently not exploited during the 1890s. In addition, salpetre mines were worked and powder was manufactured; during the Cyprus campaign of the 10th/16th century, the Ottoman armies were using powder from Mar'ash. In the second half of the 20th century, the most important mines of the province of Kahramanmaras are in Elbistan, where abundant lignite has been discovered, and power plants for the conversion of this raw material into electric energy are in the course of being completed. Mar'ash possesses an ample source of wood in the forests which are still fairly abundant in the district; in the 10th/16th century, this wood was used by the Ottoman central administration for the construction of a Euphrates flotilla in Birecik. According to Cuinet, in the second half of the 19th century wood was employed particularly in the manufacture of European-style furniture, whose quality and cheapness the author praised highly.
to the early years of Kānumi Sulayman, Marāši at the time also possessed three zdwiya. However, in actual fact the number must have greater, for a later register (before 972/1564-5) refers to six dervish foundations as having benefited from the Dhū ’l-Kadrī rulers’ generosity. Among the latter, the zāviya of Comaḵ Baba continued to function at least until the late 12th/18th century, and during this latter period of its existence was inhabited by Bektaşī dervishes.

The Ottoman tax registers of the 10th/16th century also refer to the existence of a covered market or bedestān, which seems to have been current in the Safavid period (see Table A). This latter ruler had also established a khrbānasrāy and an ānīsta. It is possible that the last-named building survived in one of the three covered streets, lined with shops, which still exist, or until recently existed, in the centre of Marāši. In the early Ottoman period, further business structures were added, for it is very probable that Ferbād Pāsha, who caused his rival ʿAlī Beg b. Shāhshāvar to be killed upon Sultan Kānumī Sulayman’s order in 928/1522, is identical with the Ferbād Pāsha who (at sometime before 972/1564-5) had a hamām and khrbānasrāy constructed in Marāši. The cited, which is said to go back to Hittite times, was evidenced to Eyvliya Ḍevlet, Seydīyāh, in his inscription dated 915/1509-10 (inc) and bore the name of Sultan Kānumī Sulayman (926-7/1520-66), who had ordered a complete reconstruction of the fortress.

**Bibliography:** Sources, unpublished: Başkanlık Arşivi, İstanbul, Tapu Tahrir 998, pp. 408-638; Tapu Kadastro Genel Müdurlüğü Kuyulu kadime 101 (inc. känan-nâme and waqfī); Başkanlık Arşivi, İstanbul, Müdurlüğün Defterleri, series; a Cengiz defteri from 1085-86/1674-5, in the National Library at Vienna, catalogued as “Procolle des divers Fermans Turcs” and in the course of being published.


**Suraiya Faroqhi**

AL-MARÂŠI [see NUR ALLAH AL-SHUSHTARI), AL-MARÂŠI, a line of sayyids originally from Marāši [q. v.], whose nisba became well-known on account of their dynasty which dominated Māzandarān [q. v.] for most of the period between 760/1358-9 and the second half of the 10th/16th century. The Safawids [q. v.] were related to them by matrimonial alliances (see Table B and below, 2). Their descendants, offspring of the various branches of the Marāši, have continued to bear this nisba by which they are generally known (see below, 3). It was also attributed over the course of the centuries to various sayyids and non-sayyids individuals. Concerning the lakab Marāši, another explanation of the origin of the Marāši sayyids, see Table A.

1. The dynasty of the Marâšî sayyids of Mâzandârân. [a] The first phase. Founded by Sayyid Kawām al-Dīn al-Marâšî, known by the name of Mir-i Buzurg, this dynasty is sometimes called Sīlsila-yi mulkâ’-i Kawāmî-yi al-Marâšîyya (Rayhānat, iii, 323). Its historical context is the vacuum of political power which—in post-Illâhî Iran—enabled sayyids and dervishes to impose their influence. Kawām al-Dīn traced his lineage to the Imām ʿAlî al-Mabīdīn. However, the connection between his Marâšî ancestors and Zayn al-Abîdîn remains unclear (see M. Sütüda, ed., TDG, Mubâk ādima). His genealogy, as featured in the work of Zâhîr al-Dīn (TTTRM) has been disputed by A. Şayâyân, who established an “exact” genealogy with which the biographers of the Marâšî family concur. A genealogy, different from the two afore-mentioned, seems to have been current in the Safawid period (see Table A). The family of Mir-i Buzurg resided at Dâbû, a village near Amûl [q. v.] where he studied religious sciences. He made a pilgrimage to the tomb of the Imâm ʿAlî b. Mûsâ al-RLadî at Mâshhad [q. v.] and...
After:

Zahir al-Din Mar^ash^
Imam CA1T Zayn al-cAbidm
Husayn al-Asghar
Hasan al-Mar‘ashi
Muhammad
"Abd Allah
"Ali
Muhammad(2)
"Abd Allah
Kawm al-Din

Notes to Table A
(1) TTRM, ed. Tasbihí, 166.
(2) Muhammad absent from TTRM, ed. Sháyán, 236.
(3) Dqahán-ári, 88; Yazdi, fol. 2a; SháhGHári, Maqálií, i., 380.
(4) The lakab al-Mar‘ashi (a kind of pigeon) is said to have been given in the first place to "Ali Mar‘ashi, the eponym of the Mar‘ashi Sayyids (Rayhání, iv, 10). In Yazdi, "Ali al-Mar‘ashi and his son Hasan are made into a single "Mar‘ashi".
(5) TTRM, Mukaddíma (approved by the Ayatallah Mar‘ashi-Nadjafi, TTRM, ed. Tasbihí, Mukaddíma, 39-40, with typographical errors).

frequented the kínánkah of the sayyid 'Izz al-Dín Súgháñdí, one of the three influential Súfi shabés of Khurásh, disciple of Sháykh Hasan Dúrí, founder of the Sháykhíyya-Dúrúyya tárkhá, promotor of the Sarbádár movement in Khuráshán (see J. Aubin, in Studia Iranica, v [1976], 217-24). Having obtained the idazút of 'Izz al-Dín, Káwan al-Dín founded his own kínánkah at Dábú where he attracted numerous disciples. The control of Tabaristán-Mazandaran was then the object of keen competition between local powers. After the reconciliation concluded between the Kiyá-i Cúláb and the Kiyá-i Djalál, in 750/1349, Fákhír al-Dawla Cúláb, last representative of the third branch of the Bawándids [q.v.], was assassinated by a son (or by two sons?) of Kiyá Afrásiáb, former sipáh salár and brother-in-law of Fákhír al-Dawla, eponym of the Kiyá-i Cúláb who were also known as Afrásiábíddís [q.v.]. Having thus obtained a precarious control over Amul and Mazandaran, Kiyá Afrásiáb attempted to strengthen his popularity by becoming a disciple of Mir-i Buzurg, who conferred on him the lakáb of sháykhí. But the other disciples of Mir-i Buzurg harassed Afrásiábí and his followers. Afrásiábí imprisoned Mir-i Buzurg, but the latter was freed by his furious disciples. Having appealed in vain for the aid of the Kiyá-i Djalál, Afrásiábí was defeated at Dgalálakmár-parćn, near Dábú, by three hundred dervishes under the command of Kamál al-Dín b. Kawm al-Dín (763/1361-2), who shared responsibilities with his brothers. In 763/1361-2, he entrusted the government of Amul to Ríḍa al-Dín (TTRM, 255 ff.). With control of Amul, Bárfrúsh-dísh and Sári thus assured, the Mar‘áshís extended their power over Sawádkúh and Fírzkúh, which were held by the representatives of the last Bawándids. In the conquest of the fortress of Fírzkúh, and seizure of the treasury of Fákhír al-Dawla, they were assisted by their allies, the Máláíí sayyids of Gílán (TTRM, 261 ff.). The conquest of Rustamdár as far as Násí-risták was the operation of Sayyíd Fákhír al-Dín (782/1380-1). His conquest of Kúdíjúr having given to the Mar‘áshís control over the whole of Mazandaran, Kímál al-Dín entrusted Rustamdár to him. Henceforward, he undertook to subdue the fortresses of Kúdíjúr, of Kálá-risták and of Núr; he conquered Táhlkán and Lawássán, as well as part of Lárríján fortresses of Kuhdír or Kuhdír in Daylá-risták, from Lawándar to Rayná (TTRM, 271 ff.). Fákhír al-Dín took possession of Kázwín—then being contested between Ághá-báyjání and 'Irákí-í Adájam—a brief control interrupted by the death of Mir-i Buzurg (see below). Subsequently, he reoccupied the town, levied taxes following Afrásiábí, Víghtásp, and 'Abd Allah b. Kawm al-Dín. Fákhír al-Dín took three sons killed at Djalálakmar-parc, near Dábú, by three hundred dervishes under the command of Kamál al-Dín b. Kawm al-Dín (763/1361-2). Kamál al-Dín was assassinated by a son (or by two sons?) of Kiyá Afrásiáb, former sipáh salár and brother-in-law of Fákhír al-Dawla, eponym of the Kiyá-i Cúláb who were also known as Afrásiábíddís [q.v.]. Having thus obtained a precarious control over Amul and Mazandaran, Kiyá Afrásiáb attempted to strengthen his popularity by becoming a disciple of Mir-i Buzurg, who conferred on him the lakáb of sháykhí. But the other disciples of Mir-i Buzurg harassed Afrásiábí and his followers. Afrásiábí imprisoned Mir-i Buzurg, but the latter was freed by his furious disciples. Having appealed in vain for the aid of the Kiyá-i Djalál, Afrásiábí was defeated at Dgalálakmár-parćn, near Dábú, by three hundred dervishes under the command of Kamál al-Dín b. Kawm al-Dín (763/1361-2). Kamál al-Dín entrusted Rustamdár to him. Henceforward, he undertook to subdue the fortresses of Kúdíjúr, of Kálá-risták and of Núr; he conquered Táhlkán and Lawássán, as well as part of Lárríján fortresses of Kuhdír or Kuhdír in Daylá-risták, from Lawándar to Rayná (TTRM, 271 ff.). Fákhír al-Dín took possession of Kázwín—then being contested between Ághá-báyjání and 'Irákí-í Adájam—a brief control interrupted by the death of Mir-i Buzurg (see below). Subsequently, he reoccupied the town, levied taxes on its natural powers of MTr-i Buzurg; the only survivor was an infant, Iskandar-i Sháykhí (according to Rayná, in JÁ [1943-5], 236, three sons were killed at Dgalálakmár-parc, and 'Ali in the same battle as Muhammad: TTRM, 250 ff.; Mahdíjí, 15 ff.). The Mar‘áshís then turned on the Kiyá-i Djalál, Fákhír al-Dín and Víghtásp, who held respectively Sári and Túdíjúr (a fortress near Bárfrúsh-dísh = Bábúl). After the first battle, Kawm al-Dín and Kamál al-Dín entered Bárfrúsh-dísh as victors. With some former
there, went to Talikan, and then pillaged Alamut (TTRM, 290 ff.). At the end of a long retreat to Barfurush-dih, Mir-i Buzurg died of illness (781/1379). For a period of twenty years, by his charismatic leadership, he controlled Māzandarān through his sons, among whom there was then a fair degree of unity (four of his fourteen sons died in infancy). Kamāl-al-Dīn held Sārī and had entrusted Amūl to Rūdāl-al-Dīn, Rustamārdār to Fāqīr-al-Dīn and Karatūqgān to Shāraf al-Dīn. The power of the Marāʾghīn extended to the west as far as the frontiers of Kaźwīn; with their support, the Malātī sayyids controlled a large part of Gīlān. But their position was threatened in the east by Mir ʿImād al-Dīn, founder of the small dynasty of the Murūtadāʾi sayyids of Hazāradsar and in Astārābd by Amīr Wālī, who attempted to have Kamāl al-Dīn assassinated. The latter conquered Astārābd, where he left a garrison (781/1379). Fearing lest Amīr Wālī would join forces with Tīmūr Lang, he restored Astārābd to him; similarly, he handed over Rūstamār to Malik Tūs (794/1391-2; TTRM, 293 ff.; Mahdūrī, 23 ff.). But soon after Tīmūr’s conquest of Khūraṣān and Hārāt, Iskandar-ʿī Shaykhī, youngest son of Afraṣīāb, who had campaigned in Khūraṣān, joined forces with him. Twice, Tīmūr took possession of Astārābd. The second time, he appointed as governor there Fīrāq, with whom Kamāl al-Dīn maintained amicable relations. Kamāl al-Dīn also sent his son Ghiyāth al-Dīn to Tīmūr on three occasions with suitable presents, in the hope of persuading him to protect the Marāʾghīn from persecution by Iskandar. But animosity towards the Marāʾghīn (Imāmī and Rāfīḍī Shīʿīs) was rife among the predominantly Sunnī military chieftains of Tīmūr. It was fostered in the west, in Rūstamārdār, by Malik Tūs and in the east, in Astārābd, by Pīrāk, who, inwardly, supported Iskandar-ʿī Shaykhī (Mahdūrī, 27 ff.). Tīmūr had given orders to open up the route through the forests of Māzandarān, and he sent Ghiyāth al-Dīn, held as a hostage, with his vanguard force. Kamāl-al-Dīn had a fortified camp built on a place on 6 Dhu ’l-Kaʿaḍ 794/294 September 1392. Although inflicting losses, the Marāʾghīs were defeated by numerical superiority and withdrew to Māhānāsar, after two months and six days of siege. Kamāl al-Dīn sent ʿulamaʾ to Tīmūr to request amān or quarter for himself and his associates. They left the fortress of Māhānāsar on 22 Ramaḍān 795/2 August 1393 and escaped persecution at the hands of Iskandar-ʿī Shaykhī due to the efforts of Malik Tūs, who interceded with Tīmūr on their behalf. All the non-Sunnī occupants of Māzandarān also escaped (TTRM, 300 ff.).

Tīmūr is said to have obtained the most important spoils ever conceded to him by a king. Massacres and pillage continued in all the urban centres from Māhānāsar to Amūl as well as at Sārī, to where the sayyids were brought. He then despatched them to Khvārazm and to Transoxiana by sea and river routes, and compelled them to reside in naturally isolated places. Before embarkation, three of the sayyids were able to take refuge in Gīlān: ʿAbd al-Muṭṭalib b. Rūdāl-al-Dīn, ʿAbd al-ʿAẓīm b. Zayn al-ʿAbidīn and ʿĪz al-Dīn ʿHasān Rīkābī. Two sons of Kamāl al-Dīn (ʿAli and Ghiyāth al-Dīn) were in the service of Tīmūr, who entrusted Sārī to Djamāḥīd Karīn Ghawrī and Amūl to Iskandar-ʿī Shaykhī. In spite of their efforts towards repopulation and economic restoration, these towns did not regain their former prosperity. Iskandar destroyed the mausoleum of Mir-i Buzurg at Amūl, which numerous inhabitants left for Sārī. ʿĪz al-Dīn Rīkābī, returning from Gīlān, was pursued and killed with his five sons. Iskandar accompanied Tīmūr in his campaigns, before leaving him in Aḥdarbāyjān and setting out for Amūl (802/1399-1400). Subsequently, he rebelled and fortified the fortress of Frūzkūh, which he entrusted to his son Husayn Kiya. Ṭīlī and Ghiyāth al-Dīn al-Mawʾashi took part in Tīmūr’s operations against Iskandar (805/1402-3), whose son ʿAli Kiya, coming to his rescue, was captured. Overtaken in the forest, Iskandar fought valiantly against the troops of Ḥazārafsūr Mūḥammad and was killed at Shīr-rūd-duhāzār. His severed head was displayed to his sons, the prisoners ʿAli Kiya and Husayn Kiya, who surrendered the fortress of Frūzkūh. Both sons were pardoned by Tīmūr, who then assigned the governorship of Amūl to ʿAli b. Kamāl-al-Dīn, with his brother Ghiyāth al-Dīn as his deputy, and promised him the liberation of the sayyids upon his return to Transoxiana. At Astārābd, Djamāḥīd Karīn Ghawrī had died and was replaced by his son Shams al-Dīn, who did his utmost to discredit Sayyid ʿAli (TTRM, 313 ff.; Mahdūrī, 29 ff.).

(b) The second phase: return to power and decline. On the death of Tīmūr (Shaʾbān 807/February 1405), four sons of Mir-i Buzurg were living in Transoxiana (Zayn al-ʿAbidīn, ʿAlī, Yahyā and Shārūf al-Dīn). Kamāl al-Dīn and Fāḥūr al-Dīn had died at Kaḡeqhar and three others (Rūdāl al-Dīn, Zahir al-Dīn and Naṣīr al-Dīn) in Transoxiana. The four surviving sons travelled with other sayyids to Hārāt for an audience with Shāhrukh, who permitted them to return to Māzandarān. At Astārābd, Pīrāk did not believe in the validity of their eḏda and detained them in order to protect Shams al-Dīn Karīn Ghawrī. The latter was then attacked and killed by dervishes, who informed ʿAlī b. Kamāl al-Dīn of their intention of marching on Astārābd. But Pīrāk freed the sayyids who, joined by numerous partisans, entered Sārī in triumph. Having controlled Amūl for three years, ʿAlī b. Kamāl-al-Dīn (ʿAlī Sārī) took over the government of Sārī and of Māzandarān (809/1406-7 to 812/1409-10). He retained Yahyā and Shāraf al-Dīn at Sārī and entrusted Bāburūgh-dīh to Ghiyāth al-Dīn. The descendants of Rūdāl al-Dīn wanted to install ʿAbd al-Muṭṭalib as ruler of Amūl, but ʿAlī Sārī preferred Kawām al-Dīn b. Rūdāl-al-Dīn (Kawām al-Dīn II), replaced in 810/1407-8 by ʿAlī b. Kawām al-Dīn (ʿAlī Amuli) who governed equitably (TTRM, 317 ff.; HS, iii, 347; Mahdūrī, 33 ff.). Ghiyāth al-Dīn sowed discord between ʿAlī Amuli and ʿAlī Sārī who, defeated by a coalition of forces from Rūstamārdār and from Hazāradsar (ʿĪz al-Dīn al-Dīn and his son-in-law Sayyid Murḍāṭ) was forced to flee to Astārābd. His only ally in this business was his brother Naṣīr al-Dīn, whom he sent to Hārāt to anticipate Shāhrukh.

After their victory, the people of Ṭūrādāʾ b. Kamāl al-Dīn in control at Sārī where, in spite of the threats of Shāhrukh, he continued to hold sway for almost a year (812/1314-15) before being deposed by the populace on account of his drinking habits. ʿAlī Sārī regained control of Sārī and of Māzandarān.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date of Death</th>
<th>Father</th>
<th>Mother</th>
<th>Wife</th>
<th>Children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kamāl al-Dīn I</td>
<td>801/1399</td>
<td>ʿAbd Allāh</td>
<td>Marjadi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murtādā</td>
<td>837/1433</td>
<td>Gazīyāh al-Dīn</td>
<td>Murtādā</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murtādā</td>
<td>837/1433</td>
<td>Zayn al-ʿĀlidīn</td>
<td>Dījāl al-Dīn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zayn al-ʿĀlidīn</td>
<td>837/1433</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nāṣīr al-Dīn</td>
<td>836/1433</td>
<td>Gazīyāh al-Dīn</td>
<td>Murtādā</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gazīyāh al-Dīn</td>
<td>856/1452</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʿAbd al-ʿĀlidīn</td>
<td>865/1461</td>
<td>Kamāl al-Dīn I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamāl al-Dīn I</td>
<td>865/1461</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʿAbd al-Āllāh I</td>
<td>872/1467-8</td>
<td>Zayn al-ʿĀlidīn</td>
<td>Shams al-Dīn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zayn al-ʿĀlidīn</td>
<td>872/1467-8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shams al-Dīn</td>
<td>905/1499-1500</td>
<td>Kamāl al-Dīn II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamāl al-Dīn II</td>
<td>905/1499-1500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʿAbd al-Karīm II</td>
<td>916/1510-1</td>
<td>Mir ʿAbd ʿAli</td>
<td>Afrozān</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afrozān</td>
<td>908/1502-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mūsā I</td>
<td>954/1537-6</td>
<td>Mirzā ʿAlī Khān</td>
<td>Mūsā II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mirzā ʿAlī Khān</td>
<td>969/1562-9</td>
<td>Mūsā II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mūsā II</td>
<td>969/1562-9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muḥammad</td>
<td>986/1578-9</td>
<td>Barākūn</td>
<td>ʿAbd al-Karīm III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barākūn</td>
<td>981/1575-6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʿAbd al-Karīm III</td>
<td>981/1575-6</td>
<td>ʿAzīz Khāṣṣā</td>
<td>Shāh Muḥammad Khūshbāndā</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʿAzīz Khāṣṣā</td>
<td>981/1575-6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shāh Muḥammad Khūshbāndā</td>
<td>981/1575-6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shāh ʿAbdās I</td>
<td>981/1575-6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note to Table B**
1. The death dates are uncertain, the dates of the end of the reigns are shown between parentheses.
2. Kamāl al-Dīn had 4 children, of whom four died at an early age.
3. Grandson of Rūyah al-Dawla Bāwānd by his mother’s side, born of the daughter of Fakhr al-Dawla Bāwānd.
Although a drinker, the latter was a decent and peace-loving man, regularly paying the annual revenue to Shahrukh. On the death of Kawām al-Dīn II, the government was given to his son Muḥammad, who conscientiously paid tribute to Sārī. But Muḥammad had five sons, including two favourites, ʿAbd al-Karim and Kamāl al-Dīn, to whom he wanted to award governorships. His sipahsālār Bahrām Rūzāf- zūn suggested that Kamāl al-Dīn and the other descendants of Rūzāf- zūn should be deprived of control of Amul. Muḥammad expelled Kamāl al-Dīn and established ʿAbd al-Karim al-Dīn at Amul, which was soon retaken by Kamāl al-Dīn with the aid of the people of Tunūkabūn. Muḥammad then sought to install Muṭṭādā b. Rūzafzūn (uncle of Kamāl al-Dīn) at Amul. When Muṭṭādā was put to flight by Kamāl al-Dīn in alliance with Zāhir b. Naṣr al-Dīn, Muḥammad allied himself with ʿAmīr Hindūkī of Astarābād. This coalition expelled Kamāl al-Dīn and Zāhir al-Dīn, who sought refuge with Malik Gāyūmārī at Rustāmdār and then at Gīlān under the protection of Sayyid Rūzāf- zūn, who conscientiously paid tribute to Sārī. Asad Allah b. Ṣafī al-Dīn took refuge at Amūl under the protection of ʿAbd al-Karīm (d. 814/1411). Ghiyāth al-Dīn took refuge at Astarābad, Abd al-Karīm and the leading citizens of Astarābad, Abd al-Karīm and the leading citizens of Khurāsān (863/1459), then, on two occasions, of Māzandarān, which was then retaken by Kamāl al-Dīn with the aid of the people of Tunūkabūn. Muḥammad then sought to install Muṭṭādā b. Rūzafzūn (uncle of Kamāl al-Dīn) at Amul. When Muṭṭādā was put to flight, Kamāl al-Dīn in alliance with Zāhir b. Naṣr al-Dīn, Muḥammad allied himself with ʿAmīr Hindūkī of Astarābād. This coalition expelled Kamāl al-Dīn and Zāhir al-Dīn, who sought refuge with Malik Gāyūmārī at Rustāmdār and then at Gīlān. Kamāl al-Dīn proceeded to regain from his uncle control of Amul, which he retained until his death (849/1445-6). Muṭṭādā (a pious and just man) then returned from exile in Rustāmdār and was established in power at Amul by the inhabitants and by dervishes (TTRM, 353 ff.).

On the death of Muḥammad (865/1452), his son ʿAbd al-Karīm was held hostage at Harāt (in the army of Dājān Shāh Kara-Koyunlū, according to HS, iii, 352). A month after the temporary enthronement of his son ʿAbd Allāh, ʿAbd al-Karīm I arrived to take over the government of Sārī and of Māzandarān (856/1453-4). A year later, Murtādā, a former officer of Ghiyāth al-Dīn, now a sipahsālār, returned from exile in Rustāmdār and was established in power at Amul by his son Shams al-Dīn, an incompetent drunkard. To obtain payment of the revenue, Bābur was obliged to send an expedition against ʿAbd al-Karīm, who experienced difficulties with rival families claiming to be his sipahsālārs. The Bābulkānī upset the ʿAzīz and later Shams al-Dīn to the east of Sārī, and Bahārm B. ʿIskandar Rūzāfzūn to the west of Sārī. Killed at the instigation of Shams al-Dīn Bābulkānī, Bahārm was replaced by his brother ʿAbd Rūzāfzūn. ʿAbd al-Karīm entrusted Amūl to Asad Allāh b. Ṣafī al-Dīn (TTRM, 367 ff.).

After the death of Bābur (861/1457), Sulṭān ʿIbrāhīm and Māhūmūd competed for control of Māzandarān. Out of patience with the tyranny of ʿAmīr Bābā Ḥāsan, the Timūrid governor of Khurāsān, Astarābād, ʿAbd al-Karīm and the leading citizens of Māzandarān appealed to Dājān Shāh Kara-Koyunlū (d. 872/1467) to come and intimidate them (Mahdijūrī, 465-6, according to MS and RS). But the Timūrid took control of Khurāsān (863/1459), then, on two occasions, of Māzandarān which he gave in ʿuyyārgāl to his son ʿAlī Muhammad. ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAbd al-Karīm (ʿAbd Allāh I) succeeded his father ʿAbd al-Karīm to Amūl (865/1452) and his two sons, whom he held as hostages, using for this purpose a former officer of Ghiyāth al-Dīn, the sayyid Rūzafzūn, whom he had made his sipahsālār. Disapproving of this conduct, ʿAbd al-Karīm left to come and intimidate them (Mahdijūrī, 465-6, according to MS and RS). Before dying, ʿAbd Allāh named his son Muṭṭādā as successor (820/1417). His brother Naṣr al-Dīn promised to support the legitimacy of Muṭṭādā, which Ghiyāth al-Dīn did not accept. Thus Naṣr al-Dīn installed his nephew at Sārī (820-37/1417-33). He obtained from ʿAbd al-Mūlī a guarantee not to rebel and strengthened ties with Malik Gāyūmārī. But when Muṭṭādā took power into his own hands, he made strenuous efforts to eliminate his uncle Ghiyāth al-Dīn and his two sons (whom he held as hostages), using for this purpose a former officer of Ghiyāth al-Dīn, ʿIskandār Rūzafzūn, whom he had made his sipahsālār. Disapproving of this conduct, Naṣr al-Dīn left to come and intimidate them (Mahdijūrī, 465-6, according to MS and RS). After a temporary refuge at Tunūkabūn, ʿAbd al-Mūlī regained Amūl from Kawām al-Dīn II (TTRM, 331 ff.).

Before dying, ʿAbd Allāh named his son Muṭṭādā as successor (820/1417). His brother Naṣr al-Dīn promised to support the legitimacy of Muṭṭādā, which Ghiyāth al-Dīn did not accept. Thus Naṣr al-Dīn installed his nephew at Sārī (820-37/1417-33). He obtained from ʿAbd al-Mūlī a guarantee not to rebel and strengthened ties with Malik Gāyūmārī. But when Muṭṭādā took power into his own hands, he made strenuous efforts to eliminate his uncle Ghiyāth al-Dīn and his two sons (whom he held as hostages), using for this purpose a former officer of Ghiyāth al-Dīn, ʿIskandār Rūzafzūn, whom he had made his sipahsālār. Disapproving of this conduct, Naṣr al-Dīn left to come and intimidate them (Mahdijūrī, 465-6, according to MS and RS). After a temporary refuge at Tunūkabūn, ʿAbd al-Mūlī regained Amūl from Kawām al-Dīn II (TTRM, 331 ff.).

Before dying, ʿAbd Allāh named his son Muṭṭādā as successor (820/1417). His brother Naṣr al-Dīn promised to support the legitimacy of Muṭṭādā, which Ghiyāth al-Dīn did not accept. Thus Naṣr al-Dīn installed his nephew at Sārī (820-37/1417-33). He obtained from ʿAbd al-Mūlī a guarantee not to rebel and strengthened ties with Malik Gāyūmārī. But when Muṭṭādā took power into his own hands, he made strenuous efforts to eliminate his uncle Ghiyāth al-Dīn and his two sons (whom he held as hostages), using for this purpose a former officer of Ghiyāth al-Dīn, ʿIskandār Rūzafzūn, whom he had made his sipahsālār. Disapproving of this conduct, Naṣr al-Dīn left to come and intimidate them (Mahdijūrī, 465-6, according to MS and RS). After a temporary refuge at Tunūkabūn, ʿAbd al-Mūlī regained Amūl from Kawām al-Dīn II (TTRM, 331 ff.).
Allāh I with his uncle Kamāl al-Dīn even more of a drunkard and more ineffectual than this nephew, who went to live in Āmul, then governed by Asad Allāh. As he gained influence, Allāh Rūzafzūn made him return to Sārī. But disorder erupted in Māzandarān following the elimination of Allāh Rūzafzūn by the Bābūlkānī sāyyids. Allāh I eliminated his rivals. He had his cousin Murtuḍā castrated and put his uncle Kamāl al-Dīn in the position where he did not. Zayn al-Abīdin avenged his father by killing Allāh I, whose son and heir, Allāh I, was only four years old and lived in the ādār of Abū Sa‘īd. The majority of leading citizens pledged alliance to Zayn al-Abīdin, but the Pāzāvārī sāyyids took pains to overthrow them. The supporters of Allāh I attempted to enthrone his son Allāh I, whom they brought back from Adharbāyjān, but when Asad Allāh refused them entry to Āmul, Allāh I, was taken by his mother to the court of Hasan Beg Ab Koyunlu (Uzun Hasan [q.e.v.] with some pishkashs. Hasan Beg appointed one of his officers, Shibīl, who, with levies from Gīlān, Rustamdār and Māzandarān, established Allāh I al-Karīm at Sārī. But Zayn al-Abīdin retained allies, including Sayyid Ḥaybat Allāh, and the citizens of Māzandarān who had been destroyed by Zayn al-Abīdin joined him. Hiding in the forest, he defied Shībīl’s confederation and recaptured Sārī, then helped Ibrāhīm to drive his uncle Asad Allāh from Āmul. But on the orders of Malik Dājāngīr b. Kāwūs and Pādūspānī, he reinstated Asad Allāh at Āmul. In the interval before acceding to power, Allāh I al-Karīm lived at Gīlān under the protection of Kār Kiya Muhammad (end of 878/1474) and spent seven months at Kum as the guest of Hasan Beg. Sayyid Ḥasan, one of the sons of Asad Allāh, left Āmul and went to Sārī to serve Zayn al-Abīdin, who ordered the detention of Asad Allāh and his younger son Husayn and installed Hasan at Āmul. Asad Allāh was imprisoned at Bārūfūrūs-dīh, but was freed by the inhabitants and, when reinstated at Āmul, urged Allāh I al-Karīm to join him in opposing Zayn al-Abīdin. On the advice of his sister’s husband, Allāh I, who had him executed and regained temporary control of Sārī (880/1476). Allāh I, went to Āmul and then, with numerous supporters, took Sārī and control of Māzandarān, but was expelled once more by Zayn al-Abīdin and was forced to take refuge for the third time at Lāhīqūn under the protection of Sayyid Muhammad and then of his son Allāh I, who sent him back to Māzandarān with a force commanded by Sayyid Zahrī al-Dīn Marāštī. Zayn al-Abīdin fled to Sāwādūkh and sent his brother Shams al-Dīn to appeal to Ya‘qūb Beg Ab Koyunlu, who sent an army to confront the partisans of Mahmūd. Out of patience, the leading citizens turned towards Muhammad Rūzafzūn (who maintained amicable relations with the leading Safavid dignitary Cuha Sultan Tekkelu), Allāh I al-Karīm regained his throne by force and consequently reigned with benevolence and equity. A learned man, despite his sternness, was eloquent and conversed with the ‘ulamā’. He was protected by Shāh Ḥusayn al-Maḥdī, whose commensal was he. But under Tāhmāsp (1524-76), Cuha Sultan obtained the release of Muhammad Rūzafzūn (imprisoned under Shāh Ḥusayn al-Maḥdī) and established him at Sārī. Allāh I, al-Karīm returned to Bārūfūrūs-dīh, where he died at about 24 years old after an unsuccessful attack on Muḥammad. The sāyyids and leading citizens were divided into two groups regarding the succession, some favouring the son and heir designate Amīr Shāhī (932/1525-6 to 938/1531), others his brother Suḥlān Muḥammad. Placed in power by one faction, Muḥammad was quickly deposed and sought refuge with Muḥammad Rūzafzūn who eliminated him (Ilī, 86). Amīr Shāhī led a licentious life, and delegated official business to Amīr Allāh I Husayn who was soon eliminated by the partisans of Muḥammad. Out of patience, the leading citizens turned towards Muḥammad Rūzafzūn. Others allied themselves with Allāh I, al-Karīm; Suḥlān Muḥammad. Amīr Shāhī joined Tāhmāsp’s retinue in Khurāsān, and Muḥammad Rūzafzūn had him assassinated on his return to Māzandarān, at Āhūsār (near Firūzkuh) by Muẓaffar Beg Turkmān. Muḥammad al-Maḥdī eliminated some of the ‘ulamā’ princes (Suḥlān Muḥammad b. Muḥammad Shāhī, then in Āmul, escaped the massacre), then dominated Māzandarān and maintained its security (939/1533-4 to 952/1545-
6; Isfahani 86 ff.). He entrusted military affairs to Hasan-mat, a leading citizen of Sawadkuh, who appointed his elder brother Gustam to the governorate of Sawadkuh. In gradual stages, all districts of Mazandaran came under the control of his relations, but jealous parties impelled Muhammad to depose Hasan-mat and his associates and disorder ensued. Shâh Tahmâsp sent an expedition (in 952/1545-6) to avenge the blood of Amir Shâhî. But Muhammad maintained a long-standing friendship with the uskâtâl Kâdi Djalân, who was able to pacify the Shâh. Mir ʿAbd Allâh b. Sulṭân Mahmûd came to Rustamdâr to avenge his father, and defeated the army commanded by ʿAbd Rastam near Barfurûsh-îâ. Almost a year after this defeat, ʿAbd Rastam died (Isfahani 89 ff.).

After killing Farâmarz b. Muhammad—who was in the Saʿfâvî ardâ—at the time of his father-in-law's death, and expelling Suhrâb, nephew of Muhammad (enthroned at Sâri for a brief period)—ʿAbd Allâh b. Mâhmûd ruled over the whole of Mazandaran. Ignoring the demands of Shâh Tahmâsp to pay tax and to restore the funds of Muhammad Rûzâfsân, he was deposed in favour of Sulṭân Murâd b. Amir Shâhî who, under Muhammad Rûzâfsân, was part of the retinue of Shâh Tahmâsp at Kazvîn. Summoned to repay the funds of Muhammad, ʿAbd Allâh was told to accept consuming opinions. Tahmâsp married the daughter of ʿAbd Allâh, Khayr al-Nisâ Begum (Mahdî-i Ulyâ), to his eldest son, Sulṭân Muhammad Khudâbânda (see below). Mirzâ Khan was obliged to share the government of Mazandaran with the elder son of Muhammad Khudâbânda, Hasan Mirzâ, accompanied by a uskâtâl Mirrâk Dîv, whom he was caused to be assassinated at the instigation of Mir ʿAzîz Khân. He succeeded in ʿAbd Allâh b. Mâhmûd, 210, 240, tr. 312, 313, 358-9. After the death of Shâh Tahmâsp (984/1576), control of Mazandaran reverted in entirety to Mirzâ Khan, through the good offices of Shams al-Dîn Dîv, but in order to avenge the death of her father ʿAbd Allâh, Mahdî-i Ulyâ had Mirzâ Khan assassinated and replaced him with her uncle Mir ʿAlî Khân b. Mâhmûd, who died soon afterwards (A.A.A., 210-11, 240-1, tr. 312-13, 358-9; on the campaigns of Mir ʿAlî Khân against Mirzâ Khân and his ʿregn, see Mir Taymûr, 201-2; on the successes of ʿAbd Allâh Khân, see also Djalân-ârâ, 91-2; Shahân, Mâzândarân, 230-1).

In the chaos which ensued, Mahdî-i Ulyâ was assassinated in her turn. While Khâbâbî factionalism enfeebled Saʿfâvî power, Mazandaran was the object of competition between various local potentates. After the death of Mir ʿAlî Khân, his control was shared between Sayyid Muzaffar Murtâdqi (of Hazâr-jâbîr, d. 1005/1596-7) and Alvand Dîv, but the descendants of the various branches of the Marâshî family continued to struggle for power. Notable among the latter were Mir Husayn Khân, cousin of Mir ʿAlî Khân (Mir Taymûr, 282-3; and especially Mir Sulṭân Murâd II b. Mirzâ Khân (ibid., 316-17). This unstable situation persisted until annexation to the Saʿfâvî crown (see below). At Isfahân, distant descendants of Mir-i Buzûrg were influential at the centre of Saʿfâvî power (below, 2).

Political, religious and cultural activity. In pre-Saʿfâvî Iran, the Marâshî movement represents an interesting case of political aspirations from which “Mahdîism” is apparently absent. Unlike the millenarianism professed by the “Shîʿî republic of” the Sarbadârs of Sabzavâr (1338-81), it remains, although Shîʿî, within the framework of Šûfism (Arjmand, 68-9, 83; on the Marâshî in the context of “popular” movements, see Petrushevsky, ʿIsmâʿîl dar Īrân, tr. K. Kîhâvâr a, Tehran 1354, 379-80). Few indications are available, however, as to the doctrine of the Marâshîs between the 8th/14th and 10th/16th centuries, preoccupied as they were with the extension or defence of their power (very few theological or literary works have survived, see below). Their immunity as sayyâds saved them from the extermination inflicted by Timûr on the Sarbadârs and other local potentates, but the charisma enjoyed by the founders—Mir-i Buzûrg and his sons—suffered from the erosion of power.

During the “second phase”, after the death of Timûr, their descendants divided into rival groups competing for control of Sâri, Āmul, Bûrûrfûsh-îâ and the frontier zones (in the east, Karâtûghân; in the west, Rustamdâr; in the south, the foothills of the mountains) which, with Gîlân, often provided refuges for claimants temporarily deprived of power. Control of Sâri, entailing that of Mazandaran, was the most hotly-contested. Essentially, it belonged to the descendants of Kamâl al-Dîn, while Āmul was controlled in the 8th/14th-9th/15th centuries by Riḍâ al-Dîn and his descendants. But claimants from both branches remained in a state of constant rivalry.

Limited to the east by Timûrî control of Astarâbâd, the influence of the Marâshîs was more easily extended on the side of their allies in Gîlân, especially at Lahâdjan [q. z.], where they asserted Sayyid ʿAli Khâyî to establish himself as master of Bîvâ-privation. Shamlûn. The rivalries between claimants were complicated by the fact that some were supported by contemporary powers (Timûrîs, Kara Koyunlu, Ak Koyunlu and Saʿfâvids), while others asserted to varying degrees a refusal of allegiance or independence. Increasingly they were thrown by the Western powers (Parthian), with the influence of the Marâshîs was more easily extended on the side of their allies in Gîlân, especially at Lahâdjan [q. z.], where they asserted Sayyid ʿAli Khâyî to establish himself as master of Bîvâ-privation. Shamlûn. The rivalries between claimants were complicated by the fact that some were supported by contemporary powers (Timûrîs, Kara Koyunlu, Ak Koyunlu and Saʿfâvids), while others asserted to varying degrees a refusal of allegiance or independence. Increasingly they were thrown by the Western powers (Parthian), with the influence of the Marchis to the extension of their power, that of Amir Husayn Khâyî Čulâwî, which was obliged to tackle Shâh Ismâʿîl I (1501-24) in order to establish a precarious control over Mazandaran in 909/1504 (Savory, Consolidation, 75-4). It was to assert his hereditary rights as grandson of Mir ʿAbd Allâh Khân Marâshî (through his mother) that Shâh ʿAbbâs took control of Mazandaran in 1005/1596; local non-Marâshî chieftains (Sayyid Muzaffar Murtâdqi; Alvand Dîv and especially Malik Bahman Lârîdjanî) were obliged to defeat or subdue his general Farhâd Khân Karamanlu (A.A.A., 518 ff.; tr. 693 ff.).

Some important vestiges of the Marâshî domination have survived in Mazandaran, a region subject to frequent earthquakes. The mausoleum (sometimes called mosque) of Kamâl al-Dîn Mir-i Buzûrg at Āmul, constructed in 781/1381-90, destroyed under Iskandar-i Shâibî, rebuilt after the death of Timûr, was decorated with kâdis [q. v.] and embellished with gold under Shâh ʿAbbâs I, was in a quite dilapidated state in the mid-19th century (Stuart, quoted by Rabino, MARÅSHÎS 515
Mázandarán, 37; drawings from photographs in the Morgan (1307/1890) reproduced in Mahdjurl, 24; Rabino, ... with a wealthy library, bears his name (brief biography in Rayhdnat, iv, 11-12; Fischer, index; Momen, 317). Although Kadi nakib dant, the Mir Nur Allah, who disseminated ll took the town where there is reproduction of an article by Kasravl c ImamI ShiSsm there. While the Mar s.v. Mir Allah. His only known work (see works of the second historian, Mir Taymur, identified Shushtar where he was at the beginning of the dynasty, Shah Mir b. Mir Kawam al-Din, grand-

These migrations sometimes took the form of deportations. Among the descendants of representatives of the Mar family is the Mar Mar ashl of Mazandaran, at Kazwin, Isfahan, Shushtar. while his father Mirza Rafi' al-Din held the post of sird. Under Shah Sa'. (1033/1624), while his father others were blinded (as were some Safawid princes). He returned to the uzaira under Shah 'Abbas II (1642-66) and died at Aghtaf in 1643-54 (AAA, 1013, tr. 1234 sq.; Mahdjuri, 15; Shayan, Mázandaran, 233).

Other Mar'ashis enjoyed the favour of Safawid sovereigns. Under Shah Tahmasp, Mir 'Ala' al-Mulk Mar'ash, kddi-i 'asat, was appointed sadr of Gilan (AAA, 155, tr. 254). The 'alim Sayyid Asad Allah Husayni Mar'ashi 'Shah Mir' (d. 984/1576-7)—who also exercised the sidiria—was appointed mutawalli of the sanctuary of Imam Ridâ at Mashhad (Rayhanat, iv, 10-11). Other Mar'ashis continued to exercise this important function at the shrine-town of Mashhad [q.v.]. Their descendants were even able to claim double Safawid and Mar'ash lineage on account of the influential family of the Khulafa of San, the Zayn al-Abidin shelters the tombs of Zayn al-Abidin and Shams al-Din, son of Kamal al-Din b. Muhammad Rabino, (Le Guilan, Illustrations, 89). On the monuments of Mázandarán and the tombs of the Mar'ashis, see Sutudâ, Astariâ, iv, v (photographs and numerous indices).

2. Some descendânts of the Mar'ash Sayyids of Mázandarán. Although all related to Ali al-Mar'ash/ali-Mar'ash or to Hasan al-Mar'ash, the Mar'ash sayyids are divided into various branches (in Mázandarán, at Kazvin, Isfahan, Shushtar, Naghsh, Nadjaf, etc.) in which the lines of kinship are sometimes hard to trace. The only ones to be mentioned here are the best-known, in the period subsequent to the foundation of the dynasty (on other Mar'ashis, see below, 3).

In spite of their charisma and their acknowledged status as sayyids, very few of the Mar'ashis of the dynasty gained renown as ‘ulama' or udabâ. Besides Kâdzil, the Sayyid Dâ'mad-ud-Din Girât-i Kâdzil the second historian, Mir Taymur, identified the death of the secon...
TABLE A
THE LINE OF MIR KAWAM AL-DIN MAR’ASHI “MIR-I BUZURG”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zahir al-Din Mar’ashi(1)</th>
<th>After:</th>
<th>Abbâs Shayây(5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Husayn al-Asghar</td>
<td>Husayn al-Asghar</td>
<td>al-Hasan Abû Muhammad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hasan al-Mar‘ashi</td>
<td>Hasan</td>
<td>Muhammad Abû ‘l-Husayn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhammad</td>
<td>Muhammad al-Akbar</td>
<td>‘Abd Allah Abû Muhammad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husayn</td>
<td>Hasan</td>
<td>‘Ali Abû ‘l-Husayn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʻAbd Allâh</td>
<td>ʻAli</td>
<td>Abû ʻHâshîm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sâdîk</td>
<td>Muhammad</td>
<td>Muhammad Abû ‘Abd Allâh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhammad(2)</td>
<td>Abû Hâshîm</td>
<td>ʻAbd Allâh Abû Sâdîk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʻAbd Allâh</td>
<td>Abû Hâshîm</td>
<td>al-Sâdîk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kawâm al-Dîn</td>
<td>Kawâm al-Dîn</td>
<td>Kawâm al-Dîn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes to Table A
(1) TTRM, ed. Tasbîhî, 166.
(2) Muhammad absent from TTRM, ed. Şâyâyî, 236.
(3) Dihkhuda, 166; Yazdi, fol. 2a; Şahîh-i Nâjîfî, ii, 380.
(4) The lakab al-Mar‘aşî (a kind of pigeon) is said to have been given in the first place to ʻAli Mar‘aşî, the eponym of the Mar‘aşîs sayyids (Rayhânî, iv, 10). In Yazdi, ʻAli al-Mar‘aşî and his son Hasan are made into a single “ʻAlî Mar‘aşî”.
(5) TTRM, Mukaddima (approved by the Ayâtallâh Mar‘aşî-Nâjîfî, TTRM, ed. Tasbîhî, Mukaddima, 39-40, with typographical errors).

more and more involved in the world of politics and public affairs, the Mar‘aşîs of Iran regard themselves predominantly as religious “specialists” (râhâ‘în), with the religious line contracting matrimonial alliances among the elite of the “ulama”. Alongside the major branch constituted by the family of the ayâtallâh Mar‘aşî-Nâjîfî—one of the seven leading marâţî-i taklîdî in 1975 (a position still held in 1985: Momen, 249)—there exists a junior branch of Mar‘aşî marâţî-i taklîdî at Shiráz (see Fischer, tables, 90, 92, 94).

Like other Imâmî ʻulama, the Mar‘aşî sayyids have established themselves in various parts of the Muslim world (Iran, ‘Irâq, Syria, Turkey and Egypt) and in countries of the Indian Ocean fringes (East Africa (Zanzibar) and Java (Rayhânî, iv, 12)). Sayyîd ʻAbd al-Husayn Mar‘aşî Shushtari was sent to Zanzibar in 1885 as mullâ to guide the newly-established Imâmî community there (Momen, 317).

3. Other Mar‘aşîs. In the genealogies of descendants of ʻAli Mar‘aşî/Mar‘aşî (or Hasan Mar‘aşî), mention is found of titles or functions such as mubâhiddî, fâhîh, nakîb al-asâfîr, wâzîr, etc., which indicate that previous to Mir-i Buzurg, some of them must have held office or wielded a certain influence in ‘Irâq and later in Iran, in the capacity of ulama or nakîs of the sayyids, or in administration. Among the other sayyîd or non-sayyîd Mar‘aşîs, whose lines of kinship with the various branches of the Mar‘aşîs are uncertain, the following are worthy of mention: Sayyîd Hasan b. Hama b. Alî Mar‘aşî, Abû Muhammad ʻ Abd al-Malik Mar‘aşî, ʻâlim of Tabaristan who went to Baghdad in 356/966-7 and died there two years later (Rayhânî, iv, 11); Husayn b. Muhammad Mar‘aşî, Abû Mansûr (d. 421/1030), historian and close associate of Sulîmân Muhammîd of Ghaznî (ibid.); Sayyîd Ahmad b. Alwâr Mar‘aşî (d. 539/1144-5) extremist Shi‘i (ghuluwwi) who travelled widely before settling at Sârî where he died (ibid., 10); and ʻAbd al-Malik Mar‘aşî, Abû al-ʻAbbâs, Hanafi fâhîh (d. 872/1467-8) (see Dihkhuda, Lughat-nâmâ, s.v. Mar‘aşî).

MARASIM (a), official court ceremonies, both processional and non-processional. The whole range of ceremonial, including protocol and etiquette, is called also ruza; other terms found frequently are mawtum [g.e.] and mawkih. Mawkih [g.e.] refer specifically to solemn processions, but seem also to have had the more general meaning of audiences (for discussion, see Sourdel, Le vizirat abbasid de 749 a 946, Damascus 1960, ii, 684, n. 3; for the Fatimid, see e.g. al-Kalkashandl, Subh, iii, 494: mawkihil [al-khalihil]; mawkihil [al-mawkihil].

1. Under the caliphate and the Fatimids.

The caliph presided over court ceremonies seated on a throne (kursi, sarir), a custom dating back to the Umayyads, surrounded by the insignia of sovereignty (khadi* al-khilal), and veiled by a curtain (sir). The insignia, according to al-Kalkashandl, Subh, iii, 269-72, are: the seals (khadem [g.e.]), the mantle of the Prophet (burda [g.e.], the staff (kadfl [g.e.]), the caliphal garments (khutba [see khutba and timar]), and the (dynastic) colour displayed in banners and robes of honour [see 'alam and khilfa]. Most of these insignia can be traced back to the Prophet himself. To these, the prerogatives of the khaliha and skaka [g.e.] can be added. For further discussion of insignia of sovereignty, see Ibn Khaldun, Muzaddima, tr. Rosenthal, New York 1957, ii, 48 ff.

Clear distinctions were made between ceremonial costume and ordinary wear. When summoned to the palace by al-Muqtadir shortly before his arrest in 306/918, the vizier Ibn al-Furat enquired, bi-kadfl al-mawkihil am bi-durrala? ("in ceremonial dress or the durrala? [everyday costume of the scribal class?")?, al-Sabi, Kitab al-Wuzur?, 264).

The 'Abbâsîd caliph wore a black kabêl and black rasîfla (a kalansuwa-type turban), and red boots. He gardened of the ceremonial occasions. To his left, another sword was kept, and in front of him, the Kur'an of 'Uthman. He wore the burda and held the kadihil (al-Sabi, Rusûm dar al-khålila, ed. Mighâl? A'wsâd, Baghdad 1383/1964, 90-8, tr. Elie A. Salem, Les rules et régulations de l'Abbassid court, Beirut 1977). Dignitaries, arâba al-mawkihil, wore black kabêl's and black robes of honour (khilfêta) were conferred on army commanders and honoured notables (al-Sabi, op. cit., 90-4).

For the Fatimids, the sources on caliphal costume are more plentiful. The dar al-kiswa (see al-Makrizi, Khilfâ, i, 409-13) provided magnificent costumes to the caliph and his entourage for each ceremony, as well as for accession) which took place in the palace. The Fatimid colour was white, and the caliph's garments were often made of white dabsî, a fine silk stuff (see dabsî). The most common term for Fatimid court apparel is badla, an outfit consisting of eleven pieces (al-Makrizi, op. cit., i, 413: badla mawkihil). The caliphs adopted the white jaylasin of lawyers and judges during Ramadan and the two festivals (ibid., i, 413, ii, 227-280).

The prerogative of wearing the dynastic colours was reserved to the caliphs, their families, their retinue and the highest officials of the bureaucracy and court. Red was also a royal colour. We read of a Fatimid vizier upon whom the caliph bestowed his own red garment (Ibn Taghribirdi, al-Nudjim al-zahira, iv, 99), as well as a warning against wearing red in the caliph's presence "because it is the colour of the caliphs' dress as well as those who rebel against him" (al-Sabi, Rusûm, 75).

The most frequent of all ceremonies were caliphal audiences (madajiil; dulsâ, used in the general sense as well as for accession) which took place in the palace (for discussion, see Sourdel, Questions de cérémonial abbasid, in RET [1960], 121-48, and M. Canard, Le cérémonial fatimite et le cérémonial byzantin: essai de comparaison, in Byzantion [1951], 408 ff.). Al-Kalkashandl lists three categories of audiences for the Fatimids: al-madajiims al-îâm ayyâm al-mawkihil (general audiences), the dulsâ held expressly for the kaid and shibid on the four layâl al-uwkuk ("nights of lights"), and the dulsâ on the mawlids (see mawlid) and several other audiences. Even these audiences had some processional elements, manifested primarily in the formal arrival of the vizier at the palace riding his mount. After the audience hall had been prepared by covering the walls and the sarir in fine fabrics (dibâdi in the winter, dabsî in the summer), the sibbi al-risâla summoned the vizier and rode with him, in customary haste, to the palace (al-maâm al-mawdiil ft sura al-buraka). The vizier wore ceremonial costume and rode with his entourage in the same order as that of the procession of the New Year (fa-yarkah bu ubbahatii wa-djmâta`ithi al-sâl 'l-tariib al-mukaddam dhikruhu ft dhsri al-rabî` al-aouw al-îâm), cf. al-Makrizi, Khilfâ, i, 448-9 ff., for details of the vizier's arrival at the palace on the New Year.

The prerogative of mounts, even in a non-procedural setting, was an important symbol of authority. Caliphs maintained large stables (see tabaristan wa-rayyan dar al-khilal), and horses were often distributed as gifts to particularly honoured officials. Even within the palace walls, caliphs were expected to ride from one point to another. Similarly, gates and doors were symbols of sovereignty and authority and were the sites of important ceremonial activity. The caliph and vizier usually mounted and dismounted at a gate or door (see e.g. al-Makrizi, Khilfâ, i, 389-90), and officials sometimes dismounted at a gate of the palace and kissed it even when the caliph was not present (idem, Ittât al-hunafa`, Cairo 1967, ii, 71-2).

Under both the 'Abbâsîds and the Fatimids, the
vizier enjoyed the privilege of entering the palace walls while riding his mount, a prerogative normally reserved to the caliph himself (idem, Khitat, i, 387). Even the high-ranking kadi al-kuddt, reserved to the caliph himself (idem, i, 386, 389). Upon his investiture with the takbil al-ard, kissing the ground, was acknowledged to be a late introduction. Previously, high-ranking officials (viziers and amirs) used the verbal salute only. As an honour to a favoured official, the caliph might offer his hand, covered by his sleeve, to be kissed. The custom of kissing the ground seems to have been thoroughly engrained and observed, regardless of rank, by the Abbasid period. Variations included kissing the caliph's hand and foot, kissing his stirrup, and kissing the mantabs in front of his sarh.

Those attending a caliphal audience were exhorted to stand straight and still, not to fidget, to maintain absolute silence unless spoken to by the caliph, and then to answer in a low and clear voice. They were to fix their attention upon the caliph to refrain from laughing even if there was cause for it, and to avoid slander, calumny, and criticism at all costs. The caliph's mistakes were not to be corrected, nor was his name or that of his wives to be used. One approached the caliph only if summoned and in that case, advanced a few steps at a time, stopped with bowed head, and waited for the caliph's command to proceed. Even the vizier, who was permitted to approach the caliph to speak about matters of state, had to hold himself in reserve. In the instance of five cubits upon completion of his business.

The djulus for the four layâli al-sukiad (at the beginning and middle of Ragib and Shabibân) took place in the belvedere (manzara) overlooking the Bâb al-Zumurrud. The high point of the ceremony occurred when the caliph opened one of the windows of the manzara and revealed his head and face. On of his mawânnak eunuchs put his head and right hand, covered by his sleeve, out of another window and proclaimed: "The Commander of the Faithful returns your greeting." The kadi al-kuddt and the sâhib al-bâb were then greeted personally.

The Fâtîmids celebrated six (according to some sources four different) mawâlîds: those of the Prophet, al-Hasan and al-Husayn, 'Ali, Fátima, and the present (mawâlîd al-khalîfa [or mawâlîd al-bâb]). The mawâlîds took place under the manzara surmounting the Bâb al-dhohab, and included much of the same ceremony as the layâli al-sukiad, with the addition of distribution of sadakât and an impressive quantity of food prepared in the Dar al-fistra. The powerful vizier al-Afâd b. Amir al-Djuyûushi annulled the observance of these mawâlîds at the height of his power, but the caliph al-Amir, encouraged by his mawânnak eunuchs, restored them when he regained power.

Both the Fâtîmids and the 'Abbasîds prepared elaborate receptions of ambassadors, in particular of the Byzantine embassies. Ambassadors rode to the palace and distanced at its gate, then entered the audience hall through a column of soldiers. The sâhib al-bâb and his nâbî flanked the caliph, who was seated on his sarh, surrounded by his vizier and high-ranking members of his retinue. Al-Makrizi describes two such embassies in Khiat, i, 403, 461, and al-Sâbî, Risâm Dar al-khalîfa, describes in detail the reception of the Byzantine ambassador Ward, 14-17. See also S.M. Stern, An embassy of the Byzantine emperor to the Fâtîmid caliph al-Mu'izz, in Byzantion, xx (1950), 425 ff.

The caliphs (at least theoretically) held an audience every evening for redress of grievances (al-djulûsi li 'l-nasaâli). The Fâtîmids conducted these djulus in the kâfîfa of the palace.

Investitures of high officials with robes of honour.
(khîlas) and titles (alkab [see LAKAB]) abound in the historical literature. These investitures generally occurred in the context of an audience, and the same protocol was observed.

Banquets (simâ' [pl. asmâ') were some of the most elaborate and impressive ceremonial occasions. They occurred during Ramadân and on the two 'îds ('îd al-šîr and 'îd al-adhâ or al-nahr), at the New Year, and at the mauûl al-na'bî. The simâ' of the Fâtîmids extended across the entire length of the audience hall, and was filled with all manner of delicacies, including sugar figurines and castles made entirely of confectionery. During Ramadân, the amîrs would rotate in attending the banquet every night, although their presence was not required. They were, as usual, seated according to their ranks. A significant feature of all banquets was the permissibility of taking food out of the palace and distributing (and even selling) it among one's family and friends. Descriptions of these banquets are found in Ibn Taghîbirdî, al-Nûdîm al-sâhîra, iv, 97-8; al-Mâkûrî, Khtâb, i, 387-8. For further information about ceremonies on Ramadân and the two 'îds, see MAWAKûB.


2. In Muslim Spain.

In al-Andalus, as elsewhere, raûmû is used, in the same manner as mansûmî, to denote court etiquette and procedure. On this subject, no treatise is available comparable to the De Ceremoniis composed by the Byzantine Emperor Constantine Porphyrogenitus, or to the Rusûm dâr al-khiyâli of Hîlîl al-Sâbî; there is no alternative therefore other than to attempt to reconstruct Hispanic-Arab court etiquette by means of the meagre information preserved by the chronicles and to have recourse to descriptions of official acts (bay'a, [q.v.]), signings of agreements, receptions, processions (maqsûkî [q.v.]).

When, in 1387/756, 'Abd al-Rahmân al-Djâkhîl [q.v.] transformed al-Andalus into an independent amirate, he was the initiator of the (embryonic) Cordovan etiquette. It is in this sense that the dispositions of his entourage are best understood. According to al-Maǒkârî (Naľf, ii, 25), "he was obliged to maintain a certain distance and not to mingle to an excessive degree with the people, nor to show himself in public". But it was 'Abd al-Rahmân II [q.v.] who (influenced by Ziriyâb [q.v.]) instituted Andalusian etiquette. According to al-Maǒkârî (Naľf, i, 223), "he was the first to isolate himself, behind a tapestry, from the people". Ibn Hayyân (Muktâbâs, ii, 91) is still more explicit: "It was he who organised the hierarchy of the court (rattâba rusîm al-dâulâl-i khîdâmâ)". This information is confirmed by Ibn Ijâhari (Bayân, ii, 91) and Ibn Sa'îd (Muqâhîrî, i, 45); the Djîrîh bâdîl al-Andalus (117) makes him "the first to clothe himself in the pomp of the caliph". The separation of the functions of the sharîa [q.v.] and of the isk [q.v.] which all authors attribute to him are to be seen in the same sense.

At the time of the king's bay'a, in 206/822, his brothers, his uncles, his kinsmen, his "men" (the senior functionaries of the court), the judges and the fâkhrâh, military officers of every rank, the dignitaries and the people, pledged allegiance to him (Djîrîh, 117). This order reflects a hierarchy, since the text clearly distinguishes six "categories" or "categories". The same regulation recurs (with minor variations) throughout the whole of the caliphate. It is observed in the allegiance pledged, in 300/912, to 'Abd al-Rahmân III al-Nâšîr [q.v.] (Chron. anôn., 29-30) and in the list of witnesses who applied their signatures to the act of surrender of Saragossa in 326/937 (Ibn Hayyân, Muktâbâs, v, 277-9). The same hierarchy appears in the description of the feasts of the Breaking of the Fast in the years 360-4 and in that of the Sacrifices in the years 360-4, preserved by the Muktâbâs of Ibn Hayyân. Lévi-Provençal (Hist. Esp. Mus., ii, 117) speaks of pomp and ostentation, of a rigid etiquette: "The reverential fear (hayya) which is inspired by the august person of the caliph and the magnificence (fâkhrî) which presides over all the manifestations of his official life encompass him in the manner of a halo".

It does not seem that al-Maǒnûr b. Âbî Šâmîr [q.v.] introduced any changes into the organisation of the caliphate. He was obliged to co-exist with the mulâk al-fawâdî [q.v.], judging by the comments of the amîr 'Abd Allâh [q.v.] when he examines, in his Memoirs, the various groups capable of supporting him.

Nothing is known of the norms of Almoravid etiquette. In the Almohad period, there is no documentary proof of the effective application of the complex and discordant order described by Ibn al-Kâtânî, al-Hulal al-mâlûkîyya and the K. al-Ansî fî ma'rîfât al-aslâb (13 categories according to the former, 18 according to the K. al-Ansî; cf. the observations of J. F. P. Hopkins, Medieval Muslim government in Barbary, London 1958). The actual gradation was that reflected by Ibn Sâbib al-Sâlît (al-Maans bi l-imâma, 232, 420, 437, 445, 457, 511), similar to the Hispano-Umayyad pattern.
In 558/1163, at the time of his proclamation, Abū Ya'qūb b. ʿAbd al-Muʾmin was recognised by the shaykh Abū Hafs, the Almohads and the ashaykh of the tribes. In the course of the formal audience at Marrākush in 1170, the hierarchical order was: Almohad ashaykh, talaba [q.v.] ashaykh and viziers. In 1171, at the time of his entry into Rabat-Salā, he was followed by the Almohad ashaykh, the vizier, the kuttab, the talaba and the Bedouin. During the Feast of Sacrifices, at Cordova, the “great Almohad ashaykh, the ukhla al-qāma [q.v.], and their followers, the talaba of the capital, the ashaykh, the judges, the kuttab, the governors, delegations and notables of the town, were introduced according to their rank.” At the time of the Feast of Sacrifices of 568/1172, at Murcia, a development is observed: “First to present themselves were his brothers, followed by the Almohad ashaykh and the great men of the state”. A further development is attested by ʿAbd al-Wāḥid al-Marrākushī (al-ʿAṣimī, 239); in 610/1213, the proclamation of Abū Yaʿqūb Yūsūf “took place first—on the Thursday—in private, attended by his close relatives; on the Friday, he was recognised by the Almohad ashaykh; and on the Saturday, by the people”.

The hierarchy of the Nasrids [q.v.] was probably close to the Hispano-UMayyad tradition. This is merely a hypothesis, for although Ibn al-Khitīb (Lugat, 38) makes the second sultan, Muhammad b. Muhammad (672-701/1273-1302), “the initiator of the State, the organiser of its administration and its hierarchy... the creator of the royal protocol (mumahhid al-dawla wada al-khdna... wa-akdma rusum al-mulky... wa-akīma rusūm al-mulūk)” this tells us nothing of its components.

Bibliography: Given in the article. (P. Chalmeta)

3. In Iran.

Persian society in most, if not all, periods was intensely formal: the demeanour, manners, dress and mode of speech of each class was minutely regulated by custom. The court set the pattern. Respect for age and position was ubiquitous. An extensive adāḥ [q.v.] literature, which sought to regulate all aspects of social life and behaviour, grew up (cf. al-Qazwī, al-Adab fi 'l-dīn; Kāwūs b. Iskandar, Kāhās-nāma; and see J. S. Badeau, They lived once thus in Baghdad, in Sami A. Hanna (ed.), Medieval and Middle Eastern Studies in honor of Aziz Suryal Aṭṭiya, Leiden 1972, 38-49).

Persian ceremonial was designed to emphasise both the awe in which the ruler was held and his separation from the rest of the population. Its influence was felt already in UMayyad times and became marked under the ʿAbbāsids. Much of the ceremonial of later times can be traced back to the early centuries. There was a long continuity of tradition in respect of the insignia of sovereignty. The parasol or lāt [see MIZALLA] held over the ruler’s head was an ancient custom going back at least to Achaemenid times, while the ṣafā [q.v.] standard was an old symbol of royalty going back to Parthian and Sassānī times (see Spuler, Iran, 348), though neither were confined absolutely to the rules, but might also be attached to high offices. The beating of kettle-drums [see Nawba] in honour of the ruler and by his subjects, was also customarily accompanied by the distribution of bags of gold and silver coins by the monarch on the occasion of his accession to those who were present at his court (H. L. Rabino, Coins, medals, and seals of the Shahs of Iran, 1500-1941, London 1945, 87). The distribution of scattering (nājar) of coins, jewels and precious objects, both by the ruler and his subjects, was also customarily connected with festive occasions such as the Naw Rūz (the Persian New Year). The canonical festivals of the ʿid al-adhā and the ʿid al-fitr [q.v.] were the occasion for public celebration. It was customary for the ruler to go out to the musalla outside the town where the ʿid prayers were performed and to take part in them (see further Nawba, 2. In Iran).

The ruler was expected, especially if his followers were largely drawn from tribal groups, to keep open table. Feasting was especially common under the Ghaznawids, the Ḵāḥāns and the Timurids. Masʿud b. Maḥmūd, the Ghaznawid, used to have a large leather table-cloth (bātān) laid out on the dais on which he sat to hold audiences, on in some neighbouring garden or pavilion, and to invite the great men of the state to sit with him at the bānān (cf. Abu ʿl-Fadl Bayhaḵi, Tārīḵ Maʿṣūdi, ed. Allā Akbar Fayyād Maḥhad H. A. H. 1350/1971, 439, 734-5). Wine flowed freely at these feasts (see ibid., passim). Niẓūm al-Mulk considered it indispensable for the ruler to keep an open table and he claims that ʿOṯoǧrīl Beg entertained his followers thus in the early morning (Siyyār-nāma, ed. Scherf, Paris 1891, 115). The court astronomer, though not essential to court ceremonial, nevertheless played an important role, especially under the Safawids and Kāḏjarīs, in deciding the most auspicious moment for the coronation of the ruler or for some movement such as when the entry into a town should take place, or even for the proper hour “to sit, to rise, to depart, to eat, to go to bed” (Du Mans, État de la Perse en 1660, ed. Scherf, Paris 1890, repr. 1969, 30).

The Ziyārid Mardawīdī [q.v.] (d. 323/935), when he sat on a golden throne and wore a crown (tāḏī), was imitating Sāsānīd (or what he believed to be Sāsānīd) custom (Miskawayh, Taḏārīḵ al-amarn, v. 489, and see A. Mez, Die Renaissance des Islams, Heidelberg 1922, 17). In subsequent centuries, the throne and the tāḏī continued to be important elements in royal ceremonial. The Būyid ʿAdud al-Dawla [q.v.] was surrounded by great magnificence when holding audiences. Like the caliph, he sat on a throne on a dais. High-standing visitors sat on stools or chairs (kursī) in front of his throne. As in the caliph’s court, his musical instruments accompanied him. The nakaraḵāna survived in Tehran until 1937. Considerable importance attached also to the throne. In the early centuries this was placed on a qūfa, or dais, which was often a considerable structure, consisting sometimes of a portico or pavilion open in the front in which the dais was situated. Sometimes on the throne itself there was another chair or seat on which the ruler sat. Apart from these ancient insignia, there were also insignia of Islamic provenance, such as the right of the ruler to have his name mentioned in the khāba [q.v.] and on coins (see DUKA).

The grant of robes of honour [see KUṬTA] though not specifically one of the insignia of royalty, was a practice followed by all rulers and one attended in Safawid and Kāḏjarī times, if not earlier, by special ceremonies. The purpose of the grant was partly to honour the recipient, but partly also to fill the ruler’s coffer, since the recipient was often expected to make gifts to the ruler in return, and if the recipient was in the provinces, to whoever brought the kāḇā. Another practice was the distribution of bags of gold and silver coins by the monarch on the occasion of his accession to those who were present at his court (H. L. Rabino, Coins, medals, and seals of the Shahs of Iran, 1500-1941, London 1945, 87). The distribution of scattering (nājar) of coins, jewels and precious objects, both by the ruler and his subjects, was also customarily connected with festive occasions such as the Naw Rūz (the Persian New Year). The canonical festivals of the ʿid al-adhā and the ʿid al-fitr [q.v.] were the occasion for public celebration. It was customary for the ruler to go out to the musalla outside the town where the ʿid prayers were performed and to take part in them (see further Nawba, 2. In Iran).
the right hand side was the place of honour (see further H. Busse, Chalif and Grosskonig, Beirut 1969, 222 ff., and ʿAli Asghar Fakhl, ʿAbd al-Dawla, Κουμ μ.Δ., 215 and passim). Hillāl al-Sabīḥ described the caliph al-Tāʾsīʿs reception of ʿAbd al-Dawla in Baghdad in 367/977-8 and the royal insignia which he gave to him in 368/978-9 (Fakhl, op. cit., 473 ff. See also al-Suyutī, History of the caliphs, tr. H.S. Jarrett, Calcutta 1881, 427).

The Sāmānids and Ghaznavids both evolved an elaborate ceremonial, which was influenced by what was assumed to be the Sāsānīd practice and by practice at the caliph’s court. In the Ghaznavid court, every effort was made to enhance the glory of the ruler. On formal occasions, the greatest deference was exacted from all, even the caliph’s envoys. It was Masʿūd b. Mahmūd’s custom to hold court, sitting on a dais (ṣafāh), in one or other of his palaces or gardens (cf. Bayhaḵi, ʿAjba, 438). It seems that his throne was originally made of wood. This was replaced in 429/1038 by a golden throne of great magnificence, which had taken three years to make. When it was finished, it was placed on a dais in the new palace which Masʿūd had built and surmounted by a parasol. Bayhaḵi describes the splendour of the scene when Masʿūd, wearing a red satin cloak shot with gold, mounted the throne for the first time on 21 Šaʿbān 429/8 July 1038. Ten richly dressed ʿglāms stood on the dais on the right side and ten on the left. With rows of ʿglāms, also richly dressed, and bearing arms and the ṣmāt ad darān standing in a body the hall. The meaning of ṣmāt ad darān is uncertain. The term may have been applied to a ṣfardān who held a switch or some such implement, whose duty was to keep back the crowds. On the other hand, one of the meanings of ṣmāt ad darān was a cushion on a dais, see Ibn Baiṣṭāṭa, Travels, tr. H.A.R. Gibb, Cambridge, 1956-71, iii, 660. 18n, and ṣmāt ad darān may, thus, have been the bearer of the royal cushion.) The notables from the provinces and the great men sat on the dais. The “pillars of the state” and the great men of Masʿūd’s entourage scattered innumerable gifts before him. The ceremony apparently began early in the morning, for Bayhaḵi states that Masʿūd sat until breakfast time (ṣaʿīdāt). At the close of the audience, Masʿūd’s boon companions (nādīmān) came forward and scattered their gifts, after which Masʿūd mounted and rode off to a garden. Having changed his clothes, he went again on horseback to another palace or pavilion (the Spring House) where a feast was held for the great men and the “pillars of the state”. After this Masʿūd went to another garden where he drank wine with his boon companions until the time of the afternoon prayer (Bayhaḵi, 714-15).

Masʿūd’s reception in Mubarram 423/December 1031-January 1032 in Balkh of an envoy sent by the caliph was marked, according to Bayhaḵi’s description, by much splendour. Four thousand palace ʿglāms, splendidly dressed and equipped, were drawn up in ranks on either side of the palace. Two hundred royal ʿglāms, in full regalia, stood in rows near Masʿūd, while the great men of the court, the provincial governors and chamberlains, in their court dresses, gathered in the assembly. Masʿūd sat on a dais. The only other person to be seated was the chief minister, Ahmad b. Hasan al-Maymandī [q.v.]. When the caliph’s envoy was brought in, he greeted Masʿūd and was led to a seat by the chamberlain, Bū Naṣr. Masʿūd then asked after the health of the caliph, and the envoy told him of the death of al-Kādīr. After Ahmad b. Hasan had said a few words to the envoy in Arabic, he gave him a signal to give the caliph’s letter to Masʿūd. The envoy got up, took the letter, which was in a black brocade bag, gave it to Masʿūd and went back to his seat. Masʿūd then called to Bū Naṣr to come up to the throne. He took the bag, opened it, read the letter and then at Masʿūd’s command translated it into Persian. The following day, a mourning assembly for the caliph al-Kādīr was held. Masʿūd and all his court were dressed in white. The bazaars were closed and the diyān shut for three days. When they were reopened, drums were played and on the following Friday theḵwāb was read in the name of the new caliph. Masʿūd sat close to the minbar, which was covered with cloth of gold (ḏabbā niʿz ar-bāfi). The chief minister and the notables of the court sat nearby, with ʿAli Mikālī and the caliph’s envoy rather further off. After theḵwāb had been read, the royal treasures placed 10,000 dinārs and five silk en purses at the foot of the minbar as a present for the caliph. The gifts of Masʿūd’s sons, the chief minister, the great chamberlain, and others were then brought, after which Masʿūd departed, while the treasurers’ scribes and mastaʿufīs took the gifts to the royal treasury. Some days later, the envoy was given a khalīf, a mule and two horses, and sent back with the presents to the caliph. The chief minister also sent him a mule, with a rug (ḏabīl) and hood (burkā), 500 dinārs, and ten garments (ibid., 383 ff.). Similarly, in later times, the exchange of presents was also not confined to the two principal gifts, but on the occasion of the envoys from the ambassad: ministers also expected to receive presents from envoys and sometimes made gifts themselves to envoys.

In the following year, 424/1033, another envoy accompanied by a eunuch (ḵādīm) brought a diploma and khalīf from the caliph for Masʿūd, who was then in Ray. When the envoy was taken to Masʿūd, he kissed the latter’s hand, while the khalīm kissed the ground. On this occasion, after Masʿūd had enquired for the health of the caliph, Bū Naṣr took the envoy under the arms and seated him near the throne on the dais, on which the army commander ʿAli Dāyā and the ṣārīb, the head of the military department [see ṣārīb] were also sitting—the chief minister was absent (ibid., 471-2). This custom of taking envoys under the arms when bringing them near to the presence of the ruler also prevailed in the Timūrid, Safawid and Afsharīd courts (see below). Bū Naṣr then came forward and told the envoy to rise and take the diploma, which was rolled up in black brocade, and put it on the throne. The envoy, standing up, told Masʿūd to come down from the throne in order to put on the caliph’s khalīf. Masʿūd ordered a prayer rug (muṣallah) to be brought. As he turned to the fiṭāla, drums were beaten and trumpets blown in the garden and at the gate of the palace. Bilge Tegān and other military leaders ran forward to help Masʿūd down from the throne to sit on the prayer rug. The caliph’s envoy then called for the box with the khalīf and brought out seven robes and other garments. Masʿūd kissed them and performed two rakʿās of prayer and remounted the throne. A jewelled crown, necklace and bracelet were then brought forward, kissed and placed on the throne at Masʿūd’s right hand, while the khalīm advanced with a turban, which Masʿūd kissed and placed on his head. A standard (liwā) had also been brought by the envoy, and this Masʿūd held in his right hand. He also put on the sword and sword-belt which the envoy had brought and then, having kissed them, put them aside. Finally, Bū Naṣr read and translated into Persian the caliph’s letter and the diploma. After which the present began to scatter coins, jewels and rarities (ibid., 473-4).
Mihragan and Naw Ruz appear to have been regularly celebrated by Masud. In 426/1035 Mihragan fell on the 16 Dhul Qa'da. Bayhaki states that on this occasion coins and jewels were scattered before Masud and presents made to him. After prayers, wine was passed round and the "the customs of Mihragan were performed" (ibid., 643, cf. also 655, 697, 743). When recording the celebration of Mihragan in 430/1039, Bayhaki states that poets and singers were not given presents on that occasion because there had been a shortage of rain (ibid., 789-90). Under later rulers, the festival of Mihragan fell into desuetude. Bayhaki mentions that in 429/1038 Masud observed the customs of the Naw Ruz and gave presents and that wine flowed (ibid., 705, cf. also 815). After the Ghaznavids, Naw Ruz was celebrated as a popular rather than a public festival; under the Safawids and Kadjars it was again celebrated as a public festival (see below). Bayhaki also mentions the celebration of Sada, the festival of fire, in 426/1035, but this was probably not a public celebration. He states that Masud sat in a tent pitched beside a stream with his boon companions. Musicians were also present and a fire of wood was lit (ibid., 572). (On Sada, see Cambridge History of Iran, iii/2, The Seleucids, Parthians and Sasanians, period, ed. E. Yarshater, Cambridge 1983, 800-1.) The Ziyarid Mardawijd had before this made an abortive attempt to revive the feast of Sada. He prepared a great bonfire in Isfahan in 323/935, but was murdered before the ceremony could take place (Fakhi, op. cit., 20). The recovery of the ruler from illness was another occasion for the offering of presents to him. On 1 Rabi\'i 428/22 December 1036 Masud, who had just recovered from illness, held a court in Bust. His entourage and the great men of the city came and scattered coins and presents, while the people offered prayers for him and sacrificed animals, giving the meat with bread to the poor (Bayhaki, 278).

It would appear from the Tarih-i Masud\'i that Masud b. Mahmud frequently granted khil\'a\'s to his subjects. These appear to have differed according to the rank of the recipient. A large stock was presumably held in the royal wardrobe (qum\'-shahma). Thus Ali Dawa on 1 Djumadi I 429/6 January 1041 was "clothed with a sipahsalar\'i khil\'a", such as was customary for army commanders" (op. cit., 436), while the khil\'a given to the caliph\'s envoy in 423/1031-2 was "such as is given to the fukahd\" (ibid., 390). When the hajib Suhbashi was made chief minister (khil\'-as-i buzurj) on 10 Safar 427/13 December 1036, he was given a "complete" khil\'a with a banner, standard, drum and kettle drum, suits of clothes (suhb-h\'-yi qum\'-ma), bags of silver and other things which went with this office (ibid., 648). A special horse was also the mark of certain offices. Tash Farrash, the army commander, when setting out for Ir\'ak\' in 422/1030-1 was presented with "the horse of the army commander (sipahsalar\') of Ir\'ak\" (ibid., 373). Bayhaki also mentions "the horse of the leader (qal\') of Hindustan" (ibid., 395). Horses played a special part in royal processions [see MAWAK\'IB].

The Saldjuks, when they came into Khurasan, took over some of the ceremonial forms they found in existence. When Toghril Beg came to Nishapur in 429/1073-8 he sat on Masud\' b. Mahmud\'s throne, which was in the front part of a dais, to receive the welcome of the population. His personal apparel was modest compared to that affected by Masud. Bayhaki states that on his entry into Nishapur he wore a woven lappet over his cloak (kha\'-yi mulham), a tarejazi turban and felt boots, and was fully armed, and carried on his arm a strong bow with three wooden arrows (ibid., 732). It is not without interest that a bow and arrows were part of the insignia of the Kadjars (see below). Even after the rule of the Saldjuks had become firmly established, their court remained less minutely regulated and less luxurious than that of the Ghaznavids. This may have been due in part to a survival of tribal tradition (so far as this survived), and in part to the fact that the Saldjuks sultans were frequently engaged in military expeditions and spent much time travelling about their empire. Rawandi states that Malikshah was not cut off from the people by a curtain (hia\'-db) and that if someone came to him to redress a wrong, he would speak to him face to face (Rab\'ah al-sud\', ed. Muhamm\'mad ib\'ali, London 1921, 131). Nizam al-Mulk believed that fixed procedures in ceremonial matters enabled the subjects to regulate their conduct. Accordingly, he lays down rules in the Si\'yasat-nama for the holding of audiences by the sultan (110, 84, 86). These may well have represented his ideal rather than actual practice. He obviously felt that the Saldjuks sultans had failed to maintain the pomp necessary to preserve the awe in which he believed the monarch ought to be held. However, on occasion the Saldjuks sultans did observe an elaborate ceremonial (cf. the marriage of the daughter of Malikshah to Al-Mu\'tadadi [see MAWAK\'IB]). Nizam al-Mulk also lays down rules for the reception of foreign envoys. They were to be accompanied by an officer of the sultan as soon as they crossed the frontier. The reason for this was not only to honour the envoy but also to find out the aims and power of his patron (ibid., 86). The practice of appointing an official, known in later times as the mihmand\'ar [q.v.], to conduct important personages through the country is also found under the Safawids and Kadjars.

Bundard\'i and Ibn al-Athir both give the impression that Toghril Beg held the caliph in great veneration, though this did not prevent him from demanding the same honours as had been accorded to the Ghaznavids and in insisting on his own marriage to the caliph\'s daughter (see G. Maksidi, Ibn \'Aqil et la résurgence de l\'Islam traditionaliste au XIe siècle, Damascus 1965, 78 ff. and passim; idem, The marriage of Toghril Beg, in LMEJ, i [1970], 270). In 449/1057-8 when he was granted an audience by the caliph, he dismounted at the gate of the caliph\'s palace and went in on foot. On seeing the caliph sitting on his throne, he kissed the ground several times. He was then seated on a chair (kurst) in front of the caliph\'s throne. The caliph, addressing him through the na\'i al-r\'-\'uda\', gave him a khil\'a, standard and diploma and girded him with a sword (Sibh b. Djawari, Mar\'ud al-zam\', ed. Ali Sevim Ankara 1968, 24-6; Ibn al-Athir, Al-Kamil, ix, 436; see also MAWAK\'IN). The caliph\'s envoy when he came in Sha\'a\'b\'an 453/August-September 1061 to Tabriz for the conclusion of the \'ad\' between the caliph\'s daughter and Toghril Beg, appears to have been treated with great respect. When he entered the sultan\'s presence the latter was sitting on his throne, around which were standing the amirs and meliks according to their ranks. After the envoy had saluted the sultan, \'Amid al-Mulk al-Kunduri [q.v.], Toghril Beg\'s wazir, approached him and greeted him; under both the Ghaznavids and the Saldjuks it appears to have been the function of the chief minister to speak on such occasions on behalf of the sultan. The caliph\'s envoy then stood up and took out his deed of proxy (khâ\'ah al-wu\'al\'). The whole company rose and he went on to the passage stating the exalted ceremonies which were to be performed," he bowed, and those present, including the sultan and \'Amid al-
Mulk, also bowed. When details of the marriage portion (mahr) were mentioned, voices were raised in prayer for the caliph. The kha'ba was read by a certain Mansur al-Khurarsin, after which al-Mu'azzam al-Ma'add distributed khiyas in great profusion, the Saljuq sultans seem to have been more sparing in their grants. When Alp Arslan took oaths of allegiance from his amirs for his son Malikshah as his heir apparent, he gave them khishas (Ibn al-Ashir, x, 34). Similarly, when Sandjar came to Rayy in 543/1148-9 and renewed Mas'ud's power, Muhammad's diploma, he gave Mas'ud and all the amirs of 'Irak valuable khiyas (Rwandi, 175). Whereas Mas'ud b. Muhamud appears to have expected his subjects to present him with gifts on all occasions, under the Saljuqs the practice was less common. The Saljuqs adopted the various insignia of royalty which had prevailed under earlier rulers. They added to them the ghishina (q.v., and see also Mawakih). They apparently had special tents when on expeditions. When Muhammad b. Muhammad spent one month with his uncle Sandjar in 521/1127 after he had rebelled against him, he was not allowed a red dahram tent. When he was restored to the government of 'Irak at the end of the month, Sandjar again according to him, gave him a special garment (kivas-i khiss), as well as a bejewelled cloak, a special horse (asb-i naubat) with harness set with jewels and an elephant with a howdah also set with jewels (Rawandi, 170). Pir Muhammad, Timur's grandson, also had a red tent (Clavijo, Embassy to Tamerlane 1403-06), tr. from the Spanish by G. Le Strange, London 1928, 254), and so too did Faith Ali Shah (Feuvrier, Histoire des Tartares, viii, Paris 1965, 90-2; see also Spuler, Documents relatifs a l'histoire des Croisades, 1931, 17, 113). The birthday of the ruler, at least during the reign of Ghazan Khan, was celebrated with great splendour and presents were given to him (see Spuler, op. cit., 264). There were apparently special ceremonies concerned with the presentation of drink to the Ilkhan. These, too, were modelled on the practice of the court of the Great Khan (cf. Travels, 132 and also Tahrir-i shah-i Karâ-Khânâ), ed. Muhammad Ibrahîm Bâstânî Pârîzî, Tehran Shâhîngilhâ 2535/1976-7, 139). One of the features which differentiated the ceremonies of the Ilkhanid and Timurid courts from earlier and later courts was the participation, on occasion, of women of the royal house in public ceremonies. The Ilkhan's chief wife sometimes sat on the throne with him. The Ilkhanîs were lavish in their grant of khiyas. They and their wives held large stocks of precious garments. Some were made in royal workshops (cf. Rashid al-Din, Tahrir-i mulk-i Khânâ, q.v., Kâshânî, Tahrir-i Opolyâ, ed. Mahîn Hambîly, Tehran A.H.S. 1348/1969, 121-2). Rashid al-Din states that Ghazan gave away on one occasion 20,000 garments (Tahrir-i mulbarak-i gha'zânî, 185).

Much of the ceremony of earlier times continued to be found under the Timurids. Clavijo, in his account of Timur's reception of foreign ambassadors in Samarkand, describes how they were taken under the armpits by a series of waiting officials as they advanced through the palace and its grounds. First they came to Timur's nephew, a very old man, seated on a dais, to whom they made obeisance; then they came to several of Timur's grandsons, who were also seated on a dais and to whom they paid their respects. Three of the young princes got up, asked for the letter which the envoys had brought from the king of Castile and took it to Timur. The envoys followed and found Timur sitting on a dais in the portal at the entrance of the palace. He was dressed in a cloak of plain silk, wearing a tall white hat, ornamented with pearls and jewels, with a balas ruby on the crown, and sat on a mattress covered by an embroidered silk cloth with cushions behind him. On sight of Timur, the envoys bowed and put their right knees to the ground, crossing their arms over breasts. Advancing another step, they again bowed, and on the third occasion remained kneeling. Timur then commanded them to rise and approach him. Three chamberlains came forward, took them under the armpits, led them up to Timur until they stood immediately before him, and again made them kneel. At the end of the audience a feast was held (Embassy to Tamerlane, 220 ff.). Clavijo describes another feast given by Timur which was attended by numerous men and women (ibid., 227 ff.). At the end of it ‘‘one of the lords in waiting came forward with a silver bowl full of small pieces of silver money … and of this money he proceeded to throw handfuls over us ambassadors as also over the other guests present, and gathered up all the rest of the coins that remained in the bowl and threw them into the skirt of the cloaks we ambassadors were wearing, this being a gift to us’’ (ibid., 227). Timur then presented each of them with a robe of honour. They
bowed in acknowledgement three times and then knelt before him (ibid., cf. also the reception of the Spanish envoys by Pir Muḥammad, Timūr’s grandson, 254). At various other times the ambassadors were given robes of honour—on one occasion they each received not only a robe of kincob, but also a skirt to match, a hat and a horse for riding (ibid., 236), and on another they were each given a robe of honour of kincob and for wearing underneath it a close fitting jacket of silk cloth lined with skins, with a high collar made of the fur of two marten skins, a hat and a wallet containing 1,500 silver pieces (ibid., 276-7).

Once when Timūr received the envoys in the Great Pavilion in Samarkand, he was accompanied by a great crowd of his imperial kinsmen and many foreign ambassadors, all of whom took their seats in due order of precedence. Elephants then were brought in and performed tricks, and minstrels played their instruments. Round about there stood some 300 wine jars for the guests and two tripods made of wooden staves painted red, with a great leather sack hanging on each filled with cream and mares’ milk. These the attendants kept stirring and threw in many loaves of sugar. Timūr’s chief wife appeared at the feast, taking her place beside Timūr but slightly behind him on a low dais, three of her ladies sitting beside her. Seven others of his wives, and the wife of one of his grandsons, sat beside them. (ibid., 257 ff.). Describing the ceremonies connected with drinking that took place at the feast (which appear to have resembled customs at the court of the ʿIkhāns), Clavijo states, “Those who are given to drink at the hands of Timur have to do so ceremoniously and after this fashion. They come forward and bend the right knee knee, once at some distance before approaching; then they rise and step forward nearer to him (Timur) and kneel with both knees on the ground, receiving the offered cup from his hand. Then they stand up and go backwards a little distance, taking care always to face his highness, and they kneel again and then drink at a draught all that is in the cup, for to leave any wine undrunk would be against good manners. Then having swallowed the draught they rise again and then they rise and step forward nearer to him: after this the ambassador is conducted to the place of the ʿIkhāns.”
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and return to the city accompanied by a concourse of the local officials and inhabitants (The travels of Monsieur de Thevenot, London 1687, reprint 1971, ii, 72, 104; Jean-Baptiste Tavernier, Voyages en Perse, Geneva 1970, 273). This was also the case under the Afghars and Kadjars (cf. Jonas Hanway, An historical account of the British trade over the Caspian Sea, London 1762, i, 101; Malcolm, History of Persia, London 1829, ii, 407, 408; 'Abd Allah Mustawfi, Shahr-i zindagani-i man, Tehran A.H.S. 1324/1945-6, i, 546-7). Prior to taking leave of the shah, envoys were given khil'as, which they wore at the farewell audience. The quality of the person regulated the value of the khil'a. Some consisted of a whole suit of clothing, even to the shirt and shoes. Some were taken out of the king's own wardrobe from amongst the garments he had worn. The common ones consisted of a vest, an upper vest, a scarf and a turban. The value of khil'as varied enormously. One given to an ambassador from the Mughal emperor was valued at 100,000 crowns and consisted of a garment of gold brocade with several upper vests, lined with marten furs and enriched by a clasp of precious stones, 15,000 crowns in money, upper vests, lined with marten furs and enriched by a khil'a. Monsieur de Thevenot,
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of polo and archery contents in the maydan of the city (ibid., i, 598). Sometimes owing to the exigencies of war, the Naw Rúz was not celebrated officially, as was the case in 1025/1616-17 when the shah was en route for Georgia (ibid., ii, 897-8).

Sir John Chardin gives an eye-witness account of the coronation of Sháh Sai II (1077-1105/1667-94). His father Sháh 'Abdálláh II having died in Tabaristán without designating his successor, his chief ministers decided to put Sulaymán (who later took the name Sai) on the throne. They sent the kurtá-báshí and Isfahán to bring Sulaymán out of the kāram where he had been confined on the orders of his father, and to give him a letter announcing their decision. Every effort was meanwhile made to conceal the late shah's death, to which purpose the chief ministers, other than the kurtá-báshí remained in Tabaristán, sending only their deputies to Isfahán. Sulaymán was informed of the decision to place him on the throne and preparations for the coronation were immediately made. The kurtá-báshí, attended by the chief eunuch and a train of other persons, conducted the prince to the audience hall, where the deputies of the ministers of state made their three usual prostrations in the name of the ministers of state as also did the munájjám-báshí, who had come with them from Tabaristán (for a description of the hall, see The works of Sir John Chardin into Persia and the East Indies to London 1691, Coronation, 37 ff.). The prince then went to the bath to purify himself and put on new clothes. Meanwhile, the munájjám-báshí and another astrologer who had come with him from Tabaristán set themselves to observe the most favourable moment for the coronation to take place. The sháh al-sáli'm, who was to perform the ceremony, was sent for and the hall prepared for the coronation. Four articles needed for the coronation were placed in the middle of the hall. The first was the throne or kurtá, "a little square cushion stool, three geometrical feet in height, the feet of the pillars that supported the corners being fashioned like so many great apples". These and the pillars were plated with gold and set with rubies and emeralds. When not in use, the throne was placed in the middle of the hall. The second was the tāqí, or crown (for a description of this see ibid., 40-1). The third was a sword and the fourth a dagger, both of which were set with precious stones (ibid., 41). The three last mentioned articles were placed near the throne. When all was ready, Sulaymán came in and sat down (not on the throne) and the assembled company ranged themselves in their appointed places (ibid., 42-3). When the munájjám-báshí gave notice that the propitious moment had arrived, the prince and those present rose to their feet. The kurtá-báshí, after throwing himself at the shah's feet, rose to his knees, opened the bag in which the letter was kept, placed his right hand on it, and then rose to his feet. The prince, having received it, returned it to him and commanded him to open it and read it. When he had finished reading, the prince ordered him to send for the sháh al-sáli'm. The latter, approaching the prince, threw himself at his feet, rose after the usual prostrations, and took the letter from the kurtá-báshí. Having laid it out on his head, he read it and examined the seals, and then fell upon his knees before the prince, and bowed thrice to the ground, thus declaring the authenticity of the letter and the elevation of the prince to the throne. The kurtá-báshí on the left and the sháh al-sáli'm on the right then conducted the prince to the golden chair or throne in the centre of the hall. The sháh al-sáli'm, kneeling, said a prayer, blessed the tāqí, the sword and the dagger, girded the sword on the shah's left side and hung the dagger on his right side. Then having made a sign to the kurtá-báshí to take off the shah's bonnet, he put on the tāqí, raising it as he did so verses from the Kūrān, which he also did when he girded him with the sword and the dagger. He then gave way to the kurtá-báshí, who read the sûrat udhí'a. As the latter ended with the khāthíb by praying for the long life of the shah and the increase of his conquests, those present loudly repeated five or six times the words in shā'di'alláh. The sháh al-sáli'm then bowed his forehead to the ground three times, pronounced a second benediction and bowed again three times, after which those present, according to their rank, came forward and made the three customary prostrations. This concluded the ceremony (ibid., 42 ff.). Subsequently, as a result of an illness which attacked the shah, a shortage of foodstuffs, an outbreak of pest and various other infelicitous events, it was believed that the coronation had taken place under an unfavourable constellation. Accordingly, a second coronation was decided upon at what was hoped would be a more favourable hour. This took place in the Čihl Sútun palace, and the shah tendered the throne of Súľtan (ibid., 132-3).

Under Nádir Sháh, court ceremonial was inevitably much reduced, since he spent much of his life in camp and on military expeditions. Hanway describes his camp and the pavilion tent in which he gave audience and transacted business. Sometimes he used to sit cross-legged on a large chair or dais and sometimes on the floor. There was nothing sumptuous in the pavilion; the front was always open even in the worst weather; in very cold weather charcoal braziers were placed in the middle. Behind the pavilion were his private apartments, to which he retired at meal-times. His officers of state and those having business with him stood in the open air forming a semi-circle in front of the tent. If anyone was brought to answer for his conduct, he was held under the arms by officers to prevent his escape or committing an act of violence. The kurtá-báshí, who was the chief eunuch, was so heavy and weighty that it needed two men to carry it (Chardin, Coronation, 39-40). The second article was the tāqí or crown (for a description of this see ibid., 40-1). The third was a sword and the fourth a dagger, both of which were set with precious stones (ibid., 41). The three last mentioned articles were placed near the throne. When all was ready, Sulaymán came in and sat down (not on the throne) and the assembled company ranged themselves in their appointed places (ibid., 42-3). When the munájjám-báshí gave notice that the propitious moment had arrived, the prince and those present rose to their feet. The kurtá-báshí, after throwing himself at the shah's feet, rose to his knees, opened the bag in which the letter was kept, and kissed it, raised it to his forehead, and presented it to the prince and then rose to his feet. The prince, having received it, returned it to him and commanded him to open it and read it. When he had finished reading, the prince ordered him to send for the sháh al-sáli'm. The latter, approaching the prince, threw himself at his feet, rose after the usual prostrations, and took the letter from the kurtá-báshí. Having laid it out on his head, he read it and examined the seals, and then fell upon his knees before the prince, and bowed thrice to the ground, thus declaring the authenticity of the letter and the elevation of the prince to the throne. The kurtá-báshí on the left and the sháh al-sáli'm on the right then conducted the prince to the golden chair or throne in the centre of the hall. The sháh al-sáli'm, kneeling, said a prayer, blessed the tāqí, the sword and the dagger, girded the sword on the shah's left side and hung the dagger on his right side. Then having made a sign to the kurtá-báshí to take off the shah's bonnet, he put on the tāqí, raising it as he did so verses from the Kūrān, which he also did when he girded him with the sword and the dagger. He then gave way to the kurtá-báshí, who read the sûrat udhí'a. As the latter ended with the khāthíb by praying for the long life of the shah and the increase of his conquests, those present loudly repeated five or six times the words in shā'di'alláh. The sháh al-sáli'm then bowed his forehead to the ground three times, pronounced a second benediction and bowed again three times, after which those present, according to their rank, came forward and made the three customary prostrations. This concluded the ceremony (ibid., 42 ff.). Subsequently, as a result of an illness which attacked the shah, a shortage of foodstuffs, an outbreak of pest and various other infelicitous events, it was believed that the coronation had taken place under an unfavourable constellation. Accordingly, a second coronation was decided upon at what was hoped would be a more favourable hour. This took place in the Čihl Sútun palace, and the shah tendered the throne of Súľtan (ibid., 132-3).

Nádir's coronation was also a break with tradition. When he had decided to assume the crown, he summoned governors, káds, ulamá' and provincial notables to a kurtálay in the Mughán steppe ostensibly to choose their ruler, but in fact to acclaim him as their ruler. Those who assembled were too numerous to be received simultaneously and so were divided into groups, each being given a separate audience. Finally, on 24 Shawwáli 1148/8 March 1736, after several days of charade, Nádir having signified his readiness to accept the crown subject to certain conditions, the umará' and other persons of consequence clad in robes of honour assembled, and Mirzá Zákí placed a golden crown, adorned with magnificent jewels, on Nádir's head. All those present knelt down and prayed, except the deputy chief mullá, who intoned the prayer. While this was being uttered, all kept their arms above their heads; afterwards, while the Fāthi was being read,
they bowed their faces to the ground. When the Fatiha was finished, everyone rose and seated himself in his appointed place according to his rank (see further, L. Lockhart, *Mohammadian Affairs*, London 1833, ii, 320 ff.). Among the spoils that Nādir brought back to Persia from his Indian expedition in 1739 was the Peacock Throne. This was lost in the troubles after Nādir’s death. The modern Peacock Throne is of Kāǧār manufacture (see Amir Gllanshah, *Yak sad u pandash sad-i saltanat dar Iran*, n.d. Tehran, 28-9; Ali Asghar Hikmat, *Takhti-i Sādri*, in *FIZ*, viii, 139-52). Nādir himself (1193-1211/1779-97), like Nādir Šāh, spent much of his life in military expeditions and had little use for court ceremonial. Under his successor Fath ʿAli Šāh (1211-50/1797-1834), traditional ceremonies were revived. No court, according to Sir John Malcolm, paid more rigid attention to forms and ceremonies, the maintenance of which were deemed essential to the power and glory of the monarch. Looks, words, and the motions of the body were all regulated by the strictest forms. When the king was seated in public, his sons, ministers and courtiers stood erect, with their hands crossed over their chests, and in the exact place belonging to their rank (*History of Persia*, ii, 400). James Morier also remarks that the king was never approached by his subjects without frequent inclinations of the body; and another person introduced to his presence had reached a certain distance, he would wait until the king ordered him to proceed; upon which he would leave his shoes and walk forward to a second spot and wait there until the king directed him to advance further. No one sat before the king except relations of kings, poets, learned and holy men and ambassadors; his ministers and officers of state were never permitted this privilege (*A journey through Persia, Armenia, and Asia Minor*, London 1812, 286).

The insignia of royalty consisted of the following articles, all of which were set with jewels and pearls: the crown (of which there appear to have been several), the sword of state, a dagger, the royal bow and its arrows, a shield and staff or mace. These were held on ceremonial occasions by pages (ghulams) or other officials, or by the princes (cf. W. Ouseley, *Travels in various countries of the east...*, London 1819, iii, 130-1; Morier, *op. cit.*, 192, 214-15; Muʿayyir al-Mamālik, *Yādādēgār-hā-ī az zandāgān-i Nāṣir al-Dīn Šāh*, Tehran n.d., 25). On the front of the crown was placed an agniate (*dīgha*). A similar ornament was also worn on the headdress of the shah and princes. On state occasions, special bracelets were worn by the shah and his sons (Morier, *A second journey through Persia, Armenia, and Anatolia*, London 1818, 173). A variety of standards were in existence, some of which were brocaded with a shawl, and sometimes he would add to this a horse with its trappings and caparisons (see further, L. Ouseley, *op. cit.*, 320 ff., also quoted by R.G. Watson, *History of Persia*, London 1866, 138 n.). Under Nāṣir al-Dīn Šāh also, the Naw Rūz was celebrated with great magnificence. Three audiences were held; the first (the *salām-i tahavīl*) took place when the sun passed into Aries and was held in the hall in which Fath ʿAli’s throne was kept. A large white cloth for the Hāft Sin stretched from near the door of the hall to the edge of the dais on which the throne was placed. The Kāḡār princes, military officers, civil officials, and religious dignitaries proceeded to their places an hour before the sun entered Aries. Three
quarters of an hour later, a curtain was raised and the shah in a blaze of jewels, preceded by the ihsân-kâsâr-bâshi and the Fatimid al-Haram, advanced slowly towards the throne, but out of respect for the 'ulâmâ', he did not sit on the throne; instead he sat on a chair (masnad) covered with gold brocade, placed beside the throne, holding the sword of Nâdir Shâh on his knees.

The first minister (the yâd-i a'zâm), with his cloak and sword of office, and his subordinates stood near the throne. The 'imâm djam'ûn and the great 'ulâmâ' sat beside the masnad of the shah, while the less distinguished 'ulâmâ' stood at the foot of the throne. The khatât al-mamâlik and the munadjîm-bâshi stood facing the throne. The former, approaching the throne, read a khutba and at the mention of the names of the prophet, 'Ali and the shah all heads bowed. The munadjîm-bâshi then came forward and after a moment or two announced that the sun had entered Aries. Immediately the trumpeters, who were drawn up outside, sounded their trumpets and guns were let off in the Maydân-i Masâkh. The shah offered his congratulations to the 'ulâmâ' and then to the rest of the company. Taking the Kurân in his hands he reverently read a passage, after which Hâddûd Nizâm al-Islâm knelt before the shah and put a little dust from a packet into water and gave it to him to drink. Having drunk it, the shah began to give New Year presents, using purring, pouring out of gold coins, to the 'ulâmâ'. When this was finished and the 'ulâmâ' had left, the bands which were drawn up outside, hitherto silent out of respect to the 'ulâmâ', would begin to play. The shah then got up from his masnad and sat on a chair and gave purses full of gold coins first to the princes, then to the army leaders and mustawfis and finally to the rest of those present, saying a few words to each one in turn. The recipients, on receiving their presents, kissed them and raised them to their heads. The assembly lasted some two or three hours, after which the shah withdrew into the garden, and thence into the andarûn, where the ladies of the haram vied with each other in kissing his feet (Mu'ayyir al-mamâlik, op. cit., 70 ff.).

On the second day of the Naw Ruz, a public audience was given by the shah at the portico of the Shams al-Amara palace and give them gold coins. A lunch would then be held for the shah would watch the proceedings with members of his haram from a window looking on the audience hall (ibid., 91).

The other major festivals celebrated by Nasir al-Din Shâh were the religious festivals of the 'id al-adhâ, the birthday of the prophet Muhammad, the 'Imâm 'Ali and the Hidden Imam, the 'id al-adhdâ, and the 'id al-fitr. Muzaffar al-Din added to these the birthday of ʿUsâyyn (ibid., 73). The Kâdîjâs, influenced by European precedent, made various innovations in ceremonial matters. In addition to the playing of national anthems on state occasions, various orders were instituted. One of the first was the Order of the Sun which Fath 'Ali gave to the French envoy General Gardane; shortly afterwards he instituted the Order of the Lion and the Sun for Malcolm (see Kaye, Life and correspondence of Major-General Sir John Malcolm, London 1856, ii, 31 ff.).

Nâsir al-Din Shâh introduced the custom of giving his picture (tîmtâl-i humâyûn) adorned by one, two or three rows of diamonds to favoured recipients. The first class with three rows of diamonds was given only to foreign rulers (Mu'ayyir al-mamâlik, op. cit., 83-4).

4. In the Ottoman Empire.

In the Ottoman Empire, ceremonial, protocol and etiquette are generally referred to as Tağrîfât. Aşas [q.v.], "procession", "parade", forms an integral part of most ceremonies held by the court, in the residence of the sultans as well as those organised by provincial governors who, in a lesser way, were expected to display the splendour of their monarch's régime.

The same purpose was served by military ceremonial and display. Splendid occasions were the mustering of the army setting out on campaign when the "horsetails" were planted in the field of Dauud-paşa or outside Uskûdar. Likewise, the fleet of the kaptûn-paşa lay at anchor in front of the tomb of Khâyr al-Din Barbarossa at Beşîka before putting to sea on its yearly tour in the Mediterranean (see Bahriyâ, iii, and Tugh).

Popular entertainment (modern şenlik) often had a processional character as well. Ceremonial festivities of the sultan's court, such as weddings, circumcisions of princes and anniversaries, were coupled as a rule with extensive popular entertainments like illuminations (donamna) and theatricals.

The great Islamic festivals [see 51], especially those
during Ramadān, were occasions of general enjoyment. Special dress and the distribution of presents by the sultan, as well as to his person, by his subjects and by foreign princes belong to the ceremonial sphere [see HIBA; KHAJA; LURAS, IV; ERICHSHA]. Ottoman ceremonial derives on one hand from the ancient traditions of world rule cultivated by the Mongol and Turkish empires in Central Asia and the Middle East. On the other hand, the traditions of leadership in Islamic history has shown that such a hypothesis is no longer tenable. The pioneering studies here of M.F. Koprulü have been confirmed by the work of modern scholars such as A.K.S. Lambton and H. İnalcık.

The rules of ceremonies and protocol set by the Ottoman government were applied within the frame of Islamic legal usage and custom (["arif"] [see "urif"] and laid down in so-called "law codes" [Kânân-nâmes [q.v.]]. Hardly any sources can be dated with certainty before the reign of Bâyazid II (886-918/1481-1512). Dilger's (1967) and Heyd's (1973) researches have shown that the mss. of [Kânân-nâmes used and published by von Hammer and Mehemed "Arif were composites or pious frauds of later date than the years of Sultan Mehemmed II (second reign 855-86/1451-81). Hence the so-called "Ottoman Kânân-nâme" is unreliable as an unqualified source, and the use made of these texts by von Hammer and, a fortiori by I. H. Uzunçarşı, is therefore flawed.

Court ceremonial, appropriately enhanced by Islamic ritual, was designed to emphasise the awe in which the ruler was held by means of a show of splendour to be seen as evidence of his power. As a consequence, his separation from the rest of the population followed. A protective seclusion was a characteristic of the Ottoman sultans, with their forerunners in the Islamic Middle East. A reliable source, Bertrandon de la Broquère (1433) describes already the isolation of the reigning sultans, e.g. Murâd II still dining with the companions, but his successor sitting at table alone. The increased elevation of the sultan's person and his gradual disappearance from the public eye led to heightened ceremonial on the rare event of the ruler showing himself at appointed occasions.

The audience maintained the link between the separate spheres of authority of the sultan and of his ministers united in the Diwan-i hümâyûn [q.v.] presided over by the Grand Vizier [see ŞAHR-I ÂZAM]. In the early days of the Ottoman monarchy, the meetings of the diwan were still public audiences. Probably during the reign of Selim I (918-26/1512-20), the public audience was instituted in front of the Bâb-i Şevâdet in the Palace of Istanbul, where a throne was placed there under an awning. The appearance of the ruler was formally applauded under the guidance of the Chief Applauder or Aşıkğâl Boğhî Alıkhâ (applause), accompanied by exclamations like, "pâdishâhîniz ok yahda" intoned by the Selâm Çavuş or Dâşıği, is a ceremonial known already in Sâlûq times. The audience proper (["arif"] implied kissing hands (desbâş) or kissing the hem of the ceremonial kaftan of the sultan seated on his throne placed on a dais (soda) on such occasions. Ca. 1525 the throne was replaced in a room specially built for audiences just inside the gate, the "ard odasî still to be seen in the Topkâpî Sarayî today. The protocol is well described in numerous reports of foreign ambassadors thus received. The guests were led to the sultan while held by their arms. The traditional explanation that it was a measure of security originating in the assassination of Murâd I [q.v.] in 1389 is rendered doubtful by the earliest sources mentioning this protocol dating from 1518. In this, rigid guidance is known from Sâlûq times and the Mâmlûk court (Dilger, 1967, 58-9 and n.; Lambton).

As tokens of favour, precious kaftans were presented to those persons received as âhidî or robes of honour. In times of decline, according to diplomatic sources of the 17th and 18th centuries, these robes were actually bought back by the Ottoman Porte to be given out another time. Since the days of Selim I, the ruler would remain immobile and practically silent during audiences. An exceptional favour was a compliment on a speech of an ambassador in the guise of a word or two, e.g. "güzeldir" or a mere gesture of the hand. Bâyazid II and Mehemmed II still seem to have entered upon some civil conversation on such occasions. The throne (Tâhâ-i hümâyûn, seri" did not have an important ceremonial significance in itself apart from being of luxury manufacture. The newly-succeeding sultan would receive the homage or oath of allegiance of his subjects (baya [q.v.], bâsîn in Ottoman usage).

The actual accession to rule was the subject of the great ceremony of the ådása. The ruler proceeded in state on horseback (or boat) to the shrine of Eyyûb on the Golden Horn, where took place the Girding of the Sword (tâkid-i sayf, kilic kilsâması in Turkish) in heu of a coronation in Western style. According to tradition, this took place for the first time in 824/1421 at Bursa, where the venerable Şeyhûk Emin Bîlghârî girded Murâd II. Since Mehemmed II, the ceremony was held at the Eyyûb åtâr the accession of the last Ottoman Mehemmed VI, on 3 July 1918, when the Şeyhûk Sayyid Ahmed Şanûş [q.v.] performed it. It is a persistent but erroneous notion that the sword was fastened by the Grand Şeyhûk of the Mâlawîyya [q.v.] devrish order.

An imperial astronomer had to appoint the exact date, which was to fall between the third and seventh day after the actual accession. On the return journey, the sultan passed the Janissary Barracks of Eski Odâlar. There, this corps offered şerbet, and the traditional intention for the next campaign of holy war was formulated by the ruler's words "We shall meet at the Red Apple." (Küçü Ekme, in Turkish the symbol of distant Christian capitals such as Rome and Vienna). A distribution of money to the Janissary Corps became usual (Dâwâsî bâkhiyâh) as was also customary at the reception of foreign ambassadors by the sultan and separately by the diwan in full session, a so-called Ulufè Divânî ("Council Hall"). The swords used formed part of the collection of the Holy Relics of the Prophet Muhammad, emanât-ı mubârâke, still kept in the room in the Palace appointed for that purpose, the birkâk-i seri" odasâl. These relics acquired by Selim I comprised inter alia the Holy Mantle itself (burda), the Holy Banner (sandjâks-i seri"), a fragment of a tooth of the Prophet (dentân-i sevâdet), hairs of the Prophet's beard (ibbâ-ya sevâdet), a print of his footprint (kadâm-i sevâdet) and swords which belonged to the Prophet, to the caliphs Abû Bakr, 'Umar and 'Uthmân and to six of his Companions.
These eşya-i müteberkike were in a way the insignia of government for the Ottoman sultans in their role as leaders of Islam, and during the 19th century, especially from the time of Abd al-Hamid II (1823/1237-1876/1279), became symbolic of Ottoman pretensions to the caliphate. The true regalia and symbols of recognition as Muslim ruler were for the Ottomans as for all others, the right of coinage (sikka [q.v.]); the mention of the sultan’s name in the Friday Prayers (şuhut [q.v.]); the seal stamp (muhur); the monogram, i.e. the prestigious tugha [q.v.], the hallmark of Ottoman ruler, whose excellence, the dressing of the Imperial Tent (steb-i hümâyûn, also şadîr) and accompanying most ceremonies, the military music of the Janissaries (mehterhânâ [q.v. and also nakeâra-khanâ and nawbâ]).

The other sovereign ceremony with religious significance was the execution of the annual “holy” caravan to Mecca and Medina carrying the concrete embodiment of Ottoman devotion toward the Holy Places. The şâre-yi hümâyûn was organised around the date of 12 Rasâdja by the Đâr al-sâdet aghâšî [q.v.] in the Harem apartment of the Palace. The first sending of the sadakat-i râmiyye was ordered by Mehemmed I. 5 Abûd-ş-Âmîd II sent a sum of 3,503,610 ghurush to palaces outside town along the Bosphorus near Beşiktaş and even across the water, notably to the palaces of Çıragan, Dolmabâché and the various quarters of Yıldız, the last one built upon the initiative of Âbd-ş-Âmîd II.

On the whole, tradition was maintained in a more sober form. To the ever-increasing number of foreign visitors to the Ottoman capital, ceremonies nevertheless still made a deep impression, as is evident from the mass of travel accounts, private memoirs and observations of diplomats. Âbd al-ş-Âmîd regularly took a great interest in keeping alive the great traditions, and promoted the study and restoration of institutions from the Ottoman and Islamic past, for ceremonial was still considered a useful means to enhance the pretensions of the Ottoman Sultan-caliph to great power status and to paramount leadership of the Islamic world.

During the second half of the 19th century, we see in ceremonial a blend of ancient oriental and modern European styles. The Teşrîfâtî remained an official attached to the Grand Vizirate, i.e. the Diwan-i Hümâyûn. The newly-created Ottoman Foreign Office employed its own Chef-de-Protocole (Khârijîyye Teşrîfâtî). Official titles and ranks are systematically arranged into a hierarchy. The sâlimâne (second in 1323/1905-6) mentions a teşrîfâtci-şârî, ranking as a vizier of second class attached to the Grand Vizier’s office. Next to him functioned a Teşrîfâtî-yi Diwan-i Hümâyûn carrying the alât rank of civil servants (ibid., 164). In the Yıldız Palace, a Merâsim Dâr-i reisi functioned. The ancient office of Akbîçhî Bâşî, leading a group of official “applauders” still survived. The classical mehterhân, however, was replaced by a western-style military band playing martial music at all occasions.

A remarkable innovation alla frança was the introduction at public ceremonies, such as the muâşîye, selâmîlik or the visit to the Khârina-yi Şerîf, on 15 Ramadân, of the prominent female members of the Sultan’s household and family. The Wâlîde Sultan [q.v.] princesses, high-ranking consorts and female officials of the Harem had to take part in a great number of ceremonies and to watch the military parades in front of the Tâvînkhânâ Kâşiha inside Yıldız Park, which was the successor, in a way, of the Alay Kâşiha on the wall of the Topkapi Sarayî facing the Sublime Porte. The Bâb-i Ârî [q.v.]. As of old, the births, circumcisions and weddings of princes and princesses were occasions for court ceremonies and public entertainments. The collective circumcision of princes took place three times during 5Abûd-ş-Âmîd II’s reign. The first days of the great Islamic holidays were celebrated with splendid ceremonial audiences in the Dolmabâché palace. Foreign ambassadors could watch proceedings from balconies opened for that purpose. The destbây was performed by a long row of dignitaries. The Şârîyê al-Ilâmî performed the ritual prayer first but (a sign of the reforms!) was followed by the Orthodox Patriarch and the Chief Rabbi:

The last time Ottoman ceremonial was watched by multitudes in the streets of Istanbul was the accession to the throne by the last Ottoman sultan, Mehemmed VI, in 1918. The Grand Vizier Ahmed Tewfîk Pasha [q.v.] was the last one to leave the sultan’s palace in stately procession (alay) to proceed to the Sublime Porte, this time in a carriage instead of on horseback, on 4 November 1922 (see A. F. Turkgeldi (a former Mehemmed, Chief Secretary to the last sultan) Gûnp şifat-tiklâmên = Memoirs, Ankara 1951, 165).
Ceremonial at the Muslim courts in India, while deriving much from Islam elsewhere, especially Iran, has also continued and adapted indigenous traditions. The pomp and ceremonial of Hindu courts is of considerable antiquity, and the grandeur of kings is a consideration which has also continued and adapted indigenous traditions. The psychological value of state ostentation is of course considerable, as tending to emphasise the power of the sovereign, his distance from his subjects, and the awe in which he is held. This ceremonial is most in evident in the state audiences, and in the royal processions; for the latter, see MAWAKIR.

Ceremonial in the earliest days of the Dhiil sultanate must be presumed, from the fact that the earliest records of the administration of the sultanate show such a close connection with that of the Ghaznavids whose power in the PanjGlb it inherited, to have been modelled on that of the Ghaznavids, for whom see section 3 above; through them came 'Abbasid connections also, which were undoubtedly strengthened in the time of Ilutmish when Fakhr al-Din IsFam, who had served as a wazir at Baghdad, was appointed the Dihli wazir. However, the prestige of the sultanate declined after the death of Ilutmish, when real power was in the hands of a confederacy of wazirs. However, the prestige of the sultanate declined after the death of Ilutmish, when real power was in the hands of a confederacy of wazirs—wazir SulaI—wazir Nizamuddin, who had served as a wazir at Baghdad, was appointed the Dihli wazir. However, the prestige of the sultanate declined after the death of Ilutmish, when real power was in the hands of a confederacy of wazirs—wazir SulaI—whose headdress was surmounted with peacock feathers (a borrowing from Hindu practice), whose headdress was surmounted with peacock feathers (a borrowing from Hindu practice).
ranged in order down the darbâr-hall were the kadîs, the khaâkh, the principal jurists and other ‘ulama’, the shaykhs of the Sîfî brotherhoods in the capital, the sultan’s relations by blood and marriage, and then the principal amîrs and other commanders. When all these were in place, some sixty caparisoned horses of the royal stable, and fifty adorned war-elephants, were brought in. If anyone waiting at the third gate had brought a gift for the sultan, this was reported to him by the bâghîs; if the sultan approved, the donor and his gift were brought in, and welcomed by the sultan who might be welcomed by the donor by a khâla [q. v.] and a purse of money ‘for washing the head’ (sar-ghusht); Ibn Baţûtâ describes a more elaborate ceremonial in the case of gifts and revenues presented by one of the provincial officers (ibid., iii, 226-7, tr. Gibb, iii, 663).

When an audience was held on a feast day, the palace was spread with carpets and the hall was enclosed beneath vast awnings; on the first day of a feast the sultan sat on a cushioned seat on the large golden throne, with heavily jewelled legs, and a jewelled parasol was held over him; on later days of feasts smaller golden thrones were in use. All attending the court would salute the sultan individually, in descending order of precedence; then revenue-holders would bring present, and all would be entertained to a grand banquet, again being served in order of precedence, while a large golden brazier would fill the hall with the smoke of different kinds of incense and fragrant woods, and those present would be sprinkled with rose-water. The dishes were escorted from the kitchens by nakhîs, and a eulogy of the sultan would be pronounced by the nakhî al-mukhâbâ before those present were assigned to their places. Ibn Baţútâ describes some of the dishes presented; last comes pân (betel-leaves containing chopped areca-nut with lime and a bitter gum). (This is an indigenous custom, and the presentation of pân is still used at Indian meals as a gracious sign of dismissal.) Ibn Baţútâ further describes the special ceremonies at the reception at the court of the ABBâsid caliph; since these involved a processional entry, they are described s.v. MARDâSIM.

Ibn Baţûtâ (iii, passim) refers often to the insignia of rulers and amîrs; for these see MARATIB. Shâhîm Sirâj ‘Affî, whose Ta‘rikh-i Frûzî Shâhî is richer in administrative details than most chronicles, lists twenty-one royal prerogatives (sikka-hâ-yi tâdâ-lârân) maintained by Frûzî Shâhî, including the khathâ [q. v.], the throne (iâdâl), the royal seal cut in agate, use of a takhrâ [q. v.], the right to the fly-flap (magas-rân), the royal sable-cover [see QARSHîVA], a white quiver, encampments outside the gate, the black umbrella, the royal headdress (kulâh; malik; a crown is not specified), and others. The right to strike coin [see SIKRA] is, curiously enough, not included here, and also frîsa [q. v.] finds no mention, although the practice is not unknown in India. For the umbrellas (nakeh chata, though commonly also cale in Indian Persian text) see MIZALKA; for the special spear used in the royal escort see DURBASH. Another common royal prerogative is the scattering of small coin (and also magas-rân) in use in the halls of special audience (diwan-i kâdshân). Ibn Battuta describes the special ceremonies at the reception at the court of the ABBâsid caliph; since these involved a processional entry, they are described s.v. MARDâSIM.

When an audience was held on a feast day, the palace was spread with carpets and the hall was enclosed beneath vast awnings; on the first day of a feast the sultan sat on a cushioned seat on the large golden throne, with heavily jewelled legs, and a jewelled parasol was held over him; on later days of feasts smaller golden thrones were in use. All attending the court would salute the sultan individually, in descending order of precedence; then revenue-holders would bring present, and all would be entertained to a grand banquet, again being served in order of precedence, while a large golden brazier would fill the hall with the smoke of different kinds of incense and fragrant woods, and those present would be sprinkled with rose-water. The dishes were escorted from the kitchens by nakhîs, and a eulogy of the sultan would be pronounced by the nakhî al-mukhâbâ before those present were assigned to their places. Ibn Baţûtâ describes some of the dishes presented; last comes pân (betel-leaves containing chopped areca-nut with lime and a bitter gum). (This is an indigenous custom, and the presentation of pân is still used at Indian meals as a gracious sign of dismissal.) Ibn Baţútâ further describes the special ceremonies at the reception at the court of the ABBâsid caliph; since these involved a processional entry, they are described s.v. MARDâSIM.

Ibn Baţûtâ (iii, passim) refers often to the insignia of rulers and amîrs; for these see MARATIB. Shâhîm Sirâj ‘Affî, whose Ta‘rikh-i Frûzî Shâhî is richer in administrative details than most chronicles, lists twenty-one royal prerogatives (sikka-hâ-yi tâdâ-lârân) maintained by Frûzî Shâhî, including the khathâ [q. v.], the throne (iâdâl), the royal seal cut in agate, use of a takhrâ [q. v.], the right to the fly-flap (magas-rân), the royal sable-cover [see QARSHîVA], a white quiver, encampments outside the gate, the black umbrella, the royal headdress (kulâh; malik; a crown is not specified), and others. The right to strike coin [see SIKRA] is, curiously enough, not included here, and also frîsa [q. v.] finds no mention, although the practice is not unknown in India. For the umbrellas (nakeh chata, though commonly also cale in Indian Persian text) see MIZALKA; for the special spear used in the royal escort see DURBASH. Another common royal prerogative is the scattering of small coin (and also magas-rân) in use in the halls of special audience (diwan-i kâdshân). Ibn Battuta describes the special ceremonies at the reception at the court of the ABBâsid caliph; since these involved a processional entry, they are described s.v. MARDâSIM.

The ruler in audience, in the palace, and at the court, usually sat on a cushioned seat on a throne, which were of several kinds and of different shapes; some, in the Mughal forts, were permanent structures of marble, with or without a canopy. That in the diwan-i ‘âmmin of the Red Fort at Dîhilî is a marble baldachino (nîshârmân; zîlî; shâhî) under a marble ‘Bengali’ roof, all inlaid with precious stones; Bernier describes a raised space round it, reserved for the umârî, the Hindî râdghâ at court, and foreign ambassadors; further space within the diwan was reserved for the officials and the general public awaiting audience. When the sovereign left the outer courtyard; he gives a full account of darbâr ceremonial in Travels, 261-5. The elaborate golden thrones were in use in special audience (diwan-i khâss), including the magnificent Peacock Throne (taqht-i tâdâsh) which was later lofted by Nâdir Shâh in 1152/1739 (description in Bâdshâh-nâmâ, i, 78-81; Bernier, Travels, 269 ff.; Tavernier, Travels, i, 384 ff.; for its fate, see G. N. Curzon, Persia and the Persian question, i, 321-2). Besides the appearance of the ruler in audience, there had been introduced under Aftâr his appearance on a balcony on the wall of his palace so that he might be seen by the populace at large; for this adoption of a Hindî practice, see DÂRSHAN. The emperor here and in darbâr was usually accompanied only by the magas rân and a single veiled sword; outside the palace he was invariably accompanied by the royal umbrella and the kut, a variety of arms wrapped in bags of scarlet cloth (other colours also appear in Mughal painting), the hilts of the swords often showing, together with umams and the chartîk, and tumânîk, standards resembling the common umâm but with its shafts adorned with Tibetan yak-tails. The magas rân was commonly a switch of yak-tails (sumari; tammari; see Hobson-Johnson, s.v. CHUNY), although the folded towel is not unknown in Mughal painting; in contemporary Deccan painting, however, the folded towel is invariably depicted. Darbâr paintings of Shâhâdâhân often show the fly-whisk in the hands of a Hindî râdghâ at court. Together with these trappings was carried a flat oval shield-like screen on a long pole, the aîfus (also called sâphânân), to shade the royal person from the rays of the sun. Other insignia also might be carried; see further MARATIB.

The dignities of the chartîk and tumânîk, the makhî-mînât, the right to an umbrella and to the use of elephants, might be conferred on royal princes and favoured nobles. The emperors took the title bahâdîr [q. v.] to themselves, only very rarely conferring it on distinguished generals; they used also the title bâdshah; it would seem that mitzâ might also be awarded as a title, as to Tumush, dedicated to the verses of those not of noble birth, and even to Hindûs [see MIRZÂ]; royal princes were generally called sultân.

To the privilege of striking coin was added the...
mintage of pieces bearing the royal portrait, perhaps starting with the "symbols of faith"—the likeness of the emperor and the motto Allâhuka Akbar—presented by Akbar to his marâdis in the Din-i Ilahi (A'în-i Akbari, 1, 160). Gigantic model pieces of Mughal emperors are also known, some intended as presents, but more generally retained as treasury pieces. Small coin was also struck specially for the sîthâr (q.v.), together with gold and silver fruits and flowers following Chaghatay practice, and was continued at least as late as the reign of Farrukh-siyar. Royal seals (see MUHR) were cut in steel as well as in cornelian and agate, for use on fabric and for decorative additions to the royal libraries (A'în-i Akbari, a'în 20).

As well as royal attendance at the public mosques and at the 'izâ ceremonies (described s.v. MAWÂKÎ), new ceremonies were introduced within the Mughal courts: Djahângir writes of his own regular weighing against gold, silver and other commodities, on the lunar and solar anniversaries of his accession, and the scenes are represented in Mughal painting. He also writes of the golden chain outside his palace, attached to a bell, which any suppliant for justice could ring (but zandîq pîhî dâkhâl already occurs in A'îfî's list of prerogatives of Firûz Shâh). The naurûz and dâ-pâhshàn ceremonies were also observed with great pomp in the palaces, again with painting confirmation available. Plate 7 of the Leningrad Album shows the scene of Djahângir's investiture (sometimes called "corona- tion"); but there was no Mughal crown, merely a jewelled headband worn on the cap; foreign emissaries and Jesuit priests are distinguished by their attire (including perhaps Roe!), wrestlers and dancing-girls perform, ushers carry trays of money-bags, a courtier scatters coin, kettle-drums are played from the back of an elephant which blocks a gateway, while karâns are blown from the palace walls. Plate 32 shows a darâbîr scene of Djahângir, painted by Abu 'l-Hasan: Djahângir wears a jewelled band round his turban, behind him are the afâhâgâr and a small chatr with the kur in a pink cloth; many of the courtiers are named, and indeed Râdja Bîr Singh Dâv acts as his chowry-bearer (Leningrad Album publ. as Af'îbon indiâskhî persîskhî miniâtar xvi-xvii vo., Moscow n.d.):

Bibliography: In addition to references in the text, see I. H. Qureshi, Administration of the sultanate of Dehli, Karachi 1958, esp. ch. 4; Shams-i Sirâj 'Afîf, Tâ'rîkh-i Fârûz Shâh, Bibl. Ind. text, Calcutta 1890, 107-8; Abu 'l-Hasan Allâmî, A'în-i Akbari, and 'Abîl-hâmîd Lâhâwî, Bâdshâh-nâma, cited from Bibl. Ind. texts; F. Bernier, Travels in the Mogul empire, ed. London 1901; Taverman's travels in India, ed. V. Ball, London 1889. (J. Durton-Pace)

MARÂTHÂS, the name of the "caste-cluster of agriculturists-turned-warriors" inhabiting the north-west Dakhan, Maharâsthâra "the great country", a term which is extended to all Marâthi speakers. The Marâthâ homeland stretched between 15° N. and 23° N., nearly equidimensional with the main mass of the Dakhan lavas north of the Malaprabha river and south of the Sârpuâs. It lies within the rain-shadow of the Western Ghâts, a plateau compartmented by mesas and buttes between which valleys of black soil, watered by a 20" to 30" annual rainfall, yielded cereals, oilseeds and cotton. The significance of the Marâthâs in Islamic Indian history is that they stopped the Mughal empire in its prime.

Marâthâ fighters and revenue agents became indispensable to the sultanates of Aâmâd nâdâr (see Sâd-ar-Shâhî) and Bîjpur (see Bâd-ar-Shâhî). Hereditary local notables, deîmûkhs, despânûds and desjîts, and village headmen, pâtîls, dominated rural society with their armed followings and family connexions as outlandârs with rights to land revenue. Deîmûkhs, often enfeoffed in hill forts, became sardârs, cavalry captains, for Muslim rulers, receiving mûkâsà or (additional) revenue assignments. One such, Shâhîdî Bahânsâle (1002-74/1594-1664) father of Sîvâdî (1036 or 1040/1627 or 1630 to 1680), the creator of Marâthâ râgî, helped, along with other Marâthâ deîmûkhs families, Malik 'Anbâr (q.v.) to preserve Aâmâd nâdâr against the Mughuls in the 1620s. Following the final Mughal absorption of Aâmâd nâdâr in 1635-1636, Shâhîdî served Bîjpur in South India. In Shâhîdî's absence, Sîvâdî from 1056/1646 onwards used the resources of his father's dâjîr of Pûnâ to extend his own control over the strongholds of neighbouring, often hostile, deîmûkhs families. By 1066/1656, Sîvâdî was sufficiently important and free from Bîjpurî control for Awrangzîb, then governor of the Mughul Dakhan and attacking Bîjpur, to make overtures. In 1070/1659, Sîvâdî's slaying of the Bîjpurî commander Afdâl Khân drew more Marâthâs to himself. Hitherto, Sîvâdî had been a Marâthâ chief among many, taking advantage of the agriculturally-destructive wars between the Mughuls and the Dakhan sultanates, and the dearths that accompanied them, to recruit larger Marâthâ war bands for service under Muslim paymasters. Afdâl Khân, however, had deserted the shrine of Tûlji Tudjapur and Pandhar-pur, the latter a major centre of Marâthâ pilgrimage as "the focus of a specifically Maharashtrian bhaktî movement". By 1073-4/1663-4, during which time Sîvâdî humiliated the Mughuls by successfully raiding their chief commander's camp at Pûnâ (Sha'dân 1073/April 1663) and the port of Surât (Sha'dân 1074/January 1664), Sîvâdî had created a distinctively non-Muslim political authority in the Dakhan.

The massive Mughal campaign under Râdja Dîyâ Singh in 1075/1665, together with the bait of a future joint Sîvâdî-Dîyâ Singh campaign against Bîjpur, led to the treaty of Purandar by which Sîvâdî was to surrender 23 of his 35 forts. Sîvâdî's attendance upon Awrangzîb at Agra in 1076-7/1666 and his escape in a fruit basket illumine the obstacles to his becoming loyal to the Mughuls at the price which they could pay. Râdiput refusal to accord Sîvâdî kâtîrîya status, Mughal anger over the sack of Sûrat, and reluctance to reward defiance, limited Awrangzîb's freedom of action, while the decay of Bîjpur offered Sîvâdî more opportunities than Mughal service could have done.

Sîvâdî's coronation in 1085/1674 according to "Hindu" rites as chatrapatî symbolised the repudiation of an Indo-Muslim ethos, but not of the administrative structure of the Dakhan Muslim sultanates. He tried to curb the larger deîmûkhs and assignees in his own territory (swârdâpa) and his successful military and political activity furthered upward social movement among Marâthâ and Kunbî dâjîs and the tribal Kohs.

Prince Akbar's rebellion in 1091-2/1681 against
Awrangzib, and his joining Sivadji’s successor Sambhadji (1067-1100/1657-89) following on the capture and brutal execution of Sambhadji, Sambhadji (1067-1100/1657-89) following on a decisive victory over the Mughals at Bhopal in 1150/1737. Between 1154/1741 and 1164/1751, the forces of Raghudiji Bhonsle plundered Bihār, Bengal and Orissa, forcing the granting of āwaḥ from Bengal and the loss of Orissa. In the 1740s, the Marathās were ready to intervene in the Gangetic region, over which Mughal authority had been fatally weakened by Nādir Shāh’s [q.v.] sack of Dīlī in 1151/1739.

Although in wars against the nizâm of Ḍaydarābād in 1164-5/1751-2, 1171/1757 and 1173/1760, the Marathās acquired the cities of Ahmādānagar, Bīdāpjūr, Dawlatābād and Būrhnāpūr, their gains further south proved insurmountable. After 1145-6/1732, the Maratha possessions centred upon Ṭāndūr only became tributary to the nawāsīr of Ārkāt (Arok), and in 1156/1743 the then nizâm of Ḍaydarābād (Cīn Kīlī Khān) captured Tiruchirāppali (Trichinopoly). In 1174/1760-1, Ḥayḍar ‘Alī [q.v.] seized power in Māhīsūr (Mysore) [q.v.] and closed off the south to Maratha exploitation. Even in the Marathā homeland, the treaty of Varana (Warana) in 1143/1731 between Shāhū and Sambhadji II of Kōḷhāpūr, giving Shāhū control of the latter’s diplomatic relations but recognising his svarāgadh, indicated the segmentary character of Maratha politics. 

Under the peshwā Bādjī Rāo II (1153-74/1740-61) the Marathās led by Malhar Rāo Holkar, Dījāyappa ŚインドHYā and Raghunāth Bādjī Rāo, supported now Salār Dījāng of Awadh [q.v.], now Ghāzī Āl-Dīn Imād al-Mulk (grandson of Cīn Kīlī Khān), and now the puppet peshwā Ahmad Shāh (1161-7/1748-54) and ‘Ālīmghīr (1167-73/1754-69) in return for promises of āwaḥ from the Pandjāb or from the Gangā-Dījamna dī-āb, and of Mughal offices and subventions. In 1171/1758 Raghunāth Rāo moved to Lāhawr against the invading Afghān ruler Ahmad Shāh Durrānī [q.v.]. In Dājumād I-II 1173/January 1760 Ahmad Shāh’s forces expelled the Marathās from Dīlī, provoking a grand military riposte under Sadasāv Rāo, the peshwā’s uncle. In Dājumād I-II July 1761 the Afghāns savagely defeated the Marathās at Pānīpāt, decimating their military leadership.

The death of many of the peshwā’s principal aides and a succession of feeble peshwās after the early death of Madhav Rāo in 1186/1772, dispersed authority among the Marathās to the regional military chiefs, the Gāikwārs of Baroda, the Holkars of Indore, the Śhindhīyās of Gwāhyār and the Bhosāls of Nāgpūr. The military power of the Marathās as an uneasy confederacy was sufficient for Mahādādji Rāo ŚインドHYā (1139-40 to 1208/1772-94) to instal in 1185/1772 the Mughal peshwā Shāh ‘Ālīm in Dīlī as a dependent: it was sufficient for the Marathās to defeat the East India Company’s army at Tālegāon in 1192/1779 and to repulse it from Pūnā in 1195/1781, during the indecisive Anglo-Marathā wars of 1192-96/1778-82; it was sufficient for Tukodi Rāo Holkar and Dawlat Rāo ŚインドHYā to defeat in 1196/1783 the nizâm of Ḍaydarābād’s forces at Khārdā. But Dālāt Rāo ŚインドHYā and Djaswant Rāo Holkar fell to striving for control of the peshwā Bādjī Rāo II (1211-33/1796-1818) and, in desperation, the latter turned to the East India Company. Wellesley’s subsidiary treaty of Bassein (1217/1802) took away the peshwā’s independence. Raghudji Bhōṇāl and Dālāt Rāo ŚインドHYā resorted to arms and in 1218/1803 the latter lost Dīlī, the dī-āb and
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MARATĪ, the main Ind·ō-Ārjan language [see hind. iii. Languages] spoken by some 40 million in Bombay and the surrounding state of Mahārāšttrā. It differs from the "central" Hindi-Urdu language especially by its retention of the three genders of Old Indo-Aryan languages, and by its pronunciation and vocabulary. The national language of the Marathas, it is also a major medium of thought and communication in the Maratha homelands, and is the language of the Maratha court, the Maratha administrative system, the Maratha military, and the Maratha agricultural and economic system.
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ships among the fifteen of the governor of Lahan Bandar. The practice of Firuz Shah's troops marching with 90,000 cavalry under 180 marābit and niżāma-yī hastād ("Afī, Tabīqāt-i Firuz Šahī, Bibl. Ind. text 1443, i.e. two such insignia among the many") was practised with pictures, although Firuz Šah ordered their removal. The practice of using the marābit as battle ensigns continued in Mughal times, as is demonstrated profusely in Mughal painting; but there is no lack of painted (or embroidered) pictures here, including conspicuously the Persian Lion-and-Sun device (Sol in Leo?); see gīr wa kāturistik. This device is known elsewhere in Indian Muslim art, e.g. among the Bahmani buildings at Bidar [q.v.], with no evidence however, to connect it with the marābit.

A special dignity, especially but not exclusively of Mughal times, is the mākhi-marābit, "fish banner", the institution of which has been attributed to Khusrav Parvīz, Sāsānīd emperor of Persia 591-628, from whom it passed to the house of Timūr, especially to the Mughal emperors, as a symbol of sovereignty of the realm. With the names of the "leash" which holds the falcon down and the veiled swords of state do not appear among the Bahmani buildings at Bidar, [q.v.], with no evidence however, to connect it with the marābit.

In regard to the Kur'ānic expression (VIII, 62/60) "... min ribāt al-khayāl ... (horses held in readiness)", the philologist al-Baydawī [q.v.], in his commentary (Anwār al-tanzil, ed. H. L. Fleischer, Leipzig, 1896, i, 372), is hesitant about the exact nature of this term ribāt, proposing to interpret it either as a singular, or as a masdar, or as a plural of ribāt; this last seems most logical, even though the lexicographers do not give a plural for this singular.

The practice of using the marābit as battle ensigns continued in Mughal times, as is demonstrated profusely in Mughal painting; but there is no lack of painted (or embroidered) pictures here, including conspicuously the Persian Lion-and-Sun device (Sol in Leo?); see gīr wa kāturistik. This device is known elsewhere in Indian Muslim art, e.g. among the Bahmani buildings at Bidar, [q.v.], with no evidence however, to connect it with the marābit.

A special dignity, especially but not exclusively of Mughal times, is the mākhi-marābit, "fish banner", the institution of which has been attributed to Khusrav Parvīz, Sāsānīd emperor of Persia 591-628, from whom it passed to the house of Timūr, especially to the Mughal emperors, as a symbol of sovereignty of the realm. With the names of the "leash" which holds the falcon down and the veiled swords of state do not appear among the Bahmani buildings at Bidar, [q.v.], with no evidence however, to connect it with the marābit.

In regard to the Kur'ānic expression (VIII, 62/60) "... min ribāt al-khayāl ... (horses held in readiness)", the philologist al-Baydawī [q.v.], in his commentary (Anwār al-tanzil, ed. H. L. Fleischer, Leipzig, 1896, i, 372), is hesitant about the exact nature of this term ribāt, proposing to interpret it either as a singular, or as a masdar, or as a plural of ribāt; this last seems most logical, even though the lexicographers do not give a plural for this singular.
1. DJAMIL, born in Damascus in 1894, received his primary and secondary education in various schools in his native city, in particular that of the Lazarist Fathers, and pursued higher studies in law and political sciences in Paris and Switzerland. For this reason, he was residing in Paris when the First World War broke out. His political activities began in 1913 with his involvement in the Arab Congress which was convened in Paris to defend the interests of the Arabs and of which he was elected Secretary-General. In 1919, after making a tour of South America, he returned to Damascus where he was appointed adviser to the Amir Fayyaz. In 1920, he became adviser to the Ministry of the Interior in the Cabinet of Hāshîm al-Atâsî.

Having participated in the Syrian Revolution (1925-6), he escaped to Jaffa in Palestine, but was arrested and handed over to the French Mandatory authorities. He spent two months imprisoned at Arwâd/Ruwâd, a small island situated close to the Syrian coastal city of Tartûs. In 1928, he was sent to Paris to negotiate on behalf of the Constituent Assembly which had recently been instituted in Syria. Elected deputy for the city of Damascus to the Syrian Parliament in 1932, Djamil Mardam was subsequently appointed Minister of Finance. In April 1933 he resigned and became involved again in the politics of resistance.

From January to March 1936, he was placed under house-arrest by the French authorities at Kirk-Kînân, a little town belonging to the sandjak of Alexandretta. On his return to Damascus, he was received with enthusiasm. Subsequently he was a member of the Syrian delegation which travelled to Paris to discuss the term of the Franco-Syrian Treaty. In December 1936 he formed the first Nationalist cabinet and served as Prime Minister until February 1938. During this period, he travelled to Paris and to Geneva to defend the Syrian position in the question of the sandjak of Alexandretta and to continue discussions relating to the Franco-Syrian Treaty. In the early part of the Second World War, he lived in ʿIrāk and in Saudi Arabia, not returning to Damascus until 1941. In 1943, he was again elected deputy for his native city and became respected literary figures. In 1944-5 he was appointed Minister of Foreign Affairs (1943-4) and Minister of National Defence and of the National Economy (1944-5).

After the proclamation of Syrian independence in 1945, Djamil assumed the functions of Minister Plenipotentiary to the Kingdom of Egypt and to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. In November 1946, he returned to Damascus and formed a Syrian Cabinet for the second time (from January 1946 to October 1947). In July 1947, he was re-elected deputy for Damascus and was charged for the third time with the task of forming a Syrian Cabinet which lasted from October 1947 to summer 1948. Having resigned, he was recalled to form yet another Cabinet, and he remained at its head until the coup d'état of Colonel Husni al-Za'im (30 March 1949). Djamil Mardam then left Syria and made his way to Egypt, where he stayed until the end of his life. He died in Cairo in 1961, and his remains were conveyed to Damascus and interred in the cemetery of Bāb al-Saghir.

A veteran activist of the Nationalist Bloc (al-Kulta al-wataniyya), a political party linking the eminent Syrian personalities who led Syria to independence, Djamil Mardam was a skilful and far-sighted statesman. Enraptured in his speeches, which were sometimes improvised, he did not lack in eloquence. His principal works are: a diwân (edited after his death by the Arab Academy of Damascus in 1960 in collaboration with his son, the poet ʿAdnān Mardam);
and studies of al-Djahiz, Ibn al-Mukaffa, Ibn al-ʿAmid, al-Šahb and al-Farazdak (published, undated, in Damascus in the ʿArmanat al-adab collection). He also established and published in 1943 the series of the Arab Academy of Damascus the texts of the diwan of Ibn ʿUnayn (1946), ʿAli b. al-Djähn (1949), Ibn Hayyāt (1951) and Ibn al-Khayyāt (1958). Some biographical works were published in Damascus and Beirut after his death; most worthy of mention are ʿAbd al-Majān al-mugannin (the singers), al-ʿArābiyya (the Bedouin women), ʿAyān al-karn al-thālith (the notables of the 13th century A.H.) and Yaʿqūbiyya al-Khalī (his diary).

The poetry of Khalī Mardam comprises the traditional genres and is distinguished by its lyrical tone. In his description of nature and in his love poems, the poet displays extreme sensibility and remarkable finesse. His patriotic poetry is sincere, and his cultivated style is always fluent and clear and reflects the lucidity of his mind.


C. Rikārī MARDANĪSH [see ibn Mardanīsh].

MARDĀWĪDĪ u. Zīvār b. Wardanšah, Abu ʾl-Ḥādīq, founder of the Ziyarīd dynasty [q.v.] in the Caspian regions of Persia. Mardawīdī’s rise as a soldier of fortune in northern Persia is bound up with the decline of direct caliphal control there, seen already in the independent role of the Ṣadīq governors [q.v.] in Adharbaydžan during the end of the 3rd/9th century and in the general upsurge of hitherto submerged indigenous Iranian elements, Daylām, Djīlī and Kurdisch, forming what has been called the “Daylam interlude” of Persian history [see DAYLAM, and also BUWAYHIDS, KAKUYIDS, MUSAFIRIDS, RAWWADIDS, SHADDADIDS, etc.].

On his father’s side, Mardawīdī (literally, “man-assailant”), see Just, Iransche Namenbuch, 1949, sprang from the royal clan of the Djīlīs, and on his mother’s side from the ʿisabāḥṣ of Rūyān. He served the Hasanid ʿAlīʾi rulers of Tabaristān and then the Djīlī condottiere Asfār b. Shīrūya or b. Shīraway (q.v.) until the latter’s tyranny impelled Mardawīdī, with the support of the ruler of Taʿrūm, Muḥammad b. Muʿṣīrī, to rebel against Asfār, killing him in 319/931 and then rapidly capturing Hamadān, Dinawar and Isfahān in western Persia from their caliphal governors. He now clashed with a rival Daylāmī commander, ʿAbdān b. Kākī (q.v.), who had held Tabaristān, Gurgān and western Khurāsān since 318/930. Mardawīdī conquered Tabaristān and attacked ʿAbdān, but since Mākān obtained the backing of the Sāmānid ʿAlī Naṣr b. Ahmad, Mardawīdī agreed to a peace treaty, retaining only Ṣayd as tributary to Naṣr. It was at this time that the three Būyid brothers ʿAlī, Hasan and Ahmad transferred to his service from that of Mākān, and Mardawīdī appointed ʿAlī (the future ʿImād al-Dawla) governor of Kāragār. Since Mardawīdī was able to overrule most of Djīlī almost to Hulwān, the ʿAbbāsid caliphs al-Muqtaḍīr and al-Khārīr were compelled to recognise him as governor there, on condition that Mardawīdī evacuate Isfahān, now governed by his brother (and eventual successor) Wuḥūmī Mardawīdī.

By the end of 322/934, Mardawīdī’s forces had even occupied the province of Ahwāz. But the ambitions attributed to him in the (generally hostile) sources of planning to conquer Bagdād, overthrow the caliphate and proclaim himself ruler of a renewed Persian empire, were frustrated by his murder at Isfahān on 7 January 322/934. He was buried in the Zoroastrian festival or Sādhak, by his Turkish ghulāms, whom he had treated with contempt and harshness. Minorsky has described Mardawīdī as “fantasque et barbaris”, and al-Masʿūdī imputes to him delusions of grandeur and the assumption of a messianic role as the awaited ʿman with yellow-eyes”, who would rule the world. His brother Wuḥūmī Mardawīdī and his descendants kept the Ziyarīds as a force in the Caspian region for a further century, but the main southwards impetus of the Daylamī Völkerwanderung was to be spearheaded by the Būyids.


MARDĪN (written in Arabic as Mardin, in Greek as Μάρδιν, Μάρτιν, in Syriac as Mardē and in modern Turkish as Mardin), a town in what was in mediaeval Islamic times Upper Mesopotamia or al-Djazīra, in the region of Diyar Rabaʾīya [q.v.] lying on a slope rising to an altitude of 3780 ft./1152 m. in lat. 37° 18′ N. and long. 40° 44′ E. The modern town, in southeastern Turkey near the Syrian border, is the chief-locus of the il (formerly vilayet) of the same name.

Position. In Upper Mesopotamia, the watershed between the Tigris and Euphrates is formed by the heights which culminate in Karadja-dagh (3,900 feet) to the south-west of Diyar Bakr. This resultant massif is continued eastwards in the direction of Djazīra Ibn ʿUmar by the limestone chain known in ancient times as Masius and later as Izala (Ἰζάλα). The eastern part of this ridge forms the district of Djābal-Ṭūr or Tūr ʿAbdīn [q.v.], the capital of which is Midyāt. From the southern slopes of the Masius descend numerous watercourses, the majority of which join one another before flowing between the mountains of ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz or Elazīg (in the west) and Tell Kawkab and Sinjiq (in the east); their combined waters form the river Khābūr [q.v.].

Mardin lies near the point where there is an easy pass through the Masius from the lands south of the Tigris (the rivers Gök-su and Shakhqan) to the lands round the sources of the Khābūr (the stream called Zawārak which rises north of Mardin), in other words, Mardin commands the Djurāh Bāniqān road (which then turns towards Djazīra Ibn ʿUmar and Maṣṣīl). On the other side towards the west, several (Ritter, xi, 356, gives three) direct roads connect Mardin via Urfa with Birejik (on the Euphrates); to the south-west, a road runs from Mardin to Raʾs al-ʿAyn and to Harrān. The direct distances are as follows: Mardin-Diyar Bakr 35 miles; Mardin-Darnawin 30 miles; Mardin-Sawur-Midyat 75 miles; Mardin-Birejik 160 miles; Mardin-Adana (by rail) 450 miles.

The advantages of this position at the intersection
of important roads are enhanced by the very strong
natural situation of the town, built on an... to
the plain (ibid., i, 676-9). The people of Mardin
obtained an amnesty on the birth of Ulugh Beg. Salih

The Marwānids and the Sa’djids. It is probable
that Mardin was within the sphere of influence
of the Marwānids, for according to their
teacher (cf. Amedroz, in JRAS [1904], their ancestor
Bağd (d. 380/990) had extended his power over Diyar
Rab’a (Nisibin, Tür ‘Abdin). The Sa’djids ruled
there next. After the defeat of Il-Khanid Salikāghā (q.v.)
the tribe of Abū ‘Alī Tudubby b. Alp Arslan seized for a time all the lands as far as
Nisibin. Under Berk-yaruk, Mardin was given to his
old bard (mughanni).

The Artuks. At this time arose the dynasty
whose fortunes are especially associated with Mardin.
The Artuk grandsons called Yākūtī took by stratagem
the fortress in which he had been imprisoned, but it
was taken from him by his brother Sukmān b. Artuḳ,
who died in 498/1104-5. In 502/1108-9, we find at
Mardin Il-Qāhīr b. Artuḳ (Ibn al-Athīr, x, 269, 321),
whose line ruled there till 811/1408. (On their coins
struck at Mardin in 599, 600, 637, 648, 655, 656,
etc., cf. Ghālib Edhem, Catalogue des monnaies
turcomanes, Constantinople 1894, and S. Lane Poole,
Catalogue of oriental coins in the British Museum,
i, x, index, 1st part.) In 579/1183 Sa‘īd al-Dīn came to Harzam (6 miles
south-west of Mardin) but was unable to take the
town. In 594/1198, al-Malik al-‘Adīl b. Ayūb
seized the outer suburb, which was pillaged, but after
the siege of the town itself was abandoned in the following
year. In 599/1202-3, al-‘Adīl sent against Mardin his
son al-‘Adīr, who appointed governors (shahna) in its
dependencies. The Ayūbids of Aleppo al-Zāhir b. Sa‘īd
al-Dīn offered his good offices, and al-‘Adīl was content
with an indemnity of 150,000 dinars and the
acknowledgement of his suzerainty by the Artuḳids
of Mardin (cf. Abu Ḥarar, Barhebraeus, Mukhtasar,

The Mongols. In 657/1259, the Mongol Hūlagū
took Mardin. In 690/1292-3, Hūlagū’s son产生了
the town itself. In 701/1302, the Bahārīs seized for a time
the town, which they held for two years. In 742/1342,
the town was besieged by the troops of Yaḥyā, son of Hūlagū.
Famine and an epidemic raged in the town. According to Rashīd al-Dīn (ed. Quatremère, 375), Muzaffar killed his father in order to put an end to the sufferings of the inhabitants (Abu Ḥarar and Wassāf give different versions, cf. d’Anslow, iii, 308, 358). Muzaffar was confirmed as lord of Mardin; his descendants also received from the Mongols the insignia of royalty (crown and parasol). In the reign of Sa‘īd b. Mānṣūr (769/1367), whose sister Dunyā Khāṭūn was the wife of the Il-Khan Muhammad Khūdābān, Ibn Battūta (ii, 142-5) visited Mardin; he mentions the fine garments made there from goats’ hair wool (mūnṭīz).

Timūr. The Artuḳids sultan Il-Kāsh (778-809/1376-
1406) was the king of Mardin at the invasion of Timūr
in 796/1394. Malik Il-Kāsh came to pay his homage to the
conqueror, but the citizens attacked those of Timūr’s men who ventured into the town. Malik Il-Kāsh was put
in chains and taken to Sulṭānīyā (Zafar-nāma, i, 663,
671-2). In Ṣawwūl 803/April 1401, Timūr returned
to the attack and the town was taken by storm. Then
the siege of the upper fortress (al-kla’al-dẖābah) was begun, but it was never taken. Timūr was content
with paying heavy taxes and with the payment of the ṣafarī (q.v.), and returned to the plain (ibid., i, 676-9).

The people of Mardin obtained an amnesty on the birth of Ulāb b. Sa‘īd

1. In pre-Ottoman times.

Ancient history. It is noteworthy that in spite of
its remarkable situation, Mardin does not seem to
be mentioned in the cuneiform sources. Ammianus
Marcellinus (xix, 9-4) is the first to mention two
fortresses “Maride and Lorne” between which the
road passed from Amīd (Diyār Bakr) to Nisibīn.
The town had a very strong natural situation, built on an isolated
island; its remarkable situation, Mardin does not seem to
be mentioned in the cuneiform sources. Ammianus
Marcellinus (xix, 9-4) is the first to mention two
fortresses “Maride and Lorne” between which the
road passed from Amīd (Diyār Bakr) to Nisibīn.
The town had a very strong natural situation, built on an isolated
island; its remarkable situation, Mardin does not seem to
be mentioned in the cuneiform sources. Ammianus
Marcellinus (xix, 9-4) is the first to mention two
fortresses “Maride and Lorne” between which the
road passed from Amīd (Diyār Bakr) to Nisibīn.
The town had a very strong natural situation, built on an isolated
island; its remarkable situation, Mardin does not seem to
be mentioned in the cuneiform sources. Ammianus
Marcellinus (xix, 9-4) is the first to mention two
fortresses “Maride and Lorne” between which the
road passed from Amīd (Diyār Bakr) to Nisibīn.
The town had a very strong...
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Kara Khan was appointed and established his headquarters at Mardin. Soon the Ottomans occupied Diyar Bakr, and then the town of Mardin, but the Persians, who never lost the fortress, restored the status quo.


(V. MINORSKY*)

2. The Ottoman and modern periods

Finally, in 922/1516, the Persian commander Kara Khan was defeated and slain in battle at Karghandere, the town of the old town of Koč-hišar, 10 miles to the southwest of Mardin. Persian domination in Upper Mesopotamia thus collapsed, but the fortress of Mardin still remained in the hands of Sulaymand Khan, brother of Kara Khan. The siege lasted a year, and not till Mehmed Bıyıklı Pasha [q. v.] arrived from Syria with reinforcements was it stormed and its valiant defenders put to the sword (Iskandar Munshi, Ta'rikh-i 'ulam-din, 24, 32, tr. Savory, i, 72; this Persian source mentions Olang-i Kuruk in place of Koč-hišar) (von Hammer, OESP II, 7367-40, quoting Abu 'l-Fadl, son of Hakim Idris and continuier of his Hājh-i-khiyād).

In the Baghdad campaign of 941/1534, Mardin was created a sanjak and included in the eyalet of Diyarbakr (for the history of the region at this time, see Nejad Goyun, VI. Türbül Mardin sana'yı, Istanbul 1969). Ewliya Celebi, iv, 39, gives Mardin 36 'atamar and 465 timariots; Mardin could put in the field 1,060 armed men (djebi). In the 18th century, Mardin became a dependency of the Pashas of Baghdad; Otter (1737) found at Mardin a voyvoda appointed by Ahmed Pasha. As late as the time of Kinneir (1810), Mardin was the frontier town of the baghdadî of Baghdad and was governed by a mawlesiîm sent from Bagdad.

The reforms of Sultan Mahmûd II were badly received in Upper Mesopotamia. In 1832 (Ainsworth), Mardin rebelled. Power in Mardin had passed to the Kurdish beys. Southgate (1836) speaks of a hereditary (?) family who ruled in Mardin. The two brothers of the "ruling bey" seized power and refused to recognise the authority of the Porte. (It may be asked if these beys were not of the Millî tribe; on their chiefs cf. Buckingham, Travels in Mesopotamia, London 1827, 156.) Rashid Pasha, the pacifier of Kurdistan, besieged the town and blew up the great mosque (Ainsworth). Order was temporarily restored. Considerable works were undertaken to improve the road giving access to the town. Rashid Pasha died in January 1837 (Poujoulat). When the Egyptians under Ibrahim b. Muhammad 4Ali Pasha invaded Syria, their partisan Timawi b. Ayyub of the Millî tribe seized Mardin (and Mardin, The Caliphs' last heritage, 320) but was killed. The defeat of the Ottomans at Nizib (June 1839) brought matters to a head. The Porte entrusted Mardin to Sa'd Allah was appointed in place of his brother, İsa (ibid., i, 676-81), but three years afterwards the latter was pardoned and restored to his fie (ibid., i, 787). When in 803/1400-1 Timur reappeared in Mesopotamia, İsa shut himself up in Mardin. As the siege would have taken some time and supplies were short, Timur did not stop before the town, but ordered Kara Uthman Ak-Koyunlu to besiege Mardin (ibid., ii, 354).

The Ak-Koyunlu. This was the beginning of Ak-Koyunlu interference in Mardin, but Kara Uthman's forces were not yet equal to this task. In 805/1402-3, İsa came of his own accord to Timur and was pardoned (ibid., ii, 51).

For a brief period, the Kara-Koyunlu tried to resist the extension of the power of the Ak-Koyunlu to Mardin. When, after the death of Timur, Kara Yusuf left Egypt to re-enter into possession of his territory he joined İsa and advanced against Kara Uthman. The battle lasted 20 days and was settled by agreement. As soon as Kara Yusuf had left for Adharbaydın, Kara Uthman returned to the attack, defeated İsa near Djasak (there is a Djasat 10 miles to the west of Mardin on the road from Derek) and besieged Mardin, but once more without success (Müneddeddin-bashî, ii, 685). It is not clear what connection these hostilities have with an expedition against Diyar Bakr conducted by Djawsak (there is a Djawsat 10 miles to the west of Mardin on the road from Derek), who appointed his general Ustadjlu Ak-Koyunlu in place of his brother, Clara (ibid., i, 676-81), but three years afterwards the latter was pardoned and restored to his fie (ibid., i, 787). When in 803/1400-1 Timur reappeared in Mesopotamia, İsa shut himself up in Mardin. As the siege would have taken some time and supplies were short, Timur did not stop before the town, but ordered Kara Uthman Ak-Koyunlu to besiege Mardin (ibid., ii, 354).

The Ak-Koyunlu. This was the beginning of Ak-Koyunlu interference in Mardin, but Kara Uthman's forces were not yet equal to this task. In 805/1402-3, İsa came of his own accord to Timur and was pardoned (ibid., ii, 51).

For a brief period, the Kara-Koyunlu tried to resist the extension of the power of the Ak-Koyunlu to Mardin. When, after the death of Timur, Kara Yusuf left Egypt to re-enter into possession of his territory he joined İsa and advanced against Kara Uthman. The battle lasted 20 days and was settled by agreement. As soon as Kara Yusuf had left for Adharbaydın, Kara Uthman returned to the attack, defeated İsa near Djasak (there is a Djasat 10 miles to the west of Mardin on the road from Derek) and besieged Mardin, but once more without success (Müneddeddin-bashî, ii, 685). It is not clear what connection these hostilities have with an expedition against Diyar Bakr conducted by Djawsak (there is a Djawsat 10 miles to the west of Mardin on the road from Derek), who appointed his general Ustadjlu Ak-Koyunlu in place of his brother, Clara (ibid., i, 676-81), but three years afterwards the latter was pardoned and restored to his fie (ibid., ii, 51).

For a brief period, the Kara-Koyunlu tried to resist the extension of the power of the Ak-Koyunlu to Mardin. When, after the death of Timur, Kara Yusuf left Egypt to re-enter into possession of his territory he joined İsa and advanced against Kara Uthman. The battle lasted 20 days and was settled by agreement. As soon as Kara Yusuf had left for Adharbaydın, Kara Uthman returned to the attack, defeated İsa near Djasak (there is a Djasat 10 miles to the west of Mardin on the road from Derek) and besieged Mardin, but once more without success (Müneddeddin-bashî, ii, 685). It is not clear what connection these hostilities have with an expedition against Diyar Bakr conducted by Djawsak (there is a Djawsat 10 miles to the west of Mardin on the road from Derek), who appointed his general Ustadjlu Ak-Koyunlu in place of his brother, Clara (ibid., i, 676-81), but three years afterwards the latter was pardoned and restored to his fie (ibid., ii, 51).
Paşa of Diyarbakır, but the inhabitants preferred to submit to Ibrahim Paşa of Mawsil, who was opposed to the Tanzimât reforms. This Paşa appointed a governor to Mardin, but the rebels still held the citadel (Ainsworth 1840), and the governor soon perished in a rising.

By the “usilâyet law” of 1287/1870, Mardin became a sandjak of the usilâyet of Diyarbakır. It had 5 kâdâ’s: Mardin, Nişîbin, Dijazîrî, Midyât and Avine. The area of the sandjak was 7,750 square miles and the number of towns and villages 1,062. The sandjak was mostly agricultural. The town of Mardin produced a small quantity of silk, wool and cotton, leather, Shawls, etc., but in spite of the excellence of the work these articles were mainly used for local consumption (Cuinet). By the reforms of 1921, Mardin formed a wilâyêt kâdâ’s, the area of the wilâyêt was 7,750 square miles and the wilâyêt of the sandjak a kâdâ’s: in addition to references given in the article: P. della Valle, Viaggi, Brighton 1843, i, 515 (the traveller’s wife was a native of Mardin); J. B. Tavernier (1644), Les six voyages, 1692, i, 187; C. Niebuhr (1766), Reisbeschreibung, Copenhagen 1778, ii, 391-8, and plate xlvii; G. A. Olivier (1795), Voyages, Paris 12 (rep.), iv, 242; A. Dupré (1808), Voyage, i, 77-92; J. M. Kinneir, A geogr. memoir of the Persian Empire; London 1817, 264-5; idem (1814), Journey through Asia Minor, London 1818, 433; J.S. Buckingham, Travels in Mesopotamia, London 1827, 188-94 (with a general view of the town); H. Southgate (1837), Narrative of a Tour through Armenia, London 1840, ii, 272-88; W.K. Ainsworth (1840), Travels and Researches, London 1842, ii, 114-16; C. Defrémery, Observations sur deux tours de l’évêque de Mardin, in JA (1843); Southgate, Narrative of a visit to the Syrian church of Mesopotamia (1841), New York 1844, 215-42; K. Ritter, Erdkunde, xi (1844), 150-3, 379-97 (very detailed résumé); F.J. Goldsmith, An overland journey from Bagdad, in Trans. Bombay Geogr. Soc. xvii (1868), 29 (the population of Mardin is 22,000, half of whom are Christians); Cernik, Technische Studien-Expedition, in Peterm. Mit., Ergänzungsheft, x (1875-6), Heft 45, 15-18; H. Howorth, History of the Mongols, iii, 683-6; Socin, Zur Geogr. des Tür Abînîn, in ZDMG, xxxv (1881), 237-69 (map), 327-415; Sachau, Reise in Syrien und Mesopotamien, 404-7, 428; V. Cuinet, La Turquie d’Asie, Paris 1895, ii, 494-519; Tomilov, Otipé o pojezdke! 1904, St. Petersburg 1907, i, 263-7; Sykes, The Caliphs’ last heritage, London 1915, index.

Among the religious sects of Mardin, the Shamsiyya would merit a special study. In the time of Niebuhr (1766), there were about a hundred families in the town, and Buckingham (op. cit., 192) and Southgate (1837) also mention them. The Shamsiyya probably represent the last survivors of a local pagan cult. Towards the middle of the 18th century, they were led to declare themselves Jacobite Christians, but only formally (cf. Ritter, Erdkunde, xi, 303-5).

Christianity at Mardin. The district of Mardin has played an exceptionally important part in the development of Eastern Christianity. A brilliant period of the Nestorian church which began in 755 is closely associated with Mardin. Towards the end of the 8th century, numerous monasteries were established around the town by the bishop John of Mardin. In 1171 the Jacobite patriarchate was transferred from Diyar-Bakr (Amid) to Mardin. In 1207 it was moved to Dayr al-Za’farán, an hour’s journey from Mardin, to a place called Minâr (see also: O. Orient, ii, 110, 221, 470; W. Wright, A short history of Syriac literature, Oxford 1891, index). On the position of Christians before 1914, cf. the works of Southgate, Parry, Cuinet, etc.

Monuments. Niebuhr noted many Arabic inscriptions at Mardin. Those of the buildings of the Artukids and the waqfyyas of their principal buildings were studied by ‘Ali Emiri [q. e. in Suppl.], himself a native of the Diyar Bakr region; see his edn. of Kâtîb Ferdi (wrote 944/1537-8), Mardin mulâk-i Artabiyûs ta’irîzî, Istanbul 1331/1931. The citadel of the town was built or rebuilt in Hamdânid times. Numerous mosques were erected by the Artukids beys from the time of Nadim al-Din il-Ghâzî in the early 6th/12th century onwards, including the great mosque, and an Artukid hammâm remains. The construction of the Zindjîyya and Khâtûniyya or Sitt Ridwiyya madrasas, whilst the imposing Kâsîm Paşa madrasa was built in 849/1445 by the Ak-Koyunlu Kâsîm b. Dîhângîr. There are many interesting churches and monasteries in the town and the surrounding countryside, including the Dayr al-Za’farân, where numerous Syrian Christian patriarchs and metropolitans are buried. See A. Gabriel, Voyages archéologiques dans la Turquie orientale, Paris 1940, i, 3-44, ii, pls. a-d, i, XXV; IA, art. Mardin, addition on Eski eserler by T.H.: Metropolit Hanna Dolaponû, Tarîhte Mardin, Il-er-lîmânî fi tarîh Mardin, Istanbul 1972, 128 ff.

Dialect and ethnography. (in addition to references given in the article): P. della Valle, Viaggi, Brighton 1843, i, 515 (the traveller’s wife was a native of Mardin); J. B. Tavernier (1644), Les six voyages, 1692, i, 187; C. Niebuhr (1766), Reisbeschreibung, Copenhagen 1778, ii, 391-8, and plate xlvii; G. A. Olivier (1795), Voyages, Paris 12 (rep.), iv, 242; A. Dupré (1808), Voyage, i, 77-92; J. M. Kinneir, A geogr. memoir of the Persian Empire; London 1817, 264-5; idem (1814), Journey through Asia Minor, London 1818, 433; J.S. Buckingham, Travels in Mesopotamia, London 1827, 188-94 (with a general view of the town); H. Southgate (1837), Narrative of a Tour through Armenia, London 1840, ii, 272-88; W.K. Ainsworth (1840), Travels and Researches, London 1842, ii, 114-16; C. Defrémery, Observations sur deux tours de l’évêque de Mardin, in JA (1843); Southgate, Narrative of a visit to the Syrian church of Mesopotamia (1841), New York 1844, 215-42; K. Ritter, Erdkunde, xi (1844), 150-3, 379-97 (very detailed résumé); F.J. Goldsmith, An overland journey from Bagdad, in Trans. Bombay Geogr. Soc. xvii (1868), 29 (the population of Mardin is 22,000, half of whom are Christians); Cernik, Technische Studien-Expedition, in Peterm. Mit., Ergänzungsheft, x (1875-6), Heft 45, 15-18; H. Howorth, History of the Mongols, iii, 683-6; Socin, Zur Geogr. des Tür Abînîn, in ZDMG, xxxv (1881), 237-69 (map), 327-415; Sachau, Reise in Syrien und Mesopotamien, 404-7, 428; V. Cuinet, La Turquie d’Asie, Paris 1895, ii, 494-519; Tomilov, Otipé o pojezdke! 1904, St. Petersburg 1907, i, 263-7; Sykes, The Caliphs’ last heritage, London 1915, index.

In 1207 it was moved to Dayr al-Za’farân, an hour’s journey from Mardin, to a place called Minâr (see also: O. Orient, ii, 110, 221, 470; W. Wright, A short history of Syriac literature, Oxford 1891, index). On the position of
(d. 809/1406-7), disciple of the great astronomer Ibn al-Shatir (d. 777/1375), perhaps at Damascus; he later became muwakkil at Cairo (list of works in Suter, 170, no. 421; Brockelmann, II, 218, S II, 218). A great number of these treatises are on the use of various kinds of astronomical quadrants (dastūr quadrant, almucantar quadrant and sinus quadrant).

W. Horrell and W. Carl Rufus have translated the introduction to the K. al-Durr al-mużaffār fi 'l-samal bi-rub' al-qabāsīyya (An analog computer for solving problems of spherical astronomy, in A.I.H.S., xcvii [1974], 219-42). This is a treatise on the use of a double quadrant, probably an evolved version of a similar instrument invented, in the second half of the 8th/14th century, by the astronomer of Aleppo Taybugha al-Biklimish or by his son 'Ali. All these instruments derived from the yafta shakāsīyya of the Spanish astronomer of the 5th/11th century al-Zarkalluh or from the universal plate of his contemporary 'Ali b. Ḫalaf. King has also edited and translated the introduction to his R. fi 'l-samal bi-rub' al-qabāsīyya, in Scripta mathematica, ser. 2, xiii [1899]). His works on the arithmetic of degrees and minutes, he brought out the periodicity of the sexagesimal fraction (cf. P. Schmazl, ‘Sonnenuhren der mittelalterlichen Araben’, Munich 1929, 34-5, 63, 68, 72, 84). He also compiled a collection of tables, computed for the latitude of Cairo, in order to trace the curves of a solar quadrant (cf. K. Schoy, Sonnenbahnen der spätarabischen Astronomie, in Isis, vi [1924], 332-60).

Medieval geographers usually referred to it rather by its most famous historical site, ‘Ayn Qudatilq, or by the administrative centres to its east (Baysān) and south (Divnīn and Nablus). The term occurs, however, occasionally in texts from late Mamluk times in various forms: ‘Wildat Qudatilq and Marjd Bani ‘Amir’ or as a separate administrative sub-unit (‘amal) of the province of Safad.

Early Ottoman tabris points to a formalisation of the term and its status: as part of the new administrative system, a nahiyya by this name was designated, consisting of 38 villages bordered on the west by the Jordan and the Wady Qelt, in the east, Nazareth in the north, Kabatiyya in the south, and extending towards the Mediterranean. The 74 uninhabited mezra‘as included in it indicate the extent of ruin caused to the population and economy during the late Mamluk period. In order to restore law and prosperity, it was granted to the local Bedouin amirs of Turabay, who continued to rule it during the 16th and 17th centuries. The decline of Ottoman rule in Palestine meant once more a loss of any central control over this area, which became increasingly infested with Bedouins and gradually deserted by its sedentary population. “The whole of this country is in a state of insecurity... at present almost entirely deserted” is a description by Burckardt which was invariably repeated by dozens of travelers who visited the place in the 18th and 19th centuries.

In the second half of the 19th century, most of its land was registered in the name of a few urban ayyān [q.v. families, of which the Christian Sursuks of Beirut had the lion’s share. Jewish philanthropic societies anxious to purchase lands in Palestine conducted elaborate negotiations with the Sursuks during the late 19th century, but actually bought only a small fraction. In the wake of First World War, the Jewish National Fund acquired from these ayyān 250,000 dunams, compensated the 700 tenants living there, and proceeded with similar purchases in later years when this became a major bone of contention between Jews and Arabs. The drainage of the infectious swamps that covered most of the plain, the establishment of Jewish collective settlements and the intensive cultivation that resulted there, turned it into one of the most fertile part of Palestine during the British Mandate. Ever since, both under the British and in the State of Israel, the term Marjd Bani ‘Amir fell into disuse and was replaced by the biblical equivalent, “the valley of Jezreel”.

Bibliography: Ibn al-Furat. Ta‘rikh, vii, 191; Yākūt, Ma‘jam, ii, 180; Kalkashandl, Sub al-‘aṣrā, iv, 154; Miskrizi, Kitab al-Sulāk, i, 683; Muḥammad ibn Ahmad Abū Aḥmad Abū Sā‘īd, Al-Uṣūr al-‘azīzīyya, in BSOAS, xv, 55-78, B. Lewis, An Arabic account of the province of Safad, in BSOAS, xv,
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MARDJ DABIK, a plain near Dabiq [q.v.] on the Najr al-Kuwayt in northern Syria. The town of Dabiq, was known to the Assyrians as Dabigu (Sachau, ZA, xii, 47) and is called Δαβικος by the Theophanes (Chron., ed. de Boor, 143, 451 ff.). For convenience in his campaign against the Byzantines, Sulaymān b. 'Abd al-Malik moved the headquarters of the Syrian troops from Dabiya [q.v.] to Dabiq. In 717 with an army under 'Ubayda he set out from Mardj Dabiq for Asia Minor and on his return died there in Safar 99/September-October 717 (al-Masʿūdi, Muruqī, v, 397 – 2151; Chronica minora, ed. de Boor, 143, 451 ff.). Harūn al-Rashid also encamped in 191/807 on this plain (Syr Mardq Dabiq) and composed the differences between the Syrian bishops (Michael Syrus, Chron., ed. Chabot, iii, 19; Barhebreus, Chron. eccles., ed. Abbalsos-Lamy, i, 339). The Mirdasid Mahmūd in Radjāb 457/June 1065 defeated his uncle 'Atiyah on the field of Dabiq and then took Ḥalab (Ibn al-Adlm, Zubda, ed. Dahan, i, 296).

When in 491/1098 the Franks conquered Anṭiakiya, Kurboghā of Mawsil assembled a large army on Mardj Dabiq, with which he laid siege to Anṭiakiya. (Ibn al-Atīb, x, 188; Abu 'l-Fida°, in Rec. hist. or. crois., i, 3, 194; iii, 580). In the spring of 513/1119, Il-Ghazi on his campaign against the Franks crossed the Euphrates at Badddāy (now Badda on Sachau’s map) and Sandjā and advanced via Tell Başir [q.v.] (Ibn al-Adlm, Rec. hist. or. crois. v, 155). On Sayf al-Dīn Tungrī’s campaign against the Tarars to Malatya [q.v.], in which Abu 'l-Fida° of Hamā took part, a halt was made on the way back on the plain of Dabiq from 3 Safār to 2 Rabī‘ I 715/9 May-6 July 1315 (Abu 'l-Fida°, in Rec. hist. or. crois., i, 3).

On 25 Radjāb 922/24 August 1516 was fought at Mardj Dabiq the battle which gave Sellm I a decisive victory by which Syria passed for the next four centuries under Ottoman rule (H. Jansky, Mittel., z. osman. Geschichte, ii [1923-6], 214-25) [see also dabiq and kānsawī al-Qurnārī].

Bibliography: The geographical texts are gathered together in Le Strange, Palestine under the Moslems, 503; cf. R. Dussaud, La topographie de la Syrie antike et médiérale, Paris 1927, 474, to which should be added 'Iziz al-Dīn Ibn Shaddādī, A`ṣal, ed. S. Dahan, tr. A. M. Edle-Terisse, index. The main historical references are: Masʿūdi, Muruqī, index; Yahyā al-Amālī, ed. Kratchkovsky and Vasilev, in Patr., 442; Ibn al-Adlm, ix, 160, x, 188; Ibn al-Adlm, Zubda, ed. S. Dahan, index. (E. HONIGMANN)

MARDJ RAHIT, the name of a plain near Damascus famous in Islamic history on account of the battles which took place there.

‘a mardj is a wide expanse of land with numerous estates where large and small cattle and beasts are raised’. For M. Canard (H’amdandès, 204), a mardj is “the place where agriculture and gardens cease to be found”. Beyond the mardj, the land forms parts of the muhāfaẓa of Damascus. Certain part of the mardj have special names; amongst these, certain ones have played a great rôle in the history of Syria. The Mardj ‘Adhrā‘ or Mardj Rāhit in the north-east, and the Mardj al-Suflat [q.v.] in the south.

The climate of the mardj is identical with that of Damascus; at an elevation of 700 m. above sea level on average, it receives each year between 300 to 400 mm of rain. In February, after the winter rains, the region is swollen with water, and it is more difficult to get around, since the roads and tracks are impassable. In the spring, the springs situated at the foot of the first lines of the Kalamān allow the agglomeration of ‘Adhrā‘ to be irrigated and give enough water to the grass and vegetables to grow in April. Toward mid-May, the Bedouin come to camp and to pasture their flocks on the eastern border of the mardj. In August, the grass has disappeared, and the region is dusty until the first rains of autumn.

According to certain authors, like Muhammad Kurd ‘Alī, Mardj Rāhit is identical with Mardj ‘Aţhrā‘, but for others, Mardj Rāhit is situated near ‘Aţhrā‘, which Yakūt mentions as one of the villages in the vicinity of Damascus. This settlement, which sometimes give its name to the neighbouring mardj, is situated between the modern village of Şânüninya and the Khān al-Kūšayr at the foot of the Hill of the Eagle (Şaniyyat al-‘Ukāb) on the road from Damascus to Hims. When going northwards, one passes by the Kuβbat al-‘Asţār, the Khān ‘Ayāh—identifiable with the Khān al-Dunnī of Lepri (Rec. hist. or. crois., v, 635) and the Khān al-Kušayr. It is to the south-east of this district that Musil fixes the Mardj Rāhit.

In Muharram 13/March-April 634, the general Khālid b. al-Walīd [q.v.] left ‘Irāk in order to take part, with two other Arab contingents, in the conquest of Syria. After their defeat at al-‘Adnāytn [q.v.], the Byzantines fell back on Damascus, where they shut themselves up in Muharram 14/March 635. Khālid b. al-Walīd, having arrived himself at the beginning of spring in the region of Damascus, drove out the Ghassānids who were there and installed himself at Mardj Rāhit, to the north-east of the city, which fact has led some people to think that he had come via Tadmur. Some others think that he took the southern road via Dīmat al-Djandal [q.v.]. Whilst Khālid encamped to the north-east, the general Abu ‘Ubayda b. al-Djārāb [q.v.] deployed his troops to the south-west in order to besiege Damascus, which had to surrender in Radrjāb 14/September 638.

In 64/684 Mardj Rāhit was the scene of a great battle involving an internal struggle of the Arabs. On the death of Mu‘awiyah II b. al-Yazīd [q.v.], a complex crisis ensued over the succession to the caliphate. The community became divided into two, with the Khayyāt, partisans of ‘Abd Allāh b. al-Zubayr [q.v.] on one side, and the Kaysān and supporters of the Hamāmī, ‘a mardj b. al-Hakam [q.v.] on the other. Whilst an assembly
convoked to choose a successor to Muawiya II met at al-Ḍâbiya [q.v.], al-Ḍâbiḥ b. Kays al-Fihīr [q.v.], head of the Kays and supporter of ʿAbd Allâh b. al-Zubayr, who had made him governor of Damascus, concentrated the Kaysi forces at Mardj al-Suffar. Marwân, having become caliph, had as his prime aim the dislodging and breaking-up of the forces of al-Ḍâbih, who had rallied to Ibn al-Zubayr, in turn concentrated the Kaysi forces at Mardj al-Suffar.

In Dhumâd 1529/mid-February 1135, the Atabeg ʿImâd al-Dîn Zangî arrived from Aleppo and went to encamp at Mardj Râḥît between ʿAgdrâʾ and al-Kusayr with the aim of occupying Damascus. Whilst the city organised its defence, the Atabeg left Mardj Râḥît and took up a position to the south at the foot of Akabar al-Kalâbîya on the road to Hawrân [q.v.]. On 7 Dhuʾl-Qaʿda 535/22 June 1141, Zangî appeared again on the outskirts of Damascus in order to cut off food supplies from the city. A sortie by the defenders compelled Zangî to lift the siege and beat a retreat; he then fell back to Mardj Râḥît in order to await his troops. When these last returned, loaded with plunder, he joined them on the road northwards.

A few years later, in spring 544/1148, Nur al-Dîn in turn established his camp at ʿAgdrâʾ in the western part of Mardj Râḥît whilst he was besieging Damascus. Two years later, on 13 Muharram 546/2 May 1151, Nûr al-Dîn’s vanguard set up its tents at ʿAgdrâʾ in Mardj Râḥît, but then the army, endeavouring to keep up the pressure on the city, changed camp several times before falling back at the approach of the Mongol army.

After this victory, Marwân undertook the conquest of the lands where allegiance had been given to ʿAbd Allâh b. al-Zubayr. One result of the battle was to accentuate the rivalry of the Kays and the Kalb. The victorious Kalb and the family of Bahdal [q.v.] acquired a preponderance which the Kays, with the support of Bahlâl and Ghâmî [q.v.], were to contest strongly.

The “encounter at Mardj Râḥît” was much mentioned in poetry of the Marwânid period, in particular by al-Aḍîlî [q.v.], and by Masʿûdî [q.v.] in his Tanbîh, in connection with this Umayyad victory, verses by al-Farazîdî [q.v.]. In Dhuʾl-Qaʿda 334/July 946, the Hamdânid Sayf al-Dawla [q.v.] broke the treaty which he had made with the Ikhshîdîd regent Kâfir [q.v.] and seized Damascus, but the ruler in Cairo sent troops to regain the city. The Hamdânid army was put to flight by the Ikhshîdîd forces near Nâṣira in Dhumâd 1 335/December 946, and retreated towards Damascus; it encamped at Mardj Râḥît and then reached Hîmṣ in Dhumâd 2 335/January 947, whilst Kâfir’s forces reoccupied Damascus. In spring 335/947, Sayf al-Dawla returned to Damascus, but he was beaten at Mardj Râḥît, whose terrain was suitable for warfare, and fled towards Aleppo, pursued by the Ikhshîdîd forces.

In 381/991 the Fâṭimid caliph al-ʿAzîz [q.v.] dismissed Murîn al-Khâdim, the governor of Damascus, and sent as his replacement the Turkish general Mangûtûkân, who took up his position immediately at Mardj Râḥît before making his entry into Damascus.

In Dhumâd i 529/mid-February 1135, the Atabeg ʿImâd al-Dîn Zangî arrived from Aleppo and went to encamp at Mardj Râḥît between ʿAgdrâʾ and al-Kusayr with the aim of occupying Damascus. Whilst the city organised its defence, the Atabeg left Mardj Râḥît and took up a position to the south at the foot of Akabar al-Kalâbîya on the road to Hawrân [q.v.]. On 7 Dhuʾl-Qaʿda 535/22 June 1141, Zangî appeared again on the outskirts of Damascus in order to cut off food supplies from the city. A sortie by the defenders compelled Zangî to lift the siege and beat a retreat; he then fell back to Mardj Râḥît in order to await his troops. When these last returned, loaded with plunder, he joined them on the road northwards.

A few years later, in spring 544/1148, Nur al-Dîn in turn established his camp at ʿAgdrâʾ in the western part of Mardj Râḥît whilst he was besieging Damascus. Two years later, on 13 Muharram 546/2 May 1151, Nûr al-Dîn’s vanguard set up its tents at ʿAgdrâʾ in Mardj Râḥît, but then the army, endeavouring to keep up the pressure on the city, changed camp several times before falling back at the approach of the Mongol army.

After this victory, Marwân undertook the conquest of the lands where allegiance had been given to ʿAbd Allâh b. al-Zubayr. One result of the battle was to accentuate the rivalry of the Kays and the Kalb. The victorious Kalb and the family of Bahdal [q.v.] acquired a preponderance which the Kays, with the support of Bahlâl and Ghâmî [q.v.], were to contest strongly.

The “encounter at Mardj Râḥît” was much mentioned in poetry of the Marwânid period, in particular by al-Aḍîlî [q.v.], and by Masʿûdî [q.v.] in his Tanbîh, in connection with this Umayyad victory, verses by al-Farazîdî [q.v.]. In Dhuʾl-Qaʿda 334/July 946, the Hamdânid Sayf al-Dawla [q.v.] broke the treaty which he had made with the Ikhshîdîd regent Kâfir [q.v.] and seized Damascus, but the ruler in Cairo sent troops to regain the city. The Hamdânid army was put to flight by the Ikhshîdîd forces near Nâṣira in Dhumâd 1 335/December 946, and retreated towards Damascus; it encamped at Mardj Râḥît and then reached Hîmṣ in Dhumâd 2 335/January 947, whilst Kâfir’s forces reoccupied Damascus. In spring 335/947, Sayf al-Dawla returned to Damascus, but he was beaten at Mardj Râḥît, whose terrain was suitable for warfare, and fled towards Aleppo, pursued by the Ikhshîdîd forces.

In 381/991 the Fâṭimid caliph al-ʿAzîz [q.v.] dismissed Murîn al-Khâdim, the governor of Damascus, and sent as his replacement the Turkish general Mangûtûkân, who took up his position immediately at Mardj Râḥît before making his entry into Damascus.

In Dhumâd i 529/mid-February 1135, the Atabeg ʿImâd al-Dîn Zangî arrived from Aleppo and went to encamp at Mardj Râḥît between ʿAgdrâʾ and al-Kusayr with the aim of occupying Damascus. Whilst the city organised its defence, the Atabeg left Mardj Râḥît and took up a position to the south at the foot of Akabar al-Kalâbîya on the road to Hawrân [q.v.]. On 7 Dhuʾl-Qaʿda 535/22 June 1141, Zangî appeared again on the outskirts of Damascus in order to cut off food supplies from the city. A sortie by the defenders compelled Zangî to lift the siege and beat a retreat; he then fell back to Mardj Râḥît in order to await his troops. When these last returned, loaded with plunder, he joined them on the road northwards.

A few years later, in spring 544/1148, Nur al-Dîn in turn established his camp at ʿAgdrâʾ in the western part of Mardj Râḥît whilst he was besieging Damascus. Two years later, on 13 Muharram 546/2 May 1151, Nûr al-Dîn’s vanguard set up its tents at ʿAgdrâʾ in Mardj Râḥît, but then the army, endeavouring to keep up the pressure on the city, changed camp several times before falling back at the approach of the Mongol army.

After this victory, Marwân undertook the conquest of the lands where allegiance had been given to ʿAbd Allâh b. al-Zubayr. One result of the battle was to accentuate the rivalry of the Kays and the Kalb. The victorious Kalb and the family of Bahdal [q.v.] acquired a preponderance which the Kays, with the support of Bahlâl and Ghâmî [q.v.], were to contest strongly.

The “encounter at Mardj Râḥît” was much mentioned in poetry of the Marwânid period, in particular by al-Aḍîlî [q.v.], and by Masʿûdî [q.v.] in his Tanbîh, in connection with this Umayyad victory, verses by al-Farazîdî [q.v.]. In Dhuʾl-Qaʿda 334/July 946, the Hamdânid Sayf al-Dawla [q.v.] broke the treaty which he had made with the Ikhshîdîd regent Kâfir [q.v.] and seized Damascus, but the ruler in Cairo sent troops to regain the city. The Hamdânid army was put to flight by the Ikhshîdîd forces near Nâṣira in Dhumâd 1 335/December 946, and retreated towards Damascus; it encamped at Mardj Râḥît and then reached Hîmṣ in Dhumâd 2 335/January 947, whilst Kâfir’s forces reoccupied Damascus. In spring 335/947, Sayf al-Dawla returned to Damascus, but he was beaten at Mardj Râḥît, whose terrain was suitable for warfare, and fled towards Aleppo, pursued by the Ikhshîdîd forces.

In 381/991 the Fâṭimid caliph al-ʿAzîz [q.v.] dismissed Murîn al-Khâdim, the governor of Damascus, and sent as his replacement the Turkish general Mangûtûkân, who took up his position immediately at Mardj Râḥît before making his entry into Damascus.
Dahhan, Damascus 1956, 181 and n. 7; Ibn al-Furat, Ta'wilat, ed. K. Curtze, Beirut 1953; Ibn Tahhirbidi, Nadjim, i, 281, 159; M. Kurd "Al-Khit al-Sham, Damascus 1925, i, 146-7; idem, Ghid al-Dimagh, Damascus 1952, 218 ff.—2.


After his victory over the Ghassanids at Mardj Râhit [q. v.], Khiiid b. al-Walid [q. v.] headed southwards and stayed for some time at the Mardj al-Suffar before returning to Bosra [q. v.] by way of Kanawat.

In Ramdân 64/June 684, partisans of the Umayyads met at al-Dibajiba [q. v.] to nominate a successor to Mu'awiyya II [q. v.]. The governor of Damascus, al-Dahhâk b. Kays al-Fihrl [q. v.], the leader of the Zubayrid party, was also invited to the meeting and promised to be there. He left Damascus with a considerable number of troops, but when he came to the Mardj al-Suffar, half-way to al-Dibajiba, he decided to stop there to await the outcome of the meeting, whilst at the same time making his way towards a meeting of the Kays [q. v.] of Syria, who were in rebellion against the Umayyads.

On 3 Dhu 'l-Ka'da 64/June 684, after forty days of deliberation, the Kâb [q. v.] and the Umayyad partisans elected to the caliphate by acclamation Marwan b. al-Hakam [q. v.]. Immediately, he started out for Damascus and arrived at the Mardj al-Suffar in the middle of Dhu' l-Ka'da/the beginning of July. The Kays were unable to hold their position, and in an effort to avoid combat al-Dahhâk set off hastily towards Mardj Râhit, to the north of Damascus. In the battle which followed, the Kays' leader and a large number of his men lost their lives.

In 476/1083, while the Saljuk Tutush [q. v.] was away leading an expedition against the Byzantines in the Antakiya region, Muslim b. Kuraysh, the leader of the Banu 'Ukayl and ruler of Halab [q. v.] decided to besiege Damascus. The troops of Halab, joined by the Banu Numayr [q. v.] and the Banu Shayba[n [q. v.], as well as some Turkmens elements, came to lay siege to the town. The Kays and some Yemenis joined them there. Muslim hoped for aid from Egypt promised by the Fatimids, but he hoped in vain. Tutush was recalled by the townsman of Damascus, but they had defeated their attacker before he could get back. The 'Ukaiyld was betrayed by some of his troops, and leaving the walls of the city, he went to make camp on the Mardj al-Suffar. From there he took the road eastwards across the Hamad and reached the district of Salamiyya.

Al-Ridwan b. Tutush [q. v.], the ruler of Halab, came to besiege Damascus in 489/1096, supported by Sukmân b. Arurk. When he heard that Shams al-
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The Syrian Darb al-Hadidj crosses the Mardj al-Suffar from north to south after going through the Shu'ûrât pass, the Dhabl al-Aswad and the Nahr al-
Mulūk Dukāk was returning to Damascus with his troops, Ridwān raised the siege and fell back to the Mardj al-Suffār, and then went on to pillage the Damascenes in pursuit of Ridwān’s army. As Dukāk began to close in on him, Ridwān broke away, took a northerly route through the Syrian desert and returned to Halab at the end of Dhu‘l-Hijjād 49/ mid-December 1096.

In 11 Muharram 507/28 June 1113, the Salṭūnī troops of the Amir Šarāf al-Dīn Mawdūd of Mawsīl and of the Atabeg Tugh-tātkīn [q. v.] of Damascus won a resounding victory over the Franks at al-Sinānahra, the former winter residence of the caliph Mu‘āwiyah, south of Lake Tiberias. The Franks retreated to some rising ground to the west of Tiberias, whilst the Muslims camped at the foot of the hill. After thirty-six days under siege, depleted by the extreme heat and the lack of provisions, they were obliged to surrender their position on Rabī‘I 5 507/16 April 1113. Heading north through Baysān, they reached the Mardj al-Suffār, where Mawdūd paid off his troops and they dispersed. He then accompanied the Atabeg Tugh-tātkīn to Damascus, arriving there on 21 Rabī‘I 1507/5 September 1113.

At the end of 519/1125, Baldwin II of Jerusalem decided to launch a surprise attack on Damascus in reprisal for a raid during the previous autumn by the Atabeg Tugh-tātkīn. Tugh-tātkīn positioned his troops on the Mardj al-Suffār and advanced as far as Tell al-Shakhab. On 27 Dhu‘l-Hijjād 519/25 January 1126, the two armies confronted each other and fought a little battle which has become of great interest to military historians, as noted by Charles Oman, relying upon the accounts of Fulcher of Chartres and William of Tyre. This was, in fact, the first time that the Turks had used infantry to support their cavalry. The Franks were split into twelve field units each composed of cavalrymen and footsoldiers. Opposed to them was the Muslim army made up of Turkmen cavalrymen supported by young recruits, who were mounted behind the riders and ready to leap down and fight on foot when the enemy was too far for cavalry to support them. The Franks were then dispersed by the Turks, who defeated them, and the Muslim army advanced as far as Diabal Aswad, near Kiswa. Finally, both sides returned home.

In the first half of Shawwāl 525/ the second half of September 1129, the Franks launched a new offensive against Damascus after the massacre of the Bātiniyya [q. v.]. Taqji al-Mulūk Būrī in vain solicited the help of the Fātimid caliph. The Franks encamped at the entrance to the Mardj al-Suffār before Djesr al-Khshah and foraged on the plain between Tell Shakhab and Kiswa. The Muslim army, now enlarged by Turkmen and Bedouins, halted in front of the Franks, who clustered round their tents while one group of them continued foraging in the Hawrān.

After launching several attacks the Franks were at last able to achieve a decisive victory, taking much booty and many prisoners.

During the reigns of Nūr al-Dīn [q. v.] and Salāh al-Dīn [q. v.], we find hardly any mention of the Mardj al-Suffār in contemporary chronicles. The Nāṣir of Ibn Taqhrībīdī makes no mention of any conflict on this plain which the armies used to cross on the way from Cairo to Damascus. In Džumād I 990/ May 1194, the Ayyūbīd sultan of Egypt and Ayyūbīd of Kiswa, on the banks of the Nahr al-A‘wādī on the northern edge of the Mardj al-Suffār, on his way to Damascus to hold discussions with his eldest brother al-Afdal.

During the battle between al-Afdal and al-Afdal in 595/1199, al-Afdal went to encamp on the Mardj al-Suffār several times before resuming the siege of Damascus in Ramadan/July. In the following year (596/1200), it was the turn of al-Malik al-Zāhir to encamp on the Mardj al-Suffār during the rainy season before reaching to Halab.

In 614/1217 al-Afdal [q. v.], the younger brother of Salāh al-Dīn, was hard pressed by the Crusaders, and fell back from Palestine to the north. He travelled through Baysān, crossed the Jordan, passed through 4 Adījn [q. v.], and then turned northwards to follow the track of Rā’s al-Mār in order to get the Mardj al-Suffār. From there he appealed for help to the Ayyūbīd princes, but only al-Mujāhid Shīrkuh of Himṣ came to his camp. While al-Afdal was in the Mardj al-Suffār, his elder son, who was governing Egypt on his behalf, had to confront the Fifth Crusade when it disembarked at Damietta (Dīmayt [q. v.]) on Rabī‘I 6 615/28 May 1218. As soon as al-Afdal had heard that the Franks had set foot on Egyptian soil, he left for Damietta. After a day’s forced march he arrived at ‘Alikīn where he fell ill, shocked by the defeat at Damietta. He died in his camp on Friday, Džumādā II/31 August 1218. He was buried in Damascus, firstly in the citadel and then in his own tomb. Whenever al-Afdal stayed at Damascus during the rose blossom season, he would have his tent pitched in the Mardj al-Suffār, being allergic to the smell of the flowers, and then go back to the city later.

When al-Kāmil died in Rājdāb 653/March 1238, there was trouble among the Ayyūbīd princes, and al-Nāṣir Dāwūd [q. v.] had to leave his post as governor of Damascus. For a time, he took refuge in Kabūb, some 4 km. north of Damascus. But he felt himself threatened there, so sought refuge in the Mardj al-Suffār near the old Umayyad castle of Umm Hākim, from where he fled to Ka‘fāt al-Rabād, the castle of 4 Adījn.

In Shawwāl 702/ end of March or beginning of April 1303, the Mongols of Persia again crossed the Euphrates and marched towards Hamāt [q. v.]. Damascus had been occupied for a short while by the Tartars in 699/1300, and they now went out to wait for the enemy in the Mardj al-Suffār, where they were to be joined by the Mamlūk sultan of Egypt al-Nāṣir Muhammad. The troops of the Ilkhanid Ghazan Maḥmūd [q. v.] took up their position near Shakhab, to the west of the Mardj al-Suffār. They launched their attack on 2 Ramadān 502/21 April 1303 and were repulsed by the Mamlūks, who sustained heavy losses. The amīr 4 Izāz al-Dīn Aydāmūr al-‘Irzī al- Nakib, together with 4 Izāz al-Dīn Ayyub al-Turki al-Zāhirī, the governor of the province of Himṣ, and also the 4 Hadīq [q. v.] Djalāl al-Dīn Akhūsh al-Shāmil, all fell as martyrs on that day.

In 791/1390, the Mardj al-Suffār was the theatre for violent fighting between Muslims. Barkūk, the sultan who had been stripped of his position, left al-Karāk [q. v.] where he had just been released from captivity, in Shawwāl 791/September-October 1390, and he arrived in Mardj al-Suffār on 22 Shawwāl with it, is said, 500 men, some Mamlūks and some Bedouins. He closed with the troops from Damascus near Shakhab on 4 Dhu‘l-Hijjād 50.
October 1389, and went on to lay siege to Damascus. The amirs of the main towns of the north of Syria banded together and came to the help of the city, but on the way, some of them decided to go over to Barkûk. When, at the beginning of Muharram 592/end of December 1389 a warning was given of the approach of Timûr-bughâ Minâtî, Barkûk left Damascus after a violent battle at Bâb-djâbiya, within the eastern area of the city. He fell back towards the Mardîj al-Suffar, passed through Kiswa, and went on to camp at Shakhab. According to Ibn Saqâr, the two armies confronted one another on 17 Muharram/5 January 1390. In this critical situation, Barkûk was looking for cover when he suddenly came face to face with the sultan al-Muṣṭûr Hâdîtî, the caliph of Cairo al-Mutawakkil I, and the great kâdis who, since they had only a feeble escort, quickly surrendered. Hence at that point, the situation was reversed. Minâtî tried three times to release Hâdîtî and his companions but without success, since a violent storm of hail and rain forced the adversaries to abandon their conflict. Though the number of dead on both sides was less than 50, it was nevertheless a battle important for history. While Minâtî sought refuge in Damascus, Barkûk went back to Cairo with the victors, who had joined his cause, and it was restored to the office of sultan in Şafar 792/Feb 1390, whilst al-Mansûr (al-Muzaffar) lzz al-Djm Khattab b. Abd Allah al-Katf al-Busri (?) in the Mardîj al-Suffar, at the north-west of the Ladja, was built between Kiswa and Ghabaghib in the Pilgrimage route, and another, the Khan al-Zayyât, attracted many travellers. The Khan Danun, a very large khan, built 5 km. south of Kiswa on the road to Adhîr-at, was completed in 778/1376 during the reign of Sultan al-Afâr Shâh. One source even mentions a khan at Ghabaghib, north of Sanamayn, on the Pilgrimage route, and another, the Khan al-Zayyât, to the south-west of Kiswa and north-east of Shakhab. In 1941, during the course of hostilities between the Free French forces (supported by the British and Commonwealth troops) and the Vichy troops, there was a battle on the Mardîj al-Suffar, which took place on the very spot where the Byzantines had been forced to yield ground to the Arabs 1300 years before, and this later battle allowed the Allies to enter the Syrian capital.

**Bibliography:** Arabic texts: Masûđi, Tanbih, 261, 268; Ibn Hawkal, tr. K. M. Setton, History of the Crusades, Philadelphia 1955-62, i, 401-3, 426, 430, ii, 390, 398, 775; C. Thubron, Mirror to Damascus, London 1967, 201. (N. Eliseéff) MARDJÂ-I TAKLID (pl. marâđi-i taklîd, Pers. for Ar. marâđi/marâdhi-i taklîd), title and function of a hierarchical order in the Shi'i jurisconsult (madâjih, faqih) who is to be considered during his lifetime, by virtue of his qualities and his wisdom, a model for reference, for "imitation" or "emulation" — a term employed to an increasing extent by English-speaking authors—by every observant Imâmi Shi'i (with the exception of mughâjis), on all aspects of religious practice and law. As in the case of other institutions, the history of this function (called marâđiyyat-i taklîd or simply marâđiyyat, the term marâđi-i taklîd often being abbreviated as marâđa, pl. marâđi) is to be understood in the context of the protracted doctrinal development of Imâmism. Although the Arab element played and continues to play an important part in this development, historical circumstances prevalent in Iran since the establishment of Imâmî Shi'ism as the state religion under the Safawids (907-1153/1501-1722 [q.v.]) were ultimately responsible for giving to the Imâmî mujtahids a dominant spiritual and temporal influence. Under the Kâdârs (1794-1925 [q.v.]), the Imâmî 'ulamâ' developed or re-interpreted various concepts or points of doctrine (nijâbât, al-îmâmîyyat, marâđiyyat, iâ'ibîyyat) which contributed to the increase of their power. Having undergone an eclipse since the 1920s—a period corresponding with the renaissance of Kurds [q.v.] as a theological centre—the influence of the Imâmî mujtahids and the role of the marâđi-i taklîd were seriously reexamined in the early 1960s as a result of doubts concerning the succession to Ayattulâh al-'Uzza Burûdîjî (d. 1961 [q.v. in Suppl.]), sole marâđi-i taâlîd since 1367/1947. Discussions and debates were held by members, religious and lay, of the Islamic societies (an-nâma-yi islâmî) concerning the method of selection and the composition of the marâđi-i taklîd and the institution of marâđa-iyyat in general, the position of Imâmism with regard to ijtihâd, taklîd and the various problems posed by the
relations between religious and political authorities, the forms and the degrees of power which could be exercised by the mujtahid, etc. It was especially by the publication of these discussions (Bahā'ī, 1341/1962; cf. Lambton (1964), 120), of which the authors, Āyatullāh Ţallākārī (d. 1979) and Mīhār Bāzargān, were arrested and imprisoned following the demonstrations of spring 1963 against the “white revolution” of the Shāh (in which Āyatullāh Khūmānī played a prominent role) that abroad there ensued a wide-ranging debate concerning these questions, of which the salient points are summarised below in their historical context.

1. Discussions of ḥijāḥ and taklīḍ. The evolution of Imāmī attitudes towards ḥijāḥ and taklīḍ may be analysed in the context of what has been called, sometimes retrospectively and anachronistically, the conflict between the Ḍabāhariyya Ḍabāharīyya [q. v. in Suppi.] and the Usūliyya [q. v.]. The eminent scholars of the period of the Būyids [see Būyaynīs] who formulated the Imāmī asal al-fikr (al-Mufīd, d. 431/1042; al-Murtadā, d. 434/1044; Shāhī Ţūfī, d. 460/1067) reject both ḥijāḥ and ḥijāḥ (although al-Murtadā acknowledges a subordinate role for ḥijāḥ: Brunschvig, 210; Arjomand (1984), 53). Even while employing its techniques, the Imāmī ṣulūk (premises) reject the ḥijāḥ of ṣulūk. Shī‘ī Ţūsī describes the traditionists as literaltasts (ṣāhī al-dīn al-maṣūmī, cf. Kazemi Moussavi (1985), 36). Ḍabāharīs and Usūlis appear as opposing factions in the Kītāb al-Nakhd, a anti-Sunnī polemical work written by the fervent Usūlī ʿAbd al-Dājjāl al-Kazwīnī al-Rāzī (d. 565/1170; on this source, see Calmard (1971), Scarcia Amoretti (1981)). In the Ilkhānī period, al-Muhākhir al-Hillī (d. 726/1325) admits that—although rejecting ḥijāḥ—the Imāmīs ‘ulamā‘ have practised ḥijāḥ. His pupil Ibn al-Mutahhar al-‘Allāma al-Hillī (d. 726/1325) formulated the methods of Imāmī ḥijāḥ. According to Mutahharī (Bahā’ī, 42), he was the first Imāmī jurist to use the term ṣulūk to describe one who derives religious precepts (hukm-i ġharshī) on the basis of authentic articles of the ġharshī. According to other opinions, al-Mufīd is said to have been the first Imāmī fakih to practise ḥijāḥ, al-Ṭūsī having given him a definitive formulation (J. M. Hussain, 150, quoting M. Ramay, 88, 92). Like ḥijāḥ, taklīḍ is rejected by the first Imāmī theologues, notably al-Kulaynī (cf. Arjomand (1984), 139) and al-Mufīd (cf. McDermott, 257 ff.). For al-Murtadā, the disciple of al-Mufīd, the taklīḍ of an ālim is permitted (with reservations). He has followed three centuries later by Ibn al-Mutahhar al-Hillī who—while no longer basing the competence of the mujtahids on the entirety of the ġharshī—it is concluded with the mujtahid or both the muftī, i.e. between the jurisconsult and the simple believer (Arjomand (1984), 139 f.; Kazemi Moussavi (1985), 37).

2. Basis and extent of the influence of the Imāmī mujtahids. According to Imāmī tradition, the world cannot exist for a single moment without a ġharshī (“proof” or “guarantee” of God), this function being supplied, after the Prophet, by the Imāmā. During the Minor Occultation (ḡhaybat al-sughra, 250-329/674-941), the fakīhā were able to consult the Twelfth Imām through the intermediacy of his four sīfs or wakīls. On the bases of these premises of the Imām, the fourth wakīl did not appoint a successor (Madelung, (1982), 163 ff.). During the Major Occultation (ḡhaybat al-kubrā, after 329/941), the Imāmī community therefore lived in a state of messianic expectation which compelled it to seek out solutions for its internal and external organisation. Unlike the Sunnis, the Imāmī fakihā generally denied the legitimacy of powers established de facto during the ghayba (the basis and the logic of this attitude have been questioned by Arjomand (1979) who criticises the interpretations of N. R. Keddie, A. K. S. Lambton, H. Algar etc.; cf. Calmard (1982), 253, Calder (1982 A), 3, n. 2).

In the acknowledged absence of an infallible guide or of a just sovereign, or of transmitters of traditions (muhaddithūn), the Imāmī fakihā became scholastics theologues (mutakallimūn) before extending their prerogatives in the capacity of mujtahids (J. Hussain, 150). Their influence increased under the Būyids (who professed Shī‘ism), with whom they felt able to collaborate without sacrificing their loyalty to their Imām (Kohler (1976 A), 532 f.). Numerous Imāmīs, including some ‘ulamā‘, collaborated with Sunnī authorities and occupied senior posts in the service of the Shī‘ī Bābāsīs and the Ṣālṭīs (Calmard (1971), 55 f.). The theologian Naṣīr al-Dīn Tūsī (d. 672/1274) and the Shī‘ī vizier Ibn al-A‘lākīnī promoted, in varying degrees, the accession to power of the Mongol Ilkhāns (Calmard (1975), 145 f.). The Ilkhānī Tūsī (d. 700/1304-17), the most eminent Imāmī ‘ulamā‘ such as Ibn al-Mutahhar al-Hillī and his son Fakhr al-Muhākhirīn (d. 771/1369-70); ibid., 150 f.; Arjomand (1984), 57 f.).

Whether accepting or contesting the powers established de facto, the Imāmī ‘ulamā‘ continued to seek, within the structural limits of the ġharshī, a means of coming to terms with their existence. According to a theory elaborated under the Būyids, during the ghayba certain parts of the ġharshī (such as diqāq or hudūd, legal penalties) are inapplicable (this is the doctrine of the sukūt: cf. Calder (1982 A), 4, quoting the same (1979 A), ch. 3). Points of doctrine concerning especially diqāq and the duties incumbent (such as amr bi ‘l-maṣūf wa-nahy ‘an al-munkar, ordering the good and forbidding the bad) are thoroughly discussed (Arjomand (1984), 61 ff., see also Kohler (1976 B)). But the Imāmīs, especially by al-Murtadā (and adopted by his successors) recommends in judicial and administrative matters “a positive and ethically responsible involvement in the existing political order” (Arjomand (1984), 65; see also Madelung (1980)).

With the rise of Sūfism in the post-Illkhānic period (14th-16th centuries), Shī‘ī themes began to permeate the ťarīkī and the thought of various messianic or millenarian political-religious movements inspired by charismatic chieftains or miracle-workers who seized power (the Sarbādārs, the Muḥāsaʿīs, the Safawīs, etc.). Various Sūfī movements threatened the existence of the existing established powers or compromised with them (Kulārwiyya, Dirāshīyya, Nūrakbāhīyya, Nīmarakāshīyya, Hurūfīyya, etc.). The case of the Shī‘ī order of the Marṣīḥī Sayyids [q. v.] constitutes a separate example of politicisation of Sūfism from which Mahdīsm is absent (for a socio-historical study of these movements, see Calmard (1975), 154 ff.; Arjomand (1984), 66 ff.). Although these socio-political changes were unconnected with the efforts of the ‘ulamā‘ to formulate and practise the Imāmī doctrine, their advice was sometimes solicited (cf. Kazemī Moussavi ( ashdb al-dīn al-maṣūmī, 163 ff.)). During the period of the Būyids (13th-15th centuries), Shī‘ī themes began to permeate the ťarīkī and the thought of various messianic or millenarian political-religious movements inspired by charismatic chieftains or miracle-workers who seized power (the Sarbādārs, the Muḥāsaʿīs, the Safawīs, etc.). Various Sūfī movements threatened the existence of the existing established powers or compromised with them (Kulārwiyya, Dirāshīyya, Nūrakbāhīyya, Nīmarakāshīyya, Hurūfīyya, etc.). The case of the Shī‘ī order of the Marṣīḥī Sayyids [q. v.] constitutes a separate example of politicisation of Sūfism from which Mahdīsm is absent (for a socio-historical study of these movements, see Calmard (1975), 154 ff.; Arjomand (1984), 66 ff.). Although these socio-political changes were unconnected with the efforts of the ‘ulamā‘ to formulate and practise the Imāmī doctrine, their advice was sometimes solicited (cf. Kazemī Moussavi ( ashdb al-dīn al-maṣūmī, 163 ff.)).
It was in this context of Sufism and extremism that there came about the rise of the Safawiyya and the resurgence of Sufism in the mid-17th century, this tendency was to in part restored through which Shaykh C...  

The imposition of Imamism as the state religion by Shah Isma'il (1501-24) was based simultaneously on the ethos of Iranian nationalism and on Shi'ism, state policy led to the ruthless suppression of messianic and Sufi tendencies both outside and inside the Safavid movement and to the persecution of Sunnis. With the appeal to the dogmatic principles of Shi'ism, this situation favoured the establishment and the ascendancy of a hierarchy of Imams who, from the outset, under Shah Ismai'l, were subject to the hostility of Persian religious dignitaries (Glassen, 262; Arjomand (1984), 203 f.). The decisive initiative for the establishment of an Imam hierarchy was taken by Shah Tahmâsp (1524-76). A devout Imam, professing no messianic pretensions, he favoured the installation of Imams 'ulama', 'imported' from the Arab countries (Syria, mainly the Djabal 'Amil, Arab 'Irak and the Persian Gulf region). With their Persân origins, they were then transferred to the hostile camp of the Persian religious dignitaries, from whom they ultimately constituted a 'brotherhood' of religious specialists. The farman through which Shâykh 'Ali al-Karaki 'Âmilî (d. 940/1534), the 'Propagator of Religion' was awarded the titles of Na'ib (deputy) of the Imam and of Khatam al-mudjâhidîn ("seal of the mudjâhidîn") could be considered both as the ratification of the establishment of the Imâm hierarchy in Iran and as the definitive transition from extremism to Imamism (Arjomand (1984), 129 ff., 133 f.).

The principles on which the authority of the Imam 'ulama' rests were redefined under the Safawids. The combination of the concepts of taklid and igîthâd is expressed in various works (Zahâbat al-boyân, by Mullâ Muhammad Amîn b. Muhammad Amîn, d. 983/1576; Zahâbat al-wisâl, by Bahâî al-Dîn 'Âmilî 'Shâykh-i Bahâî", d. 1050/1641; Ma'alîm al-wisâl, by Hasan b. Zayn al-Dîn, d. 1011/1602). Although the "Muhammad al-azamîn" al-Karaki fulminates against the proof of God (i.e. of the Hidden Imam) hadiths, various including a declaration by the Twelfth Imam which describes the 'ulama' as the proof (hadîd) of the proof of God (i.e. of the Hidden Imam) for all the faithful. The 'ulama' are also said to be the heirs of the Prophet (Hairi (1977), 59).

Although formulation of the concept of deputed authority was not pursued systematically in the Safawid period, some of the attributes of the Imams were then transferred to the mudjâhidîs (Arjomand (1984), 143). But the Imam hierarchy lacked an independent "clerical" organisation, and needed political power in order to consolidate its position in relation to the religious dignitaries, especially the sayyids, who also enjoyed a certain mystique and wielded politico-economic influence. Claiming to represent the Hidden Imam, but incapable of assuming the heritage of Safawid extremism, it legitimised the Safawid dynasty only as a purely temporal power (this was the prudent attitude of Muhammad Bâkîr Ma'dîsî [q.v.], d. 1111/1699; cf. ibid., 184). But in spite of its efforts and the support of Shah Tahmâsp, the hierarchy did not succeed in taking over the important religious and administrative function of the sadî (sâdûr), which was increasingly. The mystique of the na'îb 'ulama' did not fuse with that attached to the divinity of the Imam, most likely because of the political instability of the Safawid state. These setbacks were due in part to the fact that in addition to its rivalries with the religious dignitaries, the new Imam hierarchy experienced internal dissensions due to the diversity of its geographical origins and the diverse attitudes of its 'ulama', some of whom directed their attention to worldly matters, while others sought refuge in philosopho-  

After being dormant since the Seldjuk period, the opposition of the Akhbarîs towards the Usûfî school was renewed at the beginning of the 17th century, when Mullâ Muhammad Amîn b. Muhammad Shâhîf Ashtarâbâdî (d. 1036/1626-7), encouraged by his teacher Mirzâ Muhammad b. 'All Ashtarâbâdî (d. 1028/1619), formulated the Akhbarî doctrine in his K-al-Aswâ'îd al-madâniyya, the basis of the neo-Akhbarism which flourished in Iran and in 'Irâk in the 17th and 18th centuries (on Akhbarism, notably on Akhbarism, in this period, see E. Kohlberg, AKBÄRÎYA, in Encyclopaedia Iranica, i, 716-18). Both teacher and pupil belonged to the clique of Persian religious dignitaries. Neo-Akhbarism was embraced by two eminent representatives of gnostic Shi'ism, the elder Ma'dîsî, Muhammad Takî (d. 1070/1660), and Mullâ Muhsin Fâyûl Kâshâî (d. ca. 1091/1680). The shâykh al-Isldm of Ma'dîsî, al-Hurr al-'Âmilî (d. 1120/1708-9) was a fervent propagandist on its behalf. Rejecting the igîthâd and the taklid of anyone who is not infallible (i.e. other than the Imam), Akhbarism reflects the thought of religious dignitaries who prefer philosophy, hermeneutism and mysticism. By extolling reverence for the Imams, it constituted, for the simple believers, an attractive element of Shi'ism which gained in popularity. But with the anti-clerical policies of Shah Abd-Al'azîz (1602-72) on the one hand and the Akhbarîs (1642-66) and the resurgence of Sulûm in the mid-17th century, this tendency was to in part restored
before being rejected by the Imami hierocracy (ibid., 146 ff. and below).

In fact, despite the advance of Aghbārism at the time of the decline and collapse of the Safawids and throughout periods of disorder and instability (Afghan conquest and domination, 1722-9; reign of Nādir Shāh, 1736-47; Afghān-Zand interregnum, until 1763), an Usūlī reaction emerged in the very bosom of the Ḥadhratī family, under Shāh Sulaymān Huṣayn (1694-1722). In an effort to destroy popular devotion to Aghbārī-inspired Imāms, thus regaining it for himself, and to isolate the Šūfi and mystical trend of the élite, as a prelude to attacking it, Muhammad Bākīr Ḥadhratī adopted Usūlīsm. This reversal and this strategy (adopted by other 'ulamā'ī), had decisive consequences for the consolidation of an Imami hierocracy (ibid., 151 ff.; on the Ḥadhratī family and its descendants see Cole (1985), 6 ff.).

During the years 1722-63, neo-Aghbārīsm was dominant in 'Irāk, especially among converts from Usūlīsm coming from Bahrayn or Iran. But it was not long before in Iran and even in 'Irāk, Imāmī 'ulamā'ī were observed moving discreetly from Aghbārism to Usūlīsm. After a difficult period for the 'ulamā', involving a kind of Sumni-Sī'ī ecumenism (1736-51) imposed by the religious policy of Nādir Shāh, the Šī'ī prospect underlining it was that of Karīm Khān moving his centre of government to Shīrāz (1763-79). However, Karīm Khān had little regard for the 'ulamā'ī (Perry, 220 ff.) and the decisive struggles took place at the 'ātābāt (q.v. in Suppl.), the Šī'ī holy places of 'Irāk, where the Aghbārīs exploited alliances with wealthy financiers and even with heads of criminal gangs (the 'īṣīs (q.v.)). The leading figures in this resurgence of Usūlīsm was Akā Sayyid Muhammad Bākīr Wuhād al-Bihbānī (d. 1208/1793-4 (q.v.), considered the "renovator" (muğaddid) of the 13th century of the Ĥidrā or as the founder (muṭassīs) of Imāmī jurisprudence. He was linked both spiritually and genealogically to Muḥammad Bākīr Ḥadhratī. Like other 'ulamā'ī of 'Irāk, he enjoyed the support of the merchant-artisan class (through the intermediary of family alliances). Forcibly imposing a reformulation of the Šī'ī doctrine and refuting Aghbārīsm (K. al-UGhābār wa l-UGbārī), he went so far as to proclaim taṣfīr (excommunication) against the Aghbārīs, sending armed men (his mirahdābos) to harry them, and persecuted the Ni'matulhāshī Sūfī order (Cole (1983), 39 ff.; idem., (1985), 15 ff.). Bihbānī and his followers succeeded in "converting" to Usūlīsm numerous Aghbārīs, some of whom migrated towards Iran (in part on account of political tensions between Iran and the governor 'Umar Pāša concerning Iranian pilgrims, instability and outbreaks of plague). Some 'ulamā'ī of Northern India were then trained in the Usūlī doctrine, which they proceeded to canvass in India (Cole (1985), 21 ff.). The resurgence of Usūlīsm, which developed during the 1760s in the 'ātābātī, was spread in Iran during the 1770s (ibid., 26).

In the final phase of the conflict, the last important representative of the Aghbārī school, the muhaddith Muhammad b. 'Abd al-Nabī al-Nishabhūrī al-Aghbārī, was discredited in the eyes of Fath 'Ali Shāh Kāḏīr (1759-1834), who was at that time sympathetic towards Aghbārīsm, by the Shaykh Da'ī 'far Kāshfī al-Ġhāthī (q.v.) who declared him an infidel. In spite of the protests of the Shāh, he was expelled to 'Irāk and killed by the mob at al-Kāzimīyān in 1233/1818 (Algar (1969), 65 ff.). Although the situation of the Aghbārīs subsequently declined rapidly, some groups survived and aspects or concepts of their doctrinal positions remained, especially in Shaykhism (generally considered as a special branch founded by Shaykh 'Abīd al-Askārī (q.v.), d. 1241/1826; see also Soe Mecn., art. ashirīsī in Encyclopaedia Iranica, i, 674-9). According to Shaykhism, each believer has, in principle, a vocation to tālīfīḥād, the only authority to be followed or imitated (taklīf) being that of the Hidden Imām (Corbin, iv, 252 f.).

4. The institution of mardja'īyyat-i taklīf.

Under the Kadjars, relationships of power with the Imami hierarchy were ambiguous. Since Nādir Shāh, the state had lost the "imperio-papal" character on which Safawid power had been based. Despite the continuation of the "separation-collaboration", Fath 'Ali Shāh sought and obtained confirmation of a certain degree of legitimisation on the part of eminent 'ulamā'ī such as Mīrāz Abū l-Kāsim Kūmi (d. 1233/1817-18), and Akā Sayyid Bihbānī, grandson of Wuhāḥ Bihbānī, who extolled Akā Muḥammad Shāh Kāshfī al-Ġhāthī, vizier of the crown prince 'Abdās Mīrzā, consulted them in connection with the threat of invasion on the eve of the first Irano-Russian conflict (1810-13). Their attitudes and their fatwās which they collected in his Rīsāla-yi dīhāsīya testify to their influence.

The most significant initiative came from Shaykh Da'ī 'far Kāshfī al-Ġhāthī who—in the capacity of naṣīḥat-i 'umma of the mudjāhadīs—authorized Fath 'Ali Shāh to conduct the dīhādī in the name of the Hidden Imām (on the parallels and divergencies between the Rīsāla-yi dīhāsīya and the positions adopted by Shaykh Da'ī 'far, see Lambton (1970 A), 187 ff.; cf. also Kohlberg (1976 B), 82 ff., Calder (1982 A), 6, and Arjomand (1984), 224 f.). This was also a time of re-assessment of the notion of naṣīḥat-i khāṣa. Relations of power, on the basis of the representatives of the Imāms (initially to the four sūfārān), became, with the endorsement of the fukāhā, applicable to the just sovereign. Although the system of taxation had little connection with dīhādī, the subject was discussed at this time, with the mudjāhadīs re-affirming their rights concerning kharājī and especially khāni of which a half, considered to be sām-i Imām ("the Imām's share"), should revert to them after the period of the dīhādī (Arjomand (1984), 229 f.).

The sharing of prerogatives between the 'ulamā'ī and the temporal power is well defined by Da'ī 'far Kāshfī in his Tuhfat al-mulūk. His dualist theory of legitimate authority, recalled by eminent mudjāhadīs under Nāṣir al-Dīn Shāh (1848-96), permitted the 'ulamā'ī to acquire financial autonomy and judicial rights independent of the state (ibid., 225 ff.). But it was especially the reformulation of concepts or doctrines regarding the powers and functions of the mudjāhadīs which led to a structuralisation of their leadership. Long discussions of dīhādī and taklīf culminated in establishing the competence of the mudjāhadīs in guiding the makālīdīs ("imitators") in matters of farā'ī-dīn (i.e. the "branches" derived from 'Imāmī doctrine), the taklīf of a dead mudjāhadī being definitively ruled out. The problem of the application of the ḥudūd during the ḥubūbā continues to be thoroughly debated (ibid., 231 ff.). The faithful
being unable to understand the code” must entrust himself to the instructions of a jurist ...
Sayyid Abu’l-Hasan Musawi IsfahanI (d. at Kazimayn, 1365/1946).
9. Sayyid Aka Husayn b. Muhammad Tabataba5!

considered the latter obliged to supplant the existing mudjtahids in the name of the Hidden Imam (Kazemi Moussavi (1984); idem (1985), 40 ff.). Although making of the most learned juriscon-
dult (which he calls aljanan al-shar’iyya) an independent subject of ImamI fıkh, he does not seem to have considered the latter obliged to supplant the existing power or to function in parallel with it (ibid., 43 ff.).

A new and decisive step was taken, however, with the doctrinal formulation of the concept of a’amliyyat according to which the ImamI community must follow or imitate the precepts of the most learned juriscon-
dult. Its premises may be traced back to the Ilkhanid period (it was then applied to the Imams, but one celebrated mudjihat then bore the title of “Allāmā” al-Hill). Under the Safawids, the term a’lam is clearly applied to the ImamI mudjihat (Hasan b. Zayn al- Dön Amili, Ma’ālim al-usul, quoted by Kazemi Moussavi, ibid.). When, after many cautious and hesitant attitudes, the political-religious hierarchy, having forced the ImamI hierarchy to adopt a hierarchy, the rehabilitation of the concept of a’amliyyat took on its full importance, since the title of marjā’i taklīd was given to the most learned mudjihat. In view of the obscurity surrounding the birth of the concept of marjā’iyya—the initial signs of which may be traced back to the Safavid period—the greatest mudjihat of the past have recently been reinstated, a posteriori, as proper marjā’i taklīd (on the lists, beginning with al-Kulaynī, d. 328/939, generally including sixty-three names and ending with Burūjirdi, see Bagley (1970), 31; Hairi, 62 f.; Fischer, Appx. 2, 252 ff.). This tendency to reassess, in regard to a concept or a doctrine, the great figures of the past is also found in Shi’I mardjavaiyyah in Momen, 206, Table 7).

Having been in a process of gestation since the birth of Usūlisim with Wahīd Bihbahanī, the concept of mardjā’iyya took on precise form under his successors. But neither Bihbahanī nor Ahmad Narakī bore the title of marjā’i taklīd (although Bihbahanī and his immediate successor Sayyid Muhammad Mahdi Tabātabā’ī “Bahr al-ulum”, d. 1212/1797, are currently called marjā’i taklīd in Shi’I biographical works: cf. McChesney, 168). For numerous mudjihat and ordinary worshipers in Iran and ’Irāk, the first to have secured this title and this function was Ḥādījī Shāykh Muhammad Hasan Nadjavf, d. 1266/1849-50, known by the name of Sahib al-Djawahir (i.e. the author of Jawahir al-kulam, “The jewels of scholarship”, the most remarkable post-Safavid work of fıkh (Cole (1983), 40 f.; McEoin (1983), 157). When the ImamI community was risen by the rite of Bābism, Muhammad Hasan Sahib al-Djawahir appointed Shāykh Murtaḍā Ansārī (d. 1281/1864) as his successor. Having offered it to Sa’īd al-Ulāmā Māzandarānī who refused it, Ansārī occupied this function for fourteen years and became the single marjā’i taklīd (marjā’i al-taklīd al- ‘elmī, 234). The need for recourse to authorized Uṣuli studies to a considerable extent and arranged direct payment of contributions (sahm-i ImamI to local centres of education. With him, the institution of mardjā’iyya attained its zenith. He defined its functions in the manual of ritual practice entitled Sirat al-najdī (“The Way of Salvation”). All the ImamI mardjavaiyyahs (Ismā’il, ’Irāk, India, the Caucasus and the Ottoman Empire) sent contributions to him representing considerable sums of money, yet he led a pious, simple and ascetic life. His political attitudes were moderate and he adopted a conciliatory policy towards the Bahās, who treated him with respect. Some of his works became manuals (Fara’id al-usul, al-Mokasib, and many of his pupils became mudjihat and even mudjāz-i taklīd (see Algar (1969), 162 ff.; Hairi, art. Ansārī, in Suppl.; idem (1977), 63; Cole (1983), 40 ff.; Murtaḍā al-Ansārī, list of his works, 131-4). Besides the piety and the wisdom of al-Ansārī, the emergence of a single mudjihat to occupy the supreme function of mardjā’iyya owes much to the disappearance of major ImamI potentates as well as to the decline of Isfahān and the rise of Nadjavf as an ImamI religious centre (art. Ansārī, in Suppl.; Kazemi Moussavi (1985), 45 f.)

Henceforward, it was in the ‘atabāh, especially at Nadjavf, but also at Sāmārā (site of the “catcomb” of the Hidden ImamI), places of residence and instruction of the major marjā’i taklīd, that resistance was organised to Kādjār autocracy and foreign domination. Although not political at the outset, the institution of the marjā’iyyat became, because of the historical circumstances and the respective attitudes of each of the mudjihat. Unlike his predecessor, Ansārī issued no directives concerning his succession. But his definition of the institutional and ideological role of marjā’i taklīd, “supreme model” offered opportunities for the exercise of political prerogatives of which his followers took advance, beginning with his immediate successor Mārzā Muddajdah, and his immediate successor Mārzā Shīrzād (d. 1312/1894), who assumed the responsibility of issuing the fatwā to revoke a concession on Iranian tobacco awarded to a British company (the Excise Affair, fatwā of December 1891; cf. Bibli. in Hairi (1977), 111, n. 8).

The essential characteristic of the institution of mardjā’iyya in the 19th century is that the office was occupied successively by a single marjā’i taklīd. After the death of Mīrza Shīrzād, a number of mudjihat, equally qualified and unable to choose among themselves, were recognised as single marjā’I only after the demise of their colleagues. This tendency towards selection by longevity—working to the disadvantage of numerous highly-qualified mudjihat—was continued until the death of Burūjirdi. Since the beginning of the institution, the list of marjā’i taklīd who exercised the function in a sole capacity for a greater of shorter period of time until their death is summarised as follows:

1. Ḥādījī Shāykh Muhammad Hasan Isfahānī Nadjavf, “Sahib al-Djawahir” (d. at Nadjavf 1266/ 1860).
2. Mārzā Murtaḍā Ansārī (d. at Nadjavf 1281/1864).
3. Mārzā Hasan Shīrzād, mudjihat of the 19th century of the Hidjra (d. at Sāmārā 1312/1895).
5. Ḥudjdjat al-lām Sāyīd Muhammad Kazīm Tabātabā’ī Yazdī (d. at Huwāysh, near Nadjavf, 1337/1919).
6. Mīrza Muhammad Tākī Ḥā’īrī Shīrzād (d. at Karbalā, 1358/1920).
7. Sāyīd Fadl Allāh Isfahānī “Shāykh al-Sharī‘a” (died 1369, surviving his predecessor by only four months).
8. Ḥudjdjat Sāyīd Abu’l-Hasan Mūsāwī Isfahānī (d. at Kazīmīyān, 1365/1946).
9. Sāyīd Akā Husayn b. Muhammad Tabātabā’ī
Have you looked at the text of the document?
in this context that there is taking place the muted struggle over succession to Ayatullah/Imam Kâhumî, the Assembly of Experts (mâjlis-i hâqîqî) has recently (October 1986) criticized the “heir-apparent”, Ayatullah Muntazîrî, Hujjat al-Islâm Râfsandjâni, President of Parliament, now appears to be a possible successor.

5. Qualifications, selection, functions, consultative rôle and titles of the mardja^-i taklîd. Among the conditions necessary for assuming the position of mardja^-i taklîd, six are judged indispensable: maturity (hulîgh), intelligence (sâbî), faith (îmân), justice (sadâlî), being of legitimate birth (tabârat-i mawlid) and of the male sex (îshûkhârât; some women may, under exceptional circumstances, attain the level of iqtîsâd, but they cannot be mardja^-i taklîd). Other conditions are sometimes required: literacy, possession of hearing and sight, and being free, i.e. not a slave (Algar (1969), 8 f., following Burûjirdî, Sangîlî). In addition to these preliminary conditions, the future mardja must be qualified to practice iqtîsâd, receive the i'dâja  from 'ulama of repute and demonstrate his knowledge through his teaching, his sermons, his discussions, his writings, etc. The mardja must be generally acknowledged as the most learned person of his time. However, this title cannot be awarded to him through appointment, selection or election. His authority can only be confirmed by the universal recognition of the Imâmi community (Hairî (1977), 62; it seems however that there was at Kum a kind of “college of cardinals” deciding on the choice of the supreme mardja, the Ayatullah al-'Uzma (see Binder, 134)).

The essential function of the mardja^-i taklîd—also called mukallid—is to guide the community of those who “imitate” his teaching and follow his precepts, in particular concerning the following: application of the rules of the sharî'a (furû'-i din); judicial solutions or legal qualifications (âkâm) in regard to the problems of contemporary life. Imitation or emulation of the mardja has no connection, in principle, with the wujîl-î din which are derived from faith (îmân) and from inner conviction (yakîn). The mukallid established as mardja must pronounce judicial decisions (fatwâs) and write one or more books to guide his mukallids (risâla-yi 'amâliyya, a kind of practical treatise; tawdîh al-masa'il, “explanation of problems” etc.).

For his part, the mukallid has particular duties, especially as regards consultation of the mardja^-i taklîd to whom access is sometimes difficult. The rules of conduct in this respect are explained at length by 'Ansârî who forbids taklîd of a dead mudjâhid and stresses the role of the most learned (a'sâm) mudjâhid in sanctioning worship and ritual. Every mukallid is obliged to consult him, to follow or to “imitate” him, either directly, or in a case of obvious impossibility, through the intermediary of an honest man who has himself witnessed to conduct of the mardja, or through consultation of a book of rules of behaviour written by the latter. In cases of doubt or contradiction, prudence (hiûd) is recommended (on these complicated rules for consultation of the mardja see the analysis in the Sîrat al-mâdâjî of 'Ansârî, in Cole (1983), 42 ff.). These criteria represent only general principles, no specific process having been established for the choice of a mardja (cf. Algar (1969), 10).

With the development of the concept of mardja^-iyat, the economic power enjoyed by the mudjâhid has been concentrated in the hands of one man or a small group of men. Besides the collection and distribution of zakât and kâhumî, the administration of wadrafauce (taken under state control by the Pahlavîs), the mudjâhid have economic and family ties with the merchants who formed the merchant-artisan class of the bazar. The Imâmi 'ulama have also sometimes taken advantage of threats posed to political authority by movements such as the Sûfîs, Shîyähîs, Bahîs, etc. In fact, they have taken the initiative in countering or representing the doctrines and activities of groups seeking to find alternative solutions to the prolonged absence of the Hidden Imâm (wâlî-yi sâfî, 'âsâr-yi hâmûl, ra'sân-râbî’s) (“fourth pillar” of Shîyâ, Bahî, etc.). Despite periods of tension or confrontation, mudjâhid rise to abuses claiming the niyâbî^-î sîmaa have in varying degrees given a certain amount of support to the existing temporal power and have formulated a “variable approach” towards accommodation with an illegal régime established de facto (cf. Calder (1982), 6).

However, remaining generally mistrustful of both spiritual and temporal powers, the mudjâhid claimed for themselves an important role in the political life of Kâdar Iran (see especially Algar (1969)). Although abstaining from political activity, 'Ansârî formulated the notion of mardja^-i taklîd^-î a'âlî which offers the potential for political utilisation (cf. Cole (1983), 46 and below). Some of his successors have strongly resisted foreign economic, cultural and political influences from the West. In the interest of one man or by the political choices of the Kâdârs. They nevertheless held extremely diverse opinions regarding the events of the constitutional revolution of 1905-11 (cf. Lambon (1970 B); Hairî (1976-7), (1977), 55 ff.; Arjomand (1981)). In fact, neither the supporters nor the opponents of the constitution have ever reached the establishment of a government directly controlled by the mudjâhid. It is quite clear that recent events in the Middle East (in particular the seizure of power by a religious in Iran (1979), the Iran-İrâk war (since 1980) and the situation in Lebanon) have added to the difficulties of Shî believers, increasingly preoccupied with political choices and economic problems.

Since the Kâdâr period, the number of titles and functions, civil as well as religious, has increased considerably in Iran. This has given rise to abuses, especially among the Ayatullahîs and the Imâmî 'ulama (cf. Algar (1969), 10 ff.), often used to denote a mardja^-i taklîd. Although the distinctions remain somewhat fluid, current usage seems to describe a mardja^-i taklîd by the epithet Ayatullahî al-'Uzma, the term Ayatullah alone being used to describe a mudjâhid and Hudjdat al-Islâm an aspiring mudjâhid (Momen, 205 f.). According to a recent decree of Kâhumî (September 1984), certain 'ulama who used to call themselves Ayatullahî are henceforward to bear the title of Hudjdat al-Islâm (Momen, 298 f.; the two titles having been inter-changeably used until the creation of the hawad-yi 'ilmîyya of Kûm in the 1920s: Djalâl Matînî, 383 f.).

The question may be asked whether the replacement of the title of Ayatullahî by that of Imâm to designate Kûhumî signifies a change in the religious hierarchy (i.e. the creation of a title superior to that of Ayatullahî al-'Uzma) or is simply an indication of political function (Momen, ibid.; on these problems of Shî titles and their historical precedents, see Djalâl Matînî; on the epithet Imâm for Kûhumî, 603 f.).

Bibliography and abbreviations: Concerning the abundant literature on the Imâmî usîl, see H. Lischner, Die dogmatischen Grundlagen des 'islâmisches Rechts, Cologne, Berlin, etc. 1971; Brunschwig (1970); Abu 'I-Kásîm Gourî, Nâbîî bi 'âshîyà-yi Khâmî, in Makdîlî wa barrasîh, xiii, 1352; H. Mûdarîsî Tabâtabâ'î, An introduction
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MARDJAN (A.), coral. As a rule, red coral (Corallium rubrum) is used as a piece of jewelry; the black and white coral are also mentioned. The Persian term bussadh, often employed as a synonym, strictly speaking is the root of the coral “which grows as a stone in the sea in the same way as a tree on land” (al-Kazwí, Cosmography, i, 212,7), as well as the subsoil to which it is stuck.

With the pearl (la’atu [q. v.] and amber (kahrubá [q. v.]), the coral belongs to the organic products which were however, in our time, mostly associated with the precious stones (dagárakht), i.e. the minerals (ma‘ádatin). The most detailed information on the coral is given by al-Tífáší (see Bibl.), according to which the coral belongs to the mineral kingdom on the one hand because of its petrification (tabádhífar), and to the vegetable one on the other because it grows on the bottom of the sea like a tree with branches and twigs. For the rest, descriptions are taken over from antiquity. According to the Pharaohs, the coral, which grows in the sea, is like a stone, red and round like a carrot (De lapidibus, 38). Pliny (History naturalis, xxxii, 11) repeats a number of older tales on the way coral is won. He describes it as a shrub which, on green stalks, sprouts green, soft berries which petrify, turn red the moment they come out of the water and look like cornelians. According to Aristotle, the coral “is a red-coloured stone which grows in the sea. If put in dung and putrescent material, it is often used chemically” (al-Kazwí, Cosmography, i, 238, 5-6). According to the so-called “Stone-book of Aristotle”, the coral grows in the way branches do, and puts forth thin or thick twigs (Kitáb al-Ahğár, see Bibl.). As opposed to these relatively sober statements, Ps.-Apollonius of Tyana [see BÁDÚZ] enlarges and speculates upon the double vegetable-mineral nature of the coral: “It resembles the waterplants; it originates from fire and earth through the intermediary of water... its body is mineral-like because hot fire and dry earth combine in it with the help of water, but its spirit is vegetable-like because water acts as a mediator... when water, warmed by the sun, absorbs the dryness of the earth, it becomes able, in its turn, to attract the warmth and dryness of the sun, and so the coral grows gradually like a plant; in cold air however it petrifies... its vegetable character is shown by the fact that it grows and branches in proportion to the warmth which the water, mixed with dryness, causes to mount in it as nourishment”; see Sur al-fílajka wa-‘an ʼa-t-fíhka. Buch über das Geheimnis der Schöpfung und der Darstellung der Natur, ed. Ursula Weisser, Leipzíg 1979, 348, 7-351.8; cf. also the shortened translation by the same author in Das “Buch über das Geheimnis der Schöpfung” von Pseudo-Apollonius von Tyana, Berlin-New York 1980, 120 f. (Ars medica, iii, 2). In al-Tífáší, who in general quotes Apollonius extensively, the same passage is found on p. 178 f.

Coral is repeatedly said to be won at Marsá ‘I-Kharáz (~ La Calle in Algeria); from a boat, a wooden cross, weighted with a stone, is sunk on a rope to the bottom of the sea; the boat sails up and down so that the corals get caught at the extremities of the cross, which then is weighed with a jerk. Then emerges a body with a brown crust, branched like a tree. On the markets, these corals are abraded until they shine and show the desired red colour, then are sold in great quantities at a low price. Spain, Sicily and the “Frankish” i.e. probably the European, coast are given as other finding places. From the western Mediterranean, still nowadays the main deposit area of coral, it is shipped to the Orient, the Yemen, India and East Asia. At the finding places, coral is put on the markets in quantities of 10.5 Egyptian raths, costing, in Egypt and ‘Irák, 1,020 dirhams if polished, 1,100 dirhams if unpolished. Otherwise, prices fluctuate greatly according to the market situation (al-Dínáángí, Kitáb al-Íbár, illa maḥásín al-Íbárí, in Wiedemann, Aufsätze, i, 858).
In medicine, coral is used above all in collyria against eye diseases (full description by al-Tamlml, kurdliyun), and mentions the *pliGxgKxvSpov* "stone-tree" as a synonym because of the above-mentioned vegetable-mineral double nature of the coral. It is astringent and mineral double nature of the coral. It is astringent and quickly reduces proliferations, is effective against dysentery. A remedy against blockage of the urinary tracts. The root is whitened with tooth-powder, pounded coral cleanses and burned overnight in an oven and then baked. Mixed with tooth-powder, pounded coral cleanses and whitens the teeth, purifies the interstices between them, strengthens the gums and removes cavities in the roots. Until today, pulverised coral serves in the Orient as an anti-epilepticum and as a remedy against dysentery.

**Bibliography:** Dioscorides deals with it under *xoupocXiov*, *alia* and *djawdhir*, Haydarabad 1355, 137 f., 189-93; Ibn Bîikalîg, *K. al-Musta'i*nînâ, ms. Naples, Bibl. Naz. III, F. 63, ed. C. Dubler and E. Hayul'd 'l-tibb, *Uber die Steine. Das 14. Kapitel aus dem... al-Ma'sîrât al-'afkdr ft djawdhir al-'ahdjdr*, ed. M. Wellmann, lib. V 121 = tr. Stephanos, *K. al-Dj_dmdhir fi ma^rifat al-Mursid* des... al-TamimT, Freiburg 1976, 200, 208, 211, 263 (based on Latin sources); Tifashl, *K. al-Kazwtm, Kosmographie*, zum Jahresbericht 1895-196 der prov. Oberrealschule Aus dem "Handbuch der Chirurgie" des Ibn al-Quff, *Umda*, Haydarabad 1356, *Ansdb*, am, 491; al-Sam c... al-Kazwtm, *Die "Einfachen Heilmittel" i, 220, cf. H.G. Kircher, Berthelot, *La chimie au Moyen Age*, Inspectoral des Pharmacies au Caire, Cairo 1930, no. 3 (see tr. N. Elias and E. D. Ross, London 1985, index. Bartolomeus, Governor-Generalship of Turkestan, some 7 miles/12 km. south of the Sir Darya [q.v.], or Jaxartes, on a small river now called the Margelan Say. It was a place of modest importance in the first Islamic centuries as one of the main towns, with *inter alia* Andidjan [q.v.]. of the district of Farghana known as Lower Nassy, according to al-Mokaddast, 272 (see also Le Strange, *Lands, 479*; Ibn Hawkal* 513-14, 491; al-Sam2nî, Anâb, facs. ed. f. 522a), it had a Friday mosque and markets. Coins were first minted there under the Sâmanîs. Then under the Khârjiânids [see *iEek-klâns*], coins were occasionally minted by members of the eastern branch of the dynasty, e.g. at Marghinân and the neighbouring towns of Aksiskâh and Tûnhâk by the son of Yûsuf Kâdir b. Shâh, Mahmûd Toghrîl Kara Khân (451-67/1059-75) and then by the latter's son 'Umar Toghrîl Tigin (467/1074-5), see G. C. Miles, in *Camb. hist. of Iran*, v, 374, 376; E. von Zambur, Die Münzprägungen des Islams zeitlich und örtlich geordnet, 1, Wiesbaden 1968, 233. It was in the later Karâkhânîd or Kara Khitiy [q.e.] period that the famous Hanafi jurist Burhân al-Dîn al-Marghinânî [see next article] was born.

Marghinânî appears on a Chinese map of the 14th century as Ma-rh-i-nang (Bretschneider, *Levant au Moyen Age*, Suppl. 1895-196, 212, 238, tr. J. Ruska, *The modern history of Soviet Central Asia*, London 1964, 108 ff.). Old Margelan is still a place named Skoblev from 1907 till 1924. When the Bolsheviks began to impose their rule in Russian Central Asia, Margelan became a centre of Basmâfi [q.o.] resistance from January 1918 till 1922 (see G. R. Wheeler, *The modern history of Soviet Central Asia*, London 1964, 108 ff.). Old Margelan is still a place of significance, with nearly 48,000 inhabitants, but has been outrivaled in growth by New Margelan, now called Fergana, the administrative centre of the Fergana oblast of the Uzbek S.S.R., which already in 1951 had a population of ca. 50,000.

**Bibliography:** Given in the article; see also Barthold, *Turkistan*, 158-9, 315. (C. E. Bosworth)

**Marghâlnî, the name of two families of Hanâfi lawyers; the nisba comes from their native town and the scene of their activities, Marghâlnî [q.e.] in Farghana.**

**Mardjân — Al-Marghînâni**, the title of a town of Farghana, in the north of the Aksissâk region, situated to the south of the Sir Dâryâ [q.e.] or Jaxartes, on a small river now called the Margelan Say.

**Marea [see Marya].**

**Marghelan** [see Marghīnān].

**Marghīnān, later form Marghelān, a town of Farghana.**

**Mardjân** [see Mery].
celebrated Hidāya. He acquired his knowledge on his travels, then still the usual way of studying in Islam. His principal teachers were 'Abd al-Hājī al-Luknawī, 'Abd al-Mu'min b. Abd al-Nasafī, Ahmad al-Naṣafī (d. 537/1142-3), a pupil of 'Abd al-Mashhād al-Khāṣṣī, 'Abd al-'Azīz b. 'Umar b. Māzā (d. 556/1161-2) and Abū 'Amr b. 'Uthmān b. 'Abd al-Baykānī (d. 552/1157), a pupil of al-Sarakhsi. He studied al-Nawzilī and his son 'Abd al-Karīm b. al-Takhāwī who compiled from the Maraghehī al-Fuṣūl al-Fisāla and other works (H. Kh., no. 9305); 4. two collections of fatwas: Kātib al-Fardhī al-Farīdī (K. Ji'īl-Fardhī, no. 12,943); 3. two commentaries on al-Shaybānī's al-Fuṣūl (K. Kh., no. 1,394; and also with al-Hasan b. 'Uthman b. 'Abd al-Nasafī. He far surpassed his teachers and won recognition in his native town also, where he died in 593/1197. Of his works, the following are known, some surviving in manuscript and others only known from literary references: 1. Naṣīr al-madhābih (Kur., Lakh., in Hādīgī al-Khāṣṣī, no. 13,790, probably wrongly, al-Maddābih). 2. Maṣāḥih al-biddah (Kur., Lakh., K. Kh., no. 9305); 3. K. fi 'l-Farā'id (Kur., Lakh.), also called Farā'id al-'Uthmānī (K. Kh., no. 8,989); 4. two collections of fatwas: K. al-Tadhīn wa 'l-Mazīd (K. Ji'īl-Fardhī, no. 2,467; mss. in Brockelmann) and Muḥammad b. Asād al-Faṭīmī (Lakh.; in K. Ji'īl-Fardhī, no. 11,586; called Muhārūt al-nawzilī, mss. in Brockelmann); 6. Mazīd fi farā'id al-Hanafiyya (K. Kh., no. 11,838; identical with no. 4?); 7. a commentary on al-Shaybānī's al-Dīnārī al-kabīr (K. Kh., ii, 567); 8. his principal work is the legal compendium Kātib al-mubtādī (mss. in Brockelmann), based on al-Kuti's Mukhārīs al-Shaybānī and al-Shaybānī's al-Dīnārī al-saghir. On this work, he himself wrote a large commentary in 8 volumes, the Kātib al-mubtādī. But before he had completed it, he thought it was much too diffuse and decided to write a second commentary, the celebrated Hidāya, which later writers repeatedly edited and annotated. The most important commentaries and synopses are given in the table below.

For the manuscripts and printed texts of these commentaries and synopses and of many supercommentaries and glosses, see Brockelmann, ii, 466-9, S 1, 644-9; a printed edition of the Hidāya appeared in 4 vols., Cairo 1324/1908.

Bibliography:

al-Kurāshī, al-Dīnawī al-muṣīlī, Haydarābād 1332, i, 383, no. 1058; 'Abd al-Hājī al-Luknawī, al-Fauṣī'ī al-baḥṣār, Cairo 1324, 141 ff. (synopsis of the Tabākāt of Kāfāwī); Ibn Kūltūbī, Tādī al-tanāqīm, ed. Flügel, Leipzig 1862, no. 124; Brockelmann, loc. cit., and the literature there given.

His sons and pupils were:

2. 'Imād al-Dīn al-Farghānī, cf. al-Luknawī, 116. 3. 'Umar Naṣīm al-Dīn al-Farghānī. Two works by him are recorded: 1. Faṣī'ī (K. Kh., no. 9305); 2. Naṣīr al-Farā'ī, which he compiled from the Mukhārīs of al-Tahwīl and other works (H. Kh., no. 4,291; mss. in Brockelmann, S 1, 649; cf. al-Kurāshī, i, 394; al-Luknawī, 149).

4. Muḥammad Abū 'l-Fāṭār al-Dīn al-Farghānī, cf. Kutl., 137 and al-Luknawī, 182; in al-Kurāshī, ii, 99, apparently identical with no. 2. 5. A son of no. 2 and grandson of no. 1: Abū 'l-Fāṭār Zā'ūn al-Dīn 'Abd al-Rahīm b. Abī Bakr 'Imād al-Dīn b. Abī Burān al-Dīn al-Farghānī. Two works by him are recorded: 1. Faṣī'ī (K. Kh., no. 9,094; Lakh., 93; Brockelmann, i, 475-6, S 1 656, where the mss. are given.

II. Another family of Hanāfī lawyers goes back to 'Abd al-'Azīz b. 'Abd al-Razzāk b. Naṣīr b. Dīsamīr b. Sulaymān al-Marghimāni, who died in 1477/1084-5 in Marghimān at the age of 68. Of his six sons who attained fame as muftis, we may mention Abū 'l-Hasān Zāhir al-Dīn 'Alī (d. 506/1112-13). His son and pupil was Zāhir al-Dīn al-Hāsān b. Abū al-Maḥāsin. Four works by him are recorded: al-Adīkūr, al-Fadāwī, al-Fauṣā'ī and al-Shurūt, of which only the last survives in manuscript. He was the teacher of the famous Fākhīr al-Dīn Kādīḥīn (d. 592/1196) and of Burān al-Dīn al-Marghimāni [q.v.].

Bibliography:

Samānī, K. al-Anṣāb, fol. 522a; Kurāshī, nos. 487, 850, 1010; Lakhnāwī, 62, 97, 121; Flügel, Classen der hanšīfī Rechtsgeschichte, Leipzig 1860, 309; Brockelmann, i, 471, S 1, 651.

MARHALA (al-), pl. marāšīb, in mediaeval Islamic usage, a stage of travel, normally the distance which a traveller can cover in one day; it was, there-
fore, obviously a variable measurement of length, dependent on the ease or difficulty of the terrain to be crossed. The classical Arabic geographers frequently use the term Al-Mukadadda [q.v.] in one place (206) gives as his norm 6 to 7 farsakhs or parasangs (the farsakh [q.v.] being roughly 6 km.), and has an ingenious orthographical notation for marhāl of less than 6 or more than 7 farsakhs (cf. A. Miquel, La géographie humaine du monde musulman jusqu’au milieu du 11e siècle, Paris-The Hague 1967-80, i, 328 n. 1). But elsewhere (64 n. c.), his sanda works out at an average of 8.6 farsakhs = 50 km. (cf. Miquel, Ahsan at-taqāṣīm ... (La meilleure répartition ...), Damascus 1965, 139 n. 6).

Bibliography: Given in the article. (Ed.)

MĀRĪB, Māʾrīb (myrāb or mārib in the ancient South Arabian inscriptions), in classical antiquity, capital of the Sabaean realm in South-West Arabia, now the chief-city of the mudāfāa of the same name in the Yemeni Arab Republic, lying some 135 km. to the east of Sanʿā. At the last census in 1975, the mudāfāa of Mārib counted 70,000 inhabitants, and the kādaʾ of Mārib—with a population density of 2.4 inhabitants per km.2—13,000 inhabitants, consisting of about 10,000 residents, 2,000 Bedouins, and 1,000 refugees. The ṭaʿaṣ of Mārib counted 15,000 residents, and the place Mārib itself only 292 inhabitants, of whom 270 were men and 22 women, in 48 houses.

The ancient town of Mārib lies in a plain which rises 1,160-1,200 m. above sea level, and which forms the dry delta of the great Adhāna wadi (now pronounced Dhana). The latter drains an extensive area of over 10,000 km.2 in the north-eastern highlands of the Yemen which has an abundant rainfall. Since the Mārib region lies at the fringe of the desert in an arid zone which has an annual rainfall of less than 100 mm., agriculture is only possible by way of irrigation through flooding. The Adhāna wadi carries water twice a year, namely for some two weeks in spring and some six weeks in late summer. Before reaching the oasis of Mārib, this wadi forces its way through a narrow passage between the Balak mountains, and even before the extensive irrigation became possible and the deposition of fertile clay easier, so that conditions for a lush vegetation were created. The Kurʾānic statement in Sūrat Sāḥīb (baldat al-bātūtah: XXXIV,15) is rightly applied to Mārib and its surroundings (al-Hamādānī, al-Hillī, viii, 57, 1). The land of Sāḥīb around Mārib is said to have been one of the most fertile and best irrigated regions of the Yemen (al-Māṣūdī, Murīdī, iii, 366, 9-367,2 = § 1252), with irrigation creating the possibility of three sowings per year (Yākūt, Muʾālīm, iv, 383,10). The actual place of the same name stands inside the ancient urban area on a great hill of ruins which is increased by the debris of ancient cultures. It lies at 15° 26′ N. and 45° 16′ E., about as far from the Red Sea as from the Gulf of Ṣadān. By its favourable position in an oasis between the highland on the one side and the desert on the other, Mārib was predisposed to be the capital of the Sabaean realm, the core of which was formed by the urban district of Sāḥīb with Mārib as its centre. Besides, Mārib was one of the most important halting-places on the ancient caravan-route which linked the regions producing incense with the Mediterranean Sea and which, along a chain of water-places, skirted the fringes of the wadis and the eastern slope of the range of hills between the mountains and the sandy plain of the desert. Arriving from Shibwā in Hadramawt or Timnā in Katabān respectively, two different routes of the incense-road led on from Mārib, one north-westward through the Ḍawf, the other first northward, to unite again before Naǧrān [q.v.], the circumference of six miles. From the shape of its ruins, still perceptible in our days, the town formed an irregular quadrangle, with a maximum extension of 1,430 m. in length and 1,070 m. in breadth. The remains of the ancient town, such as blocks of stone from the city-wall and other constructions as well as fragments of columns, have disappeared almost completely in the last decades through unauthorised diggings. Consequently, since no scientific archaeological excavations have been carried out, for the description of ancient Mārib we still depend upon the information of the European travellers who, in the 19th century, succeeded in penetrating as far as Mārib under adventurous and dangerous circumstances. These were the two Frenchmen Th. J. Arnaud (1843) and J. Halévy (1870), and the Austrian archbishop on his third journey to South Arabia (1888). It is to the latter that we owe the most detailed, accurate and valuable observations.

More recent investigations in the Mārib oasis, carried out by the German Archaeological Institute in Sanʿā, have led to the conclusion that the irrigation sediments in places reach as high as 30 m. At a rate of sedimentation of 1.1 cm. per year, this height would lead to an irrigation period of ca. 2,700 years, i.e., if irrigation ended around the end of the 6th century A.D. or the first part of the 7th century, its beginning would reach back as far as the later period of the third millennium B.C. As for inscriptions, Mārib is mentioned in one of the earliest Sabaean texts which names a ruler, namely in G1 1719 + 1718 + 1718 = MAFRAY-al-Balak-al-Djanubi 1, a rock-inscription in which one of the governors (Yān) of Mārib (myrāb), the governor (kāna) or Yādāʾ 2 (Yādāʾ 2 Yādāʾ) dedicates some stone-hewn basins to a deity. H. von Wissmann, whose investigations into the chronology of ancient Sabaean texts is largely utilised in the following, dates this text to around 755 B.C.; its ducus belongs to the oldest paleographic stage of ancient South Arabian script. But already before this period, Mārib may well have become the capital of the Sabaean realm and the centre of South Arabia. The earliest Sabaean inscription bearing directly upon the town of Mārib is probably the three-line boustrophedon inscription (Ga 46), published by G. Garbini in Oriens Antiquus, xii (1975), 143. Here Yīthʾsamar Bayyin, son of Sumḥulʾaʾli, relates that he has walled in myrāb ḫakke. The Mukarrib of Sabaʾ named here is most probably to be dated to 715 B.C., while Hawkawī, which figures after the name of the town of Mārib, is likely to indicate a part of the town or a section of its fortifications.

Rock-inscriptions dating from the same period or even earlier, and likewise originating from the Mārib region, mention the oasis area of the town. These inscriptions, containing probably the oldest Sabaean texts, inform us in ever recurring formulaic phrases that, during the priesthood of their founder, the god Yāṭaʾr became the protector of the town by means of the rain in high summer and spring. Occasionally the word "Umm al-murūb, i.e., "the maternal of Sabaʾ", or the variant "Adhāna from Yahwir to
Himarum' Gawr indicates the lowland, i.e. the lower course of the wadi Adhana, while the expression 'Adhana from Yahwir to Himarum' probably also describes the area of the Mārib oasis. The name Saba', emerging here as the name of the region in which Mārib was situated, is originally the name of a tribe which in the inscriptions is more than once named together with Mārib. So we find e.g. "the tribe of Saba', the lords of the town of Mārib and its valleys" (ṣb'h/ṣb'ḥ/ṣb'nl/wṣb'nl/wṣb'nl: RES 3910, 2), or "the Sabaens, the inhabitants of the town of Mārib' (ṣb'h/ḥmr/ḥmr/ṣb:mm: Ga 9,3-4 with a reading corrected after F. Bron, in AION, xli [1981], 163). Still in Arabic tradition, Mārib is indicated as Ma'rīb Saba', e.g. al-Hamdani, Sīfa, 26, 22) i.e. the Mārib which lies in Saba'. After Saba', as a byname of 'Abd Shams, had been personified as the alleged ancestor of the Sabaens, and had been inserted into a pedigree by Arab genealogists, Mārib could thus become the town of Saba', that is to say of Saba' b. Yāṣḥūb b. Kāḥṭān, who allegedly founded it or after whom it also occasionally may have been named (see e.g. Yākūṭ, Mašṭakī, ed. F. Wüstenfeld, 239, 17-8; Ibn Sāfīd al-Maghribī, Naḥwāt al-takrīb, 87, 1-2; Ibn al-Mudājwīr, Taḥyīkh al-mustahbiḥ, 199, 1-2).

Line 4 of the fragmentary inscription RES 3943 relates that the ruler constructed both gates of Mārib and surrounded the town with towers, that is bastions of limestone (bk). The ruler, whose name is not retained in the text, may be Yīḥāq'āmar Bāyyīn, son of Sūmu'ālī Yānūf, whose reign can be fixed around 510 B.C. When the Sabaean realm reached the zenith of its power and founded a colony in Abyssinia, there were among the colonists also emigrants from Mārib, as is shown by the indications of their origin ḍm-mḥpb, found in Sabaean inscriptions in Yeha and Melazo.

By its geographical position at the eastern side of the mountains, Mārib was protected only slightly by nature: to the south, plains stretched out as far as Timna', the capital of Katabān, to the east as far as Shabwa, the capital of Hadramawt, and to the north as far as the towns of the Minaean realm. With the rise and strengthening of these other ancient South Arabian realms, fortification of Mārib became an urgent necessity. The town was not only the capital, but had also become the eastern fortress of the land-locked Sabaean realm: its frontier with Katabān was only some 25 km. south of Mārib, and that with the Minaeans only some 40 km. to the north. The improvement of the traffic connections with the Yemeni highlands and their maintenance became all the more urgent through the danger threatening from the south. Inscription CIH 955 + 418, dating from the period of Sūmu'ālī Yānūf around 390 B.C., mentions the construction of a road from Mārib to Sirwāḥ, the second important town of the Sabaean realm, to which refuge could be taken in case of necessity. "The town which is revered" (ḥmrnl/hmrnl) in CIH 375,2, very probably also indicates Mārib. From this inscription, dealing with the construction of the Awām temple, we learn that an attack from Katabān against Saba' could be repelled and that its founder brought peace to Mārib. CIH 37, an inscription of the vassal of Sūmālī in the Yemeni highlands drawn up under king Karīb'īl Wātar at the beginning of the 3rd century B.C., speaks about the Sabaean overlords as kings of Mārib (mlk/mḥpb). The next information about the construction of a wall of Mārib cannot be fitted in accurately, since only the name of the king's father, Yīḥāq'āmar Wātar, has been preserved (RES 4452, CIH 625, G1 1110). The latter, however, cannot be identified with either of the other rulers of this name. On palaeographic grounds, the three frag-
ments belonging to this text can be dated to the middle of the 2nd century B.C. The kings of Saba    repaired the walls of their capital, above all at the time in which danger from the outside was threatening. At that time, the city may still have been the encirclement by Katabān in the south and Maṣīn in the north, which ended only when Saba    conquered the Minean realm in the last quarter of the 2nd century B.C. A monumental inscription, occurring in at least nine homonymous versions and compiled by H. von Wissmann from more than fifty fragments (RES 2669, P. Sa 91 + 92, GL 1103 and many others), reads as follows: ‘‘Yada    il Watar, king of Saba    , son of Sumhūṣ ʿ al īl Yānūf, walled Mārib (mrb) in the order and promise of ‘Aṭṭar and Ḥawbās and Aḥmaḵ’. Unfortunately, the name of this ruler is not known from other inscriptions either, although von Wissmann plausible dated him to around 30 B.C.

Shortly after the latter date, in 25-24 B.C., a Roman army under Aelius Gallus, the proconsul of Egypt, invaded South Arabia, escorted by Naba    , and reached, as Strabo relates, the gates of the Sabaean capital Mārib. Although assaulted during a period of six days, Mārib was able to resist, for the Romans were forced to withdraw because of scarcity of water and disease among their troops. Pliny is certainly not correct in counting Mārib among the towns that were destroyed by the Romans. As Pliny reports, Mārib was used as waste land, and the Romans destroyed the irrigation works of the oasis. After their retreat, the most urgent task of the inhabitants of Mārib may well have been the reconstruction of the dam, the sluices, and the water-distributors. Numerous fragments of Yada    il Watar’s inscription about the construction of the wall were found to have been used again as building material near the northern sluice and its distributor installations. From this, it may be concluded that ashlars were removed from the city-wall, probably destroyed for the greater part, in order to set up the irrigation works anew and to revitalise the oasis of Mārib. Is it not known at what time the city-wall was reconstructed, because no inscriptions about the construction of the wall are known from that period. However, in the middle of the 3rd century A.D., the Romans were forced to withdraw because of scarcity of water and disease among their troops.

The town was still preserved almost entirely. Air photographs of recent years show on the western and northern side only a few ruins of the ancient city-wall with its bastions.

During the decades after the Roman campaign against South Arabia, a period of decline set in for Mārib. The traditional dynasty of the kings of Saba    in Mārib was pressed hard by rulers of four other dynasties rising in the Yemeni highland. All of them assumed also the title of king of Saba    and controlled Mārib alternately. Saba    and Ḥimyar, which had grown strong, were hostile to each other, each claiming the realm of the other. Henceforth, the kings of both states bore the title ‘‘King of Saba    and Dhu Raydān’’, the latter being the royal castle in the Ḥimyātī capital of Zāfār. In the same period, Beduins from the desert steppes also pressed forward from the north and the east into the region of Mārib, and were admitted into the army as contingents. In an inscription, the Beduins of Mārib (Zbl/mrb: CIH 353, 10) are explicitly mentioned among the troops participating in a campaign. But even after South Arabia, toward the end of the 3rd century A.D., had been taken over by Ḥimyar and many other nomads, Mārib was still a strongholding, and may already raise doubts for that very reason. According to the inscriptions, the seat of the Aṯār temple near Marib, the place of ruins of the Aṯār temple is mentioned with special frequency in the inscriptions of the 2nd and 3rd centuries A.D. which originate from the Awām temple near Mārib, the place of ruins now called Muḥrām Bīlīs. They mostly relate that the king who had occupied the castle of Slamh, or happiness is implored for the house of Slāhm and its lords. Slāhm was also the place where indigenous coins were minted on behalf of the Sabaean realm.

Next to Slāhm, al-Hamdānī mentions Ḥaḡar and al-Qaǧīb as other castles of Mārib (Iklīl, viii, 99, 10). From epigraphic tradition, these two are not known so far. The name al-Ḥaḡar, ‘‘the town’’, is unusual for a fortress, and may already raise doubts for that very reason. According to al-Hamdānī (Iklīl, viii, 100, 2), al-Qaǧīb was built by a member of the Dhu Ḥazāf, i.e. of that ancient eponymous kin of the Khālī tribe resident in and around Mārib. According to Yākūt (Muǧam, iv, 104, 6), the castle al-Qaǧīb is said to have been built at the order of king Shurabibī bin Yaḥyīb. Such a ruler, is, however, not attested epigraphically. The name Shurabibī would fit in with Shurābī’s Yāfūr and the father’s name Yaḥyīb with Ḥaǧar Yaḥyīb, with a faulty rendering of the surname Yaḥyīb. However, the defective title of a ‘‘king of Saba    and the Tīḥāma and their Beduins’’ which is also mentioned (Yākūt, Muǧam, iv, 104, 7-8), points to a king of the later period, i.e. rather to Shurabibī’s Yāfūr who reigned in the middle of the 5th century A.D. than to Ḥaǧar Yaḥyīb who lived more than a thousand years before the supposed ‘‘new’’, both in Sabaean and Arabic— an explanation given by al-Hamdānī himself in another place (Iklīl,
The most important temple of ancient Marīb was the sanctuary of Awām of the god Almakah, now called Hāram Bīlīkīs or Mahrām Bīlīkīs. It lay at the eastern edge of Yāsrān, the southern part of the oasis, at the other side of the wadi and at a distance of 3.5 km. south-east of the town. Partly excavated in 1952 by an American expedition under Wendell Phillips, it produced hundreds of dedicatory inscriptions, often quite extensive, which were erected in the entrance hall between the middle of the 1st and the 4th centuries A.D. They are our most important source for the history of that turbulent period. The sanctuary consists of a large, oval construction with a spacious courtyard, surrounded by a high, thick circular wall. The latter is made up of two mantles, an outer one and inner one consisting of ashlars, kept together by lateral walls, the hollow spaces being filled up with debris. The longitudinal axis between the north-western gate and the mausoleum on the opposite side measures about 105 m., while the latitudinal axis, which runs from the inner gate of the rectangular entrance hall, constructed before the circular wall, to the south-west, measures about 75 m. The temple courtyard thus had a surface of ca. 6,000 m². The construction, with its strongly fortified courtyard was only partly prepared for sowing, should not be limited if one takes it for granted that the construction as is suggested by the name of the temple, ʿelem, which very probably means 'place of refuge'. The inscription CIH 957, placed in the wall of the temple, relates that Yādāʾil Dāhirī, son of Sumhūʾalī and Mukarrīb of Sabaʾ, erected the wall of the Awām, the house of Almakah. According to von Wissmann, this ruler is to be dated around 670 B.C. The concept of the entire construction presumably reaches back to this ruler, who is known as a temple builder, even if the works were transformed and changed in later times. Thus the oval enclosing wall, originally no doubt as high as 29 layers of ashlars i.e. 8.70 m. without the frieze, was, since the first quarter of the 4th century B.C., raised by 13 more layers of ashlars (cf. CIH 373). This was done in order to make up for the heap of earth which had accumulated in this precinct of the wall since the time of foundation and to raise the wall to its original height.

The last constructional renovation which is attested epigraphically was undertaken in the second half of the 1st century A.D. under king Karībʾil Watar Yūḥannāʾīn "for the prosperity of the house of Salīh and the town of Marīb" (hgm/msh: CIH 373). It was also in this sanctuary that the tribe of Sabaʾ, i.e. the inhabitants of the town and oasis of Marīb, offered thanks for the fertility granted to their land through the water of wadi Adhāna (cf. e.g. Sh 18); or they went there in a rogation procession when rain held off (cf. Ja 735). Until the period of the beginning of monotheism in the second half of the 4th century A.D., hence during a whole millennium, the Awām temple of the god Almakah was the central place of worship of the Sabaean realm, to which people came in pilgrimage from afar (cf. e.g. RES 4176, 1-2).

Another large, sacred building in the area of the southern oasis, second only to the Awām sanctuary, was the Barʾān temple (mrhm/bmr: CIH 400, 2), likewise dedicated to the god Almakah. Nowadays it is called al-Amāʿīlīd, "the columns", because five pillars with capitals and a pillar stump still rise up from the débris of the construction so far unexcavated. With relation between the mid-2nd and mid-3rd centuries A.D. CIH 623, two identical rock-inscriptions are occasionally also called 'arsh Bīlīkīs "throne of Bīlīkīs", a designation which is however also used for a colon-
of Yasran, i.e. by cutting through the contiguous limestone rock of the Djabal Balak al-Awsat he has built the southern sluice, so that the northern half of the Marib oasis, it can be concluded from the construction of the southern sluice that the great dam and the northern sluice too were built by the same Mukarrir, since the entire complex can only have been executed as a whole, since the hewing out of the storage canal Rahabum at the southern sluice presupposes the construction of the dam which held back the waters of the wadi. This dam, which lay about 8 km. west-south-west of ancient Marib, consisted of sediments heaped on the rocky, solid stratum. At the surface, it was covered with small, unhewn stones, strongly joined by mortar; it was at least 10 m. high, at the bottom at least 60 m. broad and about 620 m. long. The dam served less to create a storage reservoir than to raise the water, brought down twice a year by the sayf, to a level from which the fields could be irrigated. So it was in fact a diverting dam, blocking the total breadth of the wadi, one which made it possible to irrigate regularly a defined acreage. The northern sluice too may well have been constructed at the same period in an analogous way. From the later Sabaean period, several dam-bursts have been recorded epigraphically. From text RES 4775, until today to be found on a wall near the northern sluice, a mark slanting at an angle of 20 m. more than the principal distributor at the western edge of the northern oasis, from where the mass of water, through 15 sluice-like openings and 121 secondary distributors, was directed to the canal systems of the various arrays built on the fields which had to be irrigated. The complicated irrigation works of the northern oasis, with its constructions of water-distributors and remains of the network of canals, is partly still discernible. The next ruler who ordered the canal of the southern sluice to be hewn further through the rock of the Djabal Balak al-Awsat was Yitha°amar Bayyin, the son of Sumhu°a°ali Yanuf. From him has also been preserved a boustrophedon inscription of two lines, recorded in two versions on the smoothed contiguous rock of the walls of the southern sluice, remains of 523 and 525 = CIH 622. This inscription related that Yitha°amar Bayyin hewed out the opening in the rock for the storage reservoir Hababid of the main canal of Yasran. The incision of the southern sluice, which has been hewn out of the rock, divides after some 30 m. towards the east in a northern and a southern branch. The northern one, which lies closer to the wadi, belonged to the Rahabum basin, as is recorded in the two versions of rock inscription CIH 623, mounted there. Consequently, the southern branch could be the Hababid basin, although the two versions of inscription CIH 622 which relate its construction have been chiselled on both sides of the entrance to the sluice on the west side. Since Yitha°amar Bayyin, through this main canal which branched off to the right, enlarged the construction of the southern sluice, a still greater acreage could probably be irrigated through the distributing constructions in the Yasran oasis which were fed by this canal. Line 5 of the fragmentary, ancient Sabaean inscription RES 3943, preserved without the name of a ruler, mentions the hewing out of the storage reservoir Hababid (the text wrongly has b d instead of b b d). Hence it may be concluded that the text was set up under Yitha°amar Bayyin. Besides, the enlargement of the storage reservoir Rahabum and the building of further irrigation works in Yasran and Abyan are also recorded. The constructions of the southern sluice have been best preserved.
dam is the rock-inscription Ja 547 which is certainly to be united with Ja 545, the latter being dated in the year 668 of the Himyarite era (= 553 A.D.). The authors of the text were again engaged, under great exertion, in removing the mud deposits at the dam. Researches by U. Brunner on the discordances which occur in the sediments of the storage area have revealed that another dam-burst must have taken place some 35 years after the one described in inscriptions CHI 541. It was again repaired. The final catastrophe apparently occurred only at the beginning of the 7th century. It is the event which is mentioned in the Kūrān as the dam-flood (sayl al-ʿarim). Sūra XXXIV, (16), i.e. the flood which broke the dam (Sabaean ʿm). Afterwards, the Mārib oasis became desolate and, in the words of the Kūrān, produced only brier fruits, tamarisks and a few Zizyphus trees (loc. cit.). Only small fields which lie at the edge of the wadi bed, and to which the high water can be directed through diverting dams, are cultivated. Al-Hamdānī already relates how in Mārib the pieces of land are irrigated from the sayl, and taḥaf and ḍukhn are sown there until finally, the harvest is reaped and ploughing prepares the soil for the next sowing (ṣāfa, 199, 19-22). In more recent times, more and more extensive areas have been added, especially in the section lying to the south of the Adhāna wadi; they are irrigated by subsoil water which has, however, to be brought up by pumps from as deep as 45-50 m.

Considering that, after a dam-burst, the sediments deposited by the floods had to be cleared away each time until the original level of the wadi was reached, it follows that each rebuilding of the dam became more difficult. Since the level of the oasis meanwhile had risen further, the dam had to be built higher each time. The mud which was carried along with the floods, and which raised the fields and was precipitated on to the dam and the storage basins, must have played an essential role in the dam construction being completely abandoned in the end.

Air photographs of the neighbourhood of Mārib show so called “dotted fields” standing out prominently. These accumulations of sediment clods lying in the ancient fields of the oasis, are relics of ancient tree and shrub plantations, widely spread, especially in the southern oasis. This observation is confirmed by the inscriptions. Text CHI 375 enumerates by name 13 palm-groves in the area of the Yarsān oasis alone, which is irrigated by the water of the Adhāna wadi by means of sluices and canals conducting the waters of the dam. Al-Hamdānī, too, relates that, during a visit to the Mārib oasis, he saw a sunken ardā shrub, at whose root was a black palm trunk. One of his companions was of the opinion that this was a remnant of palms from pre-Islamic times (ikīl, viii, 96, 2-4). In his time, date-palms remained only in Ruhābā (ṣīfa, 102, 21), the region lying beyond the dam on both sides of the Adhāna wadi.

The reasons which led to the neglect of the dam constructions and to their being left continuously to decay, and which finally reached a point so that they could not be renewed any more, may also have had a political and social background. The constant disputes between the individual principalities and dynasties of ancient South Arabia resulted in the loss of a strong central power and the disintegration of a well-organised society. This led to the growing influence of foreign powers, namely of Ethiopia and later of Sāsānid Persia. Moreover, the intensified penetration of North Arabian tribes brought about an increasing backwardness, which is attested by a considerable recession to agriculture and irrigation. A decrease of the popula-
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tion as a whole was probably connected with this. The Arab authors of the early Islamic period hold the same view. The fact that the last dam-burst is mentioned in the Kūrān as sayl al-ʿarim, the signification of this event for the town of Mārib and its surroundings, has caused Islamic tradition to deal in detail with this catastrophe and its consequences. Occasionally, information about the dam and the oasis themselves crept in, even if distorted and exaggerated. According to the Arab authors, too, events which had happened before the dam-burst, and the bursting of the dam itself, led to the Mārib oasis being abandoned by its inhabitants. The migration of entire South Arabian tribes towards the north is to be connected with it. Thus etc. the Banāb ḍāssān and the Azaq are said to have come from there and to have spread over various regions of the Arabian peninsula. The Banāb ḍāssān are even said to have established their era after the year of the dam-burst (ʾām al-ṣayl) (al-Masʿūdī, Tanbih, ed. de Goeje, Leiden 1894, 202, 14-15). This would admittedly mean that the sayl al-ʿarim event is to be dated much earlier than it in fact took place.

Through late Sabaean inscriptions we meanwhile know, however, that dating this last catastrophe in the 3rd, 2nd or 1st centuries A.D., or even earlier, as assumed by many Muslim authors and also some European scholars of the 18th and 19th centuries, is untenable. The Arab author who comes closest to the real date is Yakūṭ, who relates that the bursting of the dam took place in the period of the sovereignty of the Abyssinians (Muṣay’īm, iv, 383, 20). Only al-Masʿūdī dares to attribute the bursting to natural causes, when he writes that the water gradually undermined the dam constructions built by man (Murūdī, iii, 370, 9-371, 2 = § 1254). To be sure, it cannot be completely excluded that traditions about a catastrophic bursting of the dam of a much earlier date have been creeping into the legends which attached themselves to the sayl al-ʿarim. The most current version of the legend of the migration from the Mārib oasis is the following: a ruler of Mārib, ʿAmr b. ʿAmir of the Azd, nicknamed al-Muzayyikāya, was married to Zarfā, who had visions and dreams which she was also able to interpret. One day she saw Amr, her husband, about to be trampled underfoot when he saw how a giant rat with iron teeth and big claws, called Khuld, was about to trundle away boulders and to undermine the dam. Thus warned and informed about the coming catastrophe of the bursting of the dam, ʿAmr decided to sell his possessions at the lower end of the dam and to leave the country. However, in order to hide the real motive, he simulated a brawl with his son during which the latter slapped his face openly. This feigned defamation of the family presented him with the pretext of giving up his possessions, which could then be sold satisfactorily. After that, ʿAmr, with numerous followers, migrated from the Mārib oasis still in good time before the bursting of the dam set in (according to other versions, he only left after the event). His descendants spread over extensive guits of Arabia. After ʿAmr al-Muzayyikāya had left, the people of Mārib agreed upon a new king, who is, however, said not to have been designated as tubbaʾ. (For examples of detailed and embellished versions of this legend, see e.g. Wahb b. Munabbih, Kitāb al-Tiqdān, Şanā’ 1979, 273-97; al-Masʿūdī, Murūdī, iii, 378, 2-392, 7 = §§ 1264-76; Yakūṭ, Muṣay’īm, iv, 383, 20-385, 10; Ibn Saʿīd al-Maghribī, Nāgawat al-tarab, 114, 13-117, 10; al-Khazradjī, al-Uḏād al-awṣ̣āya, 9, 1-15; 3 versions of this incident are based on a version recorded by Ibn al-Mudājjīd, Tāʾrikh al-Mustaʿībīr, 595, 7-197.
15, where the dam, as in al-Hamdānī, Ṣīfa 110, 26, is called sadīd al-mazā'īma “the dam of the two closely joining places”.

The name of the ancient Sabaean capital has been transmitted in two forms in the ancient South Arabian inscriptions. The early inscriptions up to the 2nd century A.D., have always the form mryb; after that time, the form mrb appears. Two texts from the 2nd century A.D. still have both forms side by side. Inscriptions Fa 71 has mrb in lines 17-18, but mrb in line 6, while inscription Jā 576 has mrb in line 3, but mrb in line 2. The place-name myyāb may originally have been a nomen loci of a root ryyb of unknown meaning, which possibly has a parallel in Hebrew Maribā, a spring in the desert (Exodus, xviii, 7, and repeatedly), in as much as one does not admit the meaning “quarrel”, given in the Old Testament. For the pronunciation of myyāb as Maryab, reference can be made to the rendering by ancient authors: Māqāzha as Mrāzāwā in Strabo, xvi, 4, 768, after Erasthenes, and ibid., xvi, 4, 778, after Arimatōr, as well as Māqāzān, ibid., xvi, 4, 782, distorted either from Māqāzā or from Māqāzāx or Sāzā, and also the regia tamen omnium Mareliabata, mostly misspelled from Marciaba, in Pliny, Naturalis historia, vi, 32, 155. The pronunciation Marib may be inferred from the renderings Maribba in Pliny, Naturalis historia, vi, 32, 157, Mariba, ibid., vi, 32, 160, and Mariba or, in the Greek version, Māqāzx in the Monumentum Ansyrum = Res gestae Asiae Augustae, August, 25, 6. In his Introduction to Geography, Book vi, ch. 6, Ptolemy has the name Māqāzx μητρόπολις, but in his Canon of the noteworthy cities he has Māqāzha. A transition from a form Marib to Mārib or Mārīb is easier to explain than a change from Maryab to Marib. When describing Marib, al-Hamdānī too (Ḳīlā, vii, 199, 1-3) still gives both names Marib and Mārib side by side, but explains them as being the names of two Arabian tribes, on the basis of a line of poetry which he transmits. In one of the fragments of the Ethiopic inscriptions from Mārib, the name of the town occurs as Marāb (DJE vi, 102, 19). For al-Hamdānī, in the first line of the inscription, having been raised too high to be reached by the floods of the saḥ, had become denuded (Ḳīlā, vii, 95, 7-96, 6). But the distributing constructions, which led the water from the reservoirs of the dam to the fields, were still standing there as if their builders had finished their work only the day before (Ḳīlā, viii, 96, 6-7). Moreover, even of the dam itself a piece had survived on the left-hand side; at the lower part it is said to have been 15 ells wide (Ḳīlā, viii, 96, 10-97, 1). This, however, was probably not the former lowest part of the dam. According to the words of al-Hamdānī, the dam was based on the foundation-wall which, between the side-walls, was joined to the reservoirs with mighty ashlars hewn from the rocks, and to the base by molten lead (Ḳīlā, viii, 99, 1-2). The building of such works as the dam constructions was therefore ascribed to the legendary Lakāmān b. Ṭūrā, according to some (Ḳīlā, viii, 99, 3), al-Masʿūdī, Marāb, iii, 366, 3-4 = § 125); al-Bakīrī, Marṣaba, 1171, 2; Yākūt, Maṣṣaba, iv, 383, 1), while others were of the opinion that they had been erected by Ḥimyār b. Saḥā and al-Azd b. al-Ghawhā, a descendant of Kāḥān (Ḳīlā, viii, 99, 3 ff.). According to other traditions, the dam was begun by Yāḥṣūb b. Yārūf and finished by Ṣābīb Ḫūlī Kārnāya al-Ḥimyārī (Wāḥb b. Munābīsh, Kitāb al-Tūghān, 58, 15; d-ʿUkud al-Hijāz, 273, 19-274, 8), or built by ʾAbd Šams Sabaʿa b. Yāḥṣūb (Yākūt, Maṣṣaba, iv, 382, 22-3), who are said to have directed there 70 rivers and floods from far away (Ibn Ṣaḥā al-Maghrībi, Nashwāt al-tarab, 86, 16-7). It is also said that the dam was begun by ʾAbd Šams, continued by Ḥimyār and finished by Šābīb (al-Khazraḏī, al-ʿUkūd al-lu-luʿbysa, 7, 6-9). The building of the Marib dam is occasionally also ascribed to Būkūs (q.v.), the legendary queen of Sabaʿa (al-Dāmirī, Ḥayāt al-baytūrān, Cairo 1309/1892, i, 270, 31), or she is said to have repaired it (see R.G. Stiegenr, Die Königin von Sabaʿ in ihrem Namen, 75).

Finally, the irrigation works are said to have been built by a king, not mentioned by name, after he had consulted wise men (Maṣʿūdī, Marāb, iii, 369, 3-370, 7 = § 1254). As al-Hamdānī rightly observed, the saḥ of the ʿAḥāna wādī collected its water from many places and numerous sites of the Yemen (Ḳīlā, viii, 97, 10; detailed information in Ṣīfa, 80, 12-23). Other authors even relate that the plantations in the Marīb oasis were so extensive that a horseman needed more than a month to cross them and that, in doing so, he found himself continuously in the shadow of the trees (al-Masʿūdī, Marāb, iii, 367, 2-5 = § 1252; Ibn Ṣaḥā al-Maghrībi, Nashwāt al-tarab, 114, 20-115, 1; it is even said that it took him six months (al-Khazraḏī, al-ʿUkūd al-lu-luʿbysa, 8,9-10). If a woman or servant
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walked under the trees of the two gardens with a basket on the head, it used to fill of itself with ... Araber" vom Stamme Qahtdn. Aus dem Kitdb Naswat at-tarab fitarbih gdhiliyyat al-^Arab, ed. M. Kropp, Frankfurt 1982;

A poor Sharif was in power, who, apart from Marib, (Beschreibung von Arabien, ent town in the Djawf amdm, 243-4). Around 1050/1640, Marib came under the sovereignty of Sharif Husayn b. Muhammad b. Abyad b. Hammâl already mentioned, it is borne to Abyad b. Hammâl when the latter came to him with a delegation and requested it as such (Abû Dâwûd, Sunan, ch. Imâra, bâb 36; al-Tirmâghi, Sunan, ch. Akkâm, bâb 39). What is meant here is the salt-mine at the Qabâl Sâfîr, which can be reached from Marib with camels in three days' journey along a waterless road. In earlier times, the Banu 'Abîda supplied from there almost the entire Yemeni highlands with salt. Since the salt traffic passes through Marib, this commodity is called in the Yemeni Mârîb salt (milh Mâribî; Yâhîyim Hâbhâghî, Ru'^yat al-Yaman, 116, 16) until today. Among the products of the Mârib region, al-Hamdanî calls special attention to the sesame, whose oil is quite bright, pure and of good quality (Sîfa, 199, 9-10). Until today it is considered as the best in all Yemen. In later Islamic times the place Mârib which already al-Mukaddasî (Alasân al-takâmîsîn, 89, 2) quotes only as kayat Mârib, did not play a rôle of importance. Its name emerges sporadically in Yemeni chronicles, mostly in combination with warlike events, as when troops of the Imam moved from Sa'da through the Djâwf to Mârib, or opponents of the Imam settled there. In 418/1027 there appeared in Na'ârî an attempt to use Mârib as a base of operations. Once again among the wonders of the Yemen because of its extraordinary abundance of water, Marib was wanted for the purpose of obtaining the salt of Marib as a fief by means of which the new foundation could be sustained (Abû Dâwûd, Sunan, iv, 365-9 = Ibn Rusta, al-Tanbih wa 'l-ilmîr; ahmîr Allîh al-Wazîr, and the last amîr of the reigning Ahsânîm, Muhammad b. 'Abd al-Rahmân, was deposed.

In cultural and scientific life in Islamic times, Mârib was hardly of any significance either. The nisba al-Mâribi occurs only very sporadically. Apart from Abyad b. Hammâl already mentioned, it is borne only by an informant who transmitted the request to leave the Mârib salt as a fief, namely Yâhîya b. Kays al-Mâribî (al-Dhâhâbî, Mu$tâbadî, ed. de Jong, Leiden 1881, 465, 5; according to this source, al-Mâribî should be read instead of al-Mâzinî in al-Balêdhûrî, Futûh, 73, 7). Other scholars, mostly tradi- tionists, who bore the nisba al-Mâribî in the early Islamic period, are mentioned by Yâkût (Muqâm, iv, 398, 9-11). For the later time, 'Abd Allâh al-Hibîshî, Ma'sâdî al-fîk al-'Arâbî al-islami fi 'l-Yaman, San'â' 1978, 316, was able to name only one bearer of the nisba al-Mâribi.

During the Yemeni civil war of 1962-6, Mârib's fate was uncertain. Already in the beginning of October 1962, the Republicans, with Egyptian air support, conquered Marib. In March 1963 it was conquered by the Republicans who received Egyptian air support. In summer 1965, the Royalists succeeded in occupying Mârib again. During these combats, the houses of Mârib, which stand closely together on the ancient site, were largely destroyed by air attacks. Most of the inhabitants left the place and settled down in the neighbourhood, which explains the astonishingly low present number of the population. Until the present day, numerous houses of Old Mârib lie in ruins. At the foot of the hill of the old town lie in the Ma'sâdî Sulaymân (with ancient columns), the residence of the governor (muha'afîs), the police station, the military garrison, a water-pump installation, a number of huts covered with sheet-iron, shops and a restaurant. Formerly, Mârib could only be reached from San'â' by means of cross-country vehicles after an eight to twelve hours' difficult drive on tracks and through passes by three different routes, with a length between 170 and 220 km. Since 1981 the place has been linked with the capital San'â' by a road of about 150 km length. After this convenient connection had been established, the flights between San'â' and Mârib with obsolete DC-3 aeroplanes, which had existed for years with occasional interruption, could be discontinued.

Ibn al-Mudjawir, Ta'rikh al-mustabsir, ed. O. Lofgren, Leiden 1951-4, 195-200; Darmri, Haydt sur une mission archeologique dans le Yemen, Leipzig 1866; J. Halevy, Rapport...
Marida, a town in the south-west of Spain, in the modern province of Badajoz, where it is the capital of a partido, on the right bank of the Guadiana. Now somewhat overgrown, it has an area of about 35,000 acres and a population of 3,500, mostly the inhabitants. It is on the Madrid-Badajoz railway and is also connected by rail with Cáceres in the north and Seville in the south.

The ancient capital of Lusitania, Augusta Emerita, was founded in 23 B.C., and under the Roman empire attained remarkable importance and prosperity. Numerous remains of Roman buildings still testify to the position it held in the Iberian peninsula in those days: a bridge of 64 arches, a circus, a theatre, and the famous aqueduct of los Milagros, of which there are still standing ten arches of brick and granite. Merida under the Visigoths became the metropolis of Lusitania and, according to Rodrigo of Toledo, was fortified and strongly defended, which explains why the Muslim conquerors led by Musa b. Nusayr [q.v.] had some difficulty in taking it. The Arab leader on landing in Spain in Ramídán 93/June 712 first took Medina-Sidonia and Carmona, then Seville. He next laid siege to Mérida, before which he stayed for several months; but the inhabitants in the end capitulated and the town surrendered on 1 Shawwâl 94/30 June 713. From Mérida, Musa b. Nusayr continued his advance to Toledo.

Under the Arab governors, Mérida seems to have very soon become a ratified point for a large number of rebels of Berber and Spanish origin. It was there that Yusuf al-Fihri endeavoured to organise a movement against that organised for his own benefit by 'Abd al-Rahmân al-Dâlkhî in 141/758. At a later date, a Berber named Asbagh b. 'Abd Allâh b. Wansús rebelled there against al-Hakâm I in 190/805 and the amîr of Cordova had for the next seven years to undertake summer campaigns against him before bringing him to reason. Another rebellion broke out in Mérida in 213/828, and the town had to be besieged in 217/832 and again in 254/868. In the reign of the amîr 'Abd Allâh it was the headquarters of 'Abd al-Rahmân b. Marwân al-Dhîlîkî ("the Galînic"), an Arabic name which conveyed that of a Christian nationalistic leader. Mérida also very frequently returned to allegiance in the reign of 'Abd al-Rahmân III al-Nâṣir, when it submitted in 316/928 to the kâ'îd Ahmad b. lYâs.

From the 5th/11th century, Mérida began to decline in favour of Badajoz, especially when the latter town became the capital of the independent little kingdom of the Aftasîds [q.v.]. It remained in the hands of the Muslims till the beginning of the 7th/13th century. In 623/1228 it was retaken by Alfonso IX of Leon, but never recovered its former importance.

The Arab geographers who mention Mérida describe its Roman ruins in detail; they also mention the Muslim citadel, the foundation inscription of which has been preserved. It was built in 220/835 by the governor 'Abd Allâh b. Kulayb b. Thâ'labâ by order of the Umayyad 'Abd al-Rahmân II.

**Bibliography.** The Arabic historians of Umayyad Spain (Abhâr madâna'; Ibn 'Ishaq, Bâyân; Ibn al-Athîr; Nuwayrî; Makkârî; Alââdet, passim); Idrîsî, Description de l'Afrique et de l'Espagne, ed. Dozy and de Goeje, text, 175, 182, tr. 211, 220; Yûkût, iv, 389-90; Ibn 'Abd al-Mun'im al-Himyari, al-Rau'd al-imîrî, 210-13; E. Fagnan, Extraits inédits relatifs au Maghreb, Algiers 1924, index; Dozy, Histoire des Musulmans d'Espagne, ii, 57, 80, 62, 98, 102, Recherches, 56, 70; Coderôa, Inscrições árabes do Castello de Mérida, in Rev. recâd. Hist., Madrid 1902, 138-42; E. Lévy-Provençal, Inscriptions arabes d'Espagne, Leiden-Paris 1931, 39-40; idem, Hist. Esp. mus., iii, 350-1 and index. (E. Lévy-Provençal)
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Mâridîn [see Mardîn]

al-Mâridînî [see al-Mâridînî]

MA'rîfâ (A.). "Knowledge, cognition."

---

1. A term of epistemology and mysticism

I. Lexicographical study. Like 'íjâfân, the word ma'rîfâ is a noun derived from the verb 'arafa. According to the lexicographers, it is a synonym of 'ilm [q.v.]. Ibn Manzûr (LA) notes that 'arafa may be used in place of i'tarafa ("to recognise"), in the sense that ma'rîfâ is that which enables a person to recognise, to identify a thing. On the other hand, i'tarafa signifies "to ask somebody for information (khabar) regarding something". It is the reply which makes recognition of this thing possible. When an animal is lost, "a man comes who recognises it (ma'rîfâ-hâl), that is to say, he describes it by an attribute (sîfa) which makes known (ya'lîmûna) that it belongs to him". According to a tradition related by Ibn Masûd, people were asked if they knew their Lord. They replied: "If He makes Himself recognised to us, we know Him." Consequently, from a philological point of view, the ma'rîfâ which causes recognition and which thereby gives knowledge (i'tim) of its subject, always contains the indication of an attribute with which its subject is identified. The hadîth of Ibn Masûd is explained thus: "If God describes Himself by means of an attribute through which we can authenticate Him, then we know Him."

In his Dictionary of technical terms, al-Tâhâwî lists several senses of the word ma'rîfâ, which he identifies with the word "knowledge" while noting particular connotations which are sometimes given to it to distinguish it from i'tim. (1) In the first place, ma'rîfâ is knowledge, in the absolute sense of perception (i'drâk), whether in the form of a concept, or in the form of a judgment. (2) It is the perception of a concept; in the case of a judgment it is called knowledge. (3) It is the perception of what is simple (basî), whether in the form of a concept, or in the form of a judgment regarding the conditions of this quiddity; or it is the perception of something which is composite (mu'akkab), whether it be a concept or a judgment. But according to technical terminology, perception of the composite is specifically called knowledge. In addition, according to the lexicographers, the correct statement is "I have cognition of God ('arafa 'llâh)", and not "I have knowledge of God ('almu-hâ)", because God is a simple entity. Consequently, that which is in relation to ma'rîfâ is simple, whereas that which is in relation to knowledge is multiple (mutat-’addid) and thus composite. (4) It is the perception of the particular, notion (mâhâm) or verdict (hûm); or the perception of the universal, notion or sentence. But the perception of universals is more specifically called knowledge or speculation (nâzar). According to al-Tâhâwî, it is most probable that in principle, the word ma'rîfâ is used to apply to a concept, and the word knowledge to apply to a judgment. Then there are ramifications. Thus it may be considered that definitions (2) and (4) are ramifications of definition (3), since the particular and the concept resemble the simple, and the universal and the judgment resemble the composite. (5) It is the perception of a particular by means of a proof or indication (da'îf), this is called ma'rîfâ siddâlîyya, cognition by proof. This is reminiscent of what was previously said about i'tarafa. The language itself clearly marks the connexion
between dahl and cognition; it is said dalaltu hi 'l-tank in the sense of "I have made the way... the cloud which extends its shade over all things, and like the rain which drenches the one that it likes and the one taken in itself... It is the condition of a noun applied to a thing definable in itself. (6). It is the perception that comes after ignorance (qatl). Thus it cannot be said that God is cognisant (drif); it must be said that He is knowing (slm). In this sense, the word slm has a general meaning, and the word ma'rifa a particular meaning. (7) It is a technical term employed by Sufis.

II. Ma'rifa in mystical thought. Al-Tahâwî relates that it is usually (slm) considered to be the knowledge (slm) which precedes ignorance (nakâa). The use of the word nakâa in place of qatl is interesting (cf. above, nakâa). It is the knowledge (slm) of the situation which is presented to the object, the ma'rifa, is the Essence of God and his attributes. Cognition of the Essence consists in knowing (an yuâlãma) that God is existent (macawîd), one (wsâhid), sole and unique (fard); that He does not resemble any thing; and that nothing resembles Him. Cognition of the attributes consists in knowing Him as living, omniscient, hearing, seeing, speaking, etc. It is thus seen how regularly the word 'knowledge' or the verb "to know" intervene in definitions of ma'rifa among the mystics. It is necessary to distinguish ma'rifa based on proving indications which, by means of "signs" (âyât) constitute the proof of the Creator. Certain people see things, then see God through these things. In reality, ma'rifa is realised only for those to whom there is revealed something that is invisible (al-djâhî), in such a way that God is proved simultaneously by manifest and by hidden signs. Such is the ma'rifa of men "anchored in knowledge" (al-râkîhîn fi 'l-slîm; cf. Kurân, III, 7, IV, 162). Then there is the ma'rifa of direct testimony (ghâhidîyya) which asserts itself as evidence (darârîyya); it is this which gives cognition of the signs through Him who has instituted them, and this is the prerogative of the just (al-siddîkîn, cf. Kurân, LVII, 19: hâm al-siddîkîn wâ l-ghâhadu, insha' rabbîhum). These are the men of contemplation (ashâb al-mujâhâdâh).

III. Definitions given by the Sûfis, and the mystical tradition. It is related that God said to David in a revelation: "Do you understand what it is to know Me? Cognition of Me is the life of the heart in the contemplation which it has of Me." Al-Shiblî said, "When you are attached to God, not to your works, and when you look at nothing other than Him, then you have a perfect ma'rifa." Cognition has been compared to the sight of God in the Other Life: "Just as He is known here below without perception, so He will be seen in the other life without perception (âshâk)" (al-Tahâwî), for it is said in the Kurân (VI, 101), "Vision will not comprehend Him, but He will comprehend vision." The following is cited from the hadîth of the Prophet, "If you knew God by a true ma'rifa, the mountains would disappear at your command." Cognition is linked to various conditions (âhejâd) with which taawwuf deals. Thus Abû Yazid al-Bistâmî (q.v.) said, "True ma'rifa is life in the memory of God." Shams of God quotes Abû 'Ali (perhaps al-Djuzdjanî, 3rd/9th century), "The fruit of ma'rifa is that one bears with patience (sabr) proofs when they come; that a man gives thanks (shukr) when he receives a benefit; and that he gives his consent (ridâ) to God, when he is struck with a hateful evil." The father-in-law of al-Kughâvî (q.v.), Abu 'l-Dakîk, said, "One of the signs of the cognition that a man has of God, is the entry into him of reverential fear (hayba). One of the signs that it is growing, is that this fear grows. Ma'rifa necessarily entails quietude (sakîná) as knowledge entails rest." Ma'rifa assumes not only the abolition of the consciousness of self at the level of the soul, the empirical self, but an absence of self at the level of the heart and the spirit. Abû Hâsîf (Umâr b. Maslama al-Haddâd, born near Nižâpur, d. ca. 260/874) said, "Since I have cognition of God, there enters into my heart neither truth nor falsehood. Cognition necessarily entails for the man his absence (ghayba) from himself, in such a way that the memory of God reigns exclusively in him, that he sees nothing other than God and that he turns to nothing other than to Him. For, just as the man who reasons has recourse to his heart, to his reflection and to his memories, in every situation which is presented to him, to the condition which he encounters, no the drif has its recourse in God. Such is the difference between him who sees through his heart and him who sees through his Lord." In the same context, al-Bistâmî said, "The creature has its conditions, but the drif, the cognisant one, does not have them, because his traits are effaced and his ipeity (huâyja) is abolished in the ipeity of One Other than him (God). His features become now invisible beneath the features of God." Also worthy of quotation is al-Wâsîfî (pupil of Djnayd and of al- Nûrî, d. 320/932), "Ma'rifa is not authentic when there remains in the man an independence which dispenses with God and the need for God. For to dispense with God and to have need of Him are two signs that the man is awake and that his characteristics are unequal to God. Thus the man who has the cognition of God is in intimacy (uns) with Him. One Other than him (God). His features become invisible beneath the features of God." How could this—which is due to the fact that one loses his existence in God and is engrossed in contemplation of Him—be true, if one is not a man devoid of any sentiment which could be for him a qualification, when one approaches existence?" The following are other conditions which are related to ma'rifa. Ibn Abî 'l-Hâwâwî (3rd/9th century) said, "He who knows God best and he who fears Him the most." Ibn 5âjî, the friend of al-Hallâj, thought that ma'rifa depends on three things: reverential fear, modesty (hayâra) and intimacy with God (uns). In fact, he who has cognition of God is in intimacy (unsâs) with Him. The following are some definitions and qualifications of the one who knows God. It has been said, "The drif is he who acts for the pleasure of his Lord, without gaining anything for himself by this action." Seeing that some teachers taught that having once arrived at cognition, man no longer acts, al-Djnayd took issue with this opinion: "Those who have the cognition (al-drîfîn) of God, draw their actions from God and turn to God in their actions. If they needed to last for a thousand years, acts of piety would not be diminished by a jot." The same Djnayd said, "That man is not truly an drif, so long as he is not like the earth which is trodden by the pious and the licentious alike, and the cloud which extends its shade over all things, and like the rain which drenches the one that it likes and the one
that it does not like.” In some instances, the definition adopts a dialectical twist. Thus Yahya b. Mu’adhdh (a native of Rayy, who settled and died in Nishapür in 248/872), said, “The ‘arif is the man there without being there.” Al-Djumaylī added, “who is distinct without separation.”

In general, it is to be noted that all these conceptions, while placing ma‘rifā above demonstrative and speculative knowledge, do not absolutely imply an esoteric vision. All or most depend on certain features which make of ma‘rifā an illuminative cognition whose brightness has the power to stun. Thus Ruwaym, a Sūfī of Baghdad (d. 303/915), said, “For the ‘arif, ma‘rifā is a mirror; when he looks at it, his Lord shines there for him (tadqīl lahu),” and Sahih b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Tustarī notes that “the final stage of ma‘rifā consists in two things: amazement (dahāb) and confusion (hayra).” The same notion is found in the writings of Dhu ’l-Nūn al-Miṣrī.

Some interesting analyses, and important conclusions, are to be found in the work of Farid Jabr, La notion de ma‘rifā chez Ghazālī, Beiruit 1958. Comparing al-Ghazālī with Plotinus, he writes (p. 134), “The former aspires towards an abstract ideal world, the ‘well-guarded Table’, archetype of revealed knowledge, the latter seeks to lose himself ontologically in the One... It is here that ma‘rifā and gnōsis diverge fundamentally: the latter is achieved in ecstasy, which is not simply visionary but unitive vision, and the former in the loss of consciousness of the self.” Al-Ghazālī indeed belongs to the line of mystics whose conceptions have been related in this article.

IV. Ma‘rifā in the thought of Ibn ‘Arabī.

It seems that Ibn ‘Arabī makes no distinction in usage between the words “knowledge” and “cognition”. For him, there is one ma‘rifā which is attained through the light of intelligence (bi-nur al-‘alāq); this is the cognition of the divine nature (ma‘rifat al-‘ulāhiyya) and of what is necessary, impossible, possible and not impossible for it. It is evident therefore that what is in question is a rational cognition, in other words, knowledge. On the other hand, there is a ma‘rifā which is attained by the light of faith (bi-nur al-iman), by means of which intelligence (al-‘alāq) seizes on the Esoteric and the qualifications which God ascribes to Himself. This is the second ma‘rifā which has to be that of the mystics (cf. Futūḥat, ed. ‘Uṯmān Yāḥyā, i, 203, no. 289). Ibn ‘Arabī devoted ch. 177 of the Futūḥat to “cognition of the status of cognition.” Nobody has knowledge (‘ilm) except He who knows what (‘arafa) what is through its essence. Whoever knows what is through some thing which is added to its essence, is a mukallād who intimates that which is added thus by means of that which he receives from it. Every cognisant being that is not God thus has cognition through taklīd in conforming to the data of the senses and of reason. Since He is compelled to imitate, the man of good judgment (al-ṣākil) who wishes to know God, must imitate Him in that which He has made known (akhbāra) of Himself in His Books and through the mouths of His Messengers. When he wishes to know things, not relying on his own faculties but through force of obedience (bi-khathar al-ta‘fāl), he comes into a state where God is his hearing, his sight and all his faculties. Then he knows all things through God, and God through God. This was the answer given by Dhu ‘l-Nūn when he was asked by what means he knew his Lord. “I know my Lord through my Lord; without Him I would know Him. Those who rely on their own senses, know that senses and reason can be mistaken (as al-Ghazālī pointed out in the Munkādā). They seek to distinguish the cases where they are mistaken and the cases where they are justified. But since they make this distinction with faculties which can be mistaken, they can never know whether what they classify as true is not false and vice versa. Here there is a serious malady (dā’ ʿuddāl), which can be avoided only by those who in all things have knowledge only through God. As for knowing what it is that causes such men to have knowledge from God, this is something which our error-prone faculties are incapable of establishing. Since we see that we can have knowledge only through taklīd, all that remains for us is to imitate ‘him who is called the Messenger and that which is designated as the Word of God.” We conform to these models to the point at which God becomes the totality of our faculties. We will thus be able to determine the cases where we shall take possession of truth. The man who arrives at this state is then, as the Qur’ān expresses it (XII, 108; LXXV, 14), “dāl baṣīrat.” Ma‘rifā, in its highest degree, is thus this baṣīrāt, this interior view of realities which neither the senses nor reason are capable of attaining.

Ibn ‘Arabī distinguishes three ranks of categories of knowledge (marāthīt al-ʿulām). The first is that of the knowledge of intelligence, founded on necessary principles and the demonstrations based on them. This is not under discussion here. The second is that of the knowledge of states (šīm al-adāsīl), to which the only access is through taste (gharbī), such as the knowledge of the sweetness of honey but the bitterness of bile. This definition also accords with the taste-oriented cognition of the Sūfī. The third rank is that of knowledge of secret things (al-ʿulām al-asrār). It is superior to the category of intelligence (fa’ak fa’ar al-ṣākil); it is the knowledge of the infusion of the breath of the Spirit of Holiness in the human spirit (šīm al-dākār al-khaḍr fi d-rān). It is the prerogative of the prophet (al-nabi) and of the saint (al-ʿulām). It includes two types. The first is apprehended by the intelligence, as in the first rank of knowledges, but not as a result of speculation (nazar). The second type is of two kinds. One is linked to the knowledge of the second rank, to dhawk, and is superior (aṣyāf). The other is a knowledge of information (min ḥiṣn al-ḥiṣn). This is something which our error-prone faculties are confused about with information the veracity (ṣiḥā) of which is guaranteed; this is the information given by the prophets (cf. Futūḥat, ed. Yahyā, i, 138-40, nos. 64-8). Consequently, ma‘rifā in its highest degree, where baṣīrāt is exercised, seems to accord well with the different aspects of the al-ʿulām al-asrār.

A further division is found (ibid., i, 133, no. 100): “The axis of the knowledge which belongs to men of God (ahl Allāh) consists of seven questions. For whosoever knows them (ʿarafa-hā), there is nothing in the knowledge of Realities (al-ʿulām al-baṣīrāt) which presents a difficulty. These are: cognition (ma‘rifat) of the Names of God; the cognition of epiphanic emanations (tadgīlāt); cognition of the Word addressed by God to man in the form of the language of the Law; cognition of disclosure through imagination (al-khāf al-ḥayāt); and cognition of sickness and remedies. A detailed study of these ma‘arif forms the object of ch. 177 of the Futūḥat, to which the reader is referred. All that is noted here is that it seems that among all these cognitions, there is one which is distinct in the sense that it is operated in all the others; this is the cognition of disclosure through imagination. In particular, that which Ibn ʿArabī says concerning cognition of the Names of God depends on a symbolic vision which is the act of the imagination. Here we refer to the work of H. Corbin, L’imagination créatrice dans le soufisme d’Ibn ʿArabī, Paris 1977.”
V. The Yazdan-shanakht of al-Suhrawardi. This Persian title is the equivalent of ma^rifat ... their reigns.

From the start, the Marinids displayed a remarkably dynamic military strength: with a series of campaigns C

V. Conclusion. Ma^rifat has frequently been translated as gnosis. The Greek gno\(\iota\)s probably denotes purely and simply cognition. But the word “gnosis” has taken on a particular sense; it denotes, not one, but several systems which undoubtedly have common features, but which differ considerably from one another. There are thus several gnosti: Basilidian, Valentinian, Isma\(\iota\)ll, Ikh\(\iota\)b\(\iota\), S\(\iota\)h\(\iota\)i, etc. Corbin has written in this context: “There is certainly a measure of Avicennism in all this, but it is definitely less original than Corbin suggests. It calls for the arrival of Arab tribes in the region which the soul, the being of light, brings to bear on its object; it makes itself present in making itself present to itself” (Histoire de la philosophie islamique, in the series Idées, NRF, Paris 1964, 291).

2. As a term denoting secular knowledge

Hence opposed to ‘ilm and almost synonymous with ad\(\iota\)b, see ‘ilm.

V. The appearance of the Marinids in the works of Arab chroniclers dates from the 6th/12th century, first in reference to local conflicts, then as a political factor, from the time of their participation in the battle of Alarcos, in Spain, alongside the Almohads (591/1193) [see Al-Muwahhids]. After 610/1213-14, they maintained a slow but persistent penetration into the inhabited areas of the zone which they had habitually frequented, where the arrival of Arab tribes in the region was in the process of rapid disintegration. At the start, their activity consisted only in claiming dues from the towns and charging protection dues, and the Almohads conducted an ambiguous policy towards them, fighting them at times and collaborating with them at others. By the middle of the 7th/13th century, the Almohads were no longer able to resist forcibly the physical occupation and settlement of the Marinids in the large towns. United under the leadership of the house of 5\(\text{Abd al-Hakk}, which at this point became the dynastic family, they captured Mekn\(\iota\)s in 642/1244, F\(\iota\)\(\text{s}\) in 646/1248, Sidjilmasa in 653/1255 and finally Marrakesh, the capital, in 668/1269. Only recently converted to Islam, the Marinids showed no particular reformatory zeal at the time of their occupation of Morocco, unlike their Almoravid and Almohad predecessors. They did, however, as a result of their encounters with jurists and city dwellers, cultivate a sense of mission which had a religious ingredient, wishing to provide the Muslims with just and prosperous government, which the Almohads were no longer able to offer (M. Shatzmiller, Islam de campagne et Islam de ville: le facteur religieux à l’évenement des Marinides, in SI, li [1980], 7-36).

Following the seizure of Marrakesh, the history of the Marinids is divided into two periods of approximately equal length, corresponding to two phases: a first phase (668-759/1269-1358) characterised by military exploits, urban expansion and governmental stability, and a second phase (759-870/1358-1465) which sees a slow erosion of the political structures, a territorial regression and internal division. Almost all the Marinid sovereigns of the first phase (see the dynastic list) were distinguished by the region military campaigns and the length of their reigns. From the start, the Marinids displayed a remarkably dynamic military strength: with a series of campaigns judicial decisions (fat\(\u0111\)as and na\(\u0111\)wi\(\u0111\)).
conducted in Spain against Castile (674/1275, 676/1277, 682/1283), the sultan Abu Yusuf Ya'qub established the central position which the Marinid factor was to occupy in the diplomatic scene of the western Mediterranean basin during the 12th and 8th/13th and 14th centuries. For their Maghribi co-religionists, this constant Draghag of Spanish policy constituted a permanent threat which was realised from time to time, the most violent episode being the prolonged siege of Tlemcen under the sultan Abu Ya'qub Yusuf (698-706/1299-1307). The high point of Marinid history was reached under the sultan Abu 'l-Hasan 'Ali with the siege of Tlemcen (737/1337) and of Tunis (748/1347) and the temporary subjection of the entire Maghrib (R. Thoden, Abu 'l-Hasan 'Ali. Merinidenpolitik zwischen Nordafrika und Spanien in den Jahren 710-725H/1310-1351, Freiburg 1973).

The chroniclers of the period, al-'Umari and Ibn Marzuk, supply numerous details regarding the composition, the routine, the equipment and the pay of the army. Composed of regular and irregular units, its striking force seems to have been constituted by the Arabs, since under the Andalusian recruitment, while Andalusians were recruited as unmounted archers, the Marindat assisted their mounted cavalry equipped with catapults and fire-throwners. A Chris-"munilitia, commanded by an "alcaíy" and recruited in Aragon, Castile and Portugal from 1306 onwards, with other non-indigenous elements including Kurds and negroes, constituted the regular army and the personal bodyguard of the sovereign. The Christians, between 2,000 and 5,000 at the time of Abu 'l-Hasan, were paid once every three months at the rate of 5 to 50 gold dinars per month, part of their salary being paid to their respective sovereigns. In the turbulent years of the second phase, this militia took an active part in the increasingly numerous palace revolutions. The remainder of the army was also registered in the Diwan and paid in kind. Only the chiefs of tribes received land in iktcf-

The only point of weakness was constituted by the flotilla. Due to the abundant supply of Moorish timber and the existence of ship-building yards at Ceuta and Salé, was never large enough to compete with the Aragonese fleet. The archives of the court of Aragon testify, in fact, that for naval battles, such as the seizure of Ceuta in 678/1279, Catalan ships were hired at a high price by the Marinid sovereigns. On the other hand, a Marinid unit of Zanata horsemen participated in 1285 in the European campaign against France and in 1307, 7,000 Marinids were in the service of the Nasrids of Granada.

The first phase of Marinid history was also an age of major architectural activity, and the Marinid monuments of the early period reflect the energy and the material wealth of the time. These consist primarily of three new urban conurbations, New Fez, al-Binya near Algiercas and al-Mansura near Tlemcen; of zāyān; of the necropolis of Chella; of the arsenals of Ceuta and Salé; of a kasba at Mekrēs; of mosques at al-'Ubābā, al-Mansūra and Taza; of fortifications; of a hospital for the insane at Fās; of hydraulic wheels in numerous towns, of fountains and gardens; but most of all, of magnificent madrasas, four at Fās and one at Salé, which, renowned for the beauty of their decoration and their Hispano-Moorish style, remain the Marinid monuments par excellence. The material prosperity of the Marinid state, the image that it adopted at this time, as champion of Magrībi Islam, explains the large number of pious donations (wakf ḥayri) made by members of the dynasty to the benefit of public institutions in their own towns and in captured towns, as well as those of the holy cities of the East. The chronicles of the period and the inscriptions of wakfs attest to the donation of goods, property and land by the sultans Abu Sa'id, Abu 'l-Hasan and Abu 'l-Insān to the benefit of madrasas, mosques and libraries.

Like its two contemporary dynasties, the Abi al-Wadids and the Hafsids, the Marinids state maintained the demographic, social and government-al structures of the Almoravids, as well as the physical aspects of their civilization. In addition to the Arab and Berber ethnic variety—the human wealth of the Marinid state—the demographic composition of the countryside, still agrarian and tribal, was coloured by the distinction between the sedentary population of the plains and that of the mountain regions. While the countryside remained linguistically and socially, even religiously, almost entirely Berber, the nomadic shepherds, islamised to a small extent, became more and more arabised. In the towns, largely arabised and absolutely islamised, tribal loyalty gave way to familial aristocracy. Under the Marinids, the towns gathered in Andalusian elements in ever-increasing numbers. The ethnic variety was completed by the existence of Jewish and Christian communities in the urban centres. While the Christians were merchants, priests and soldiers, more numerous in the coastal towns but still a small minority, the Jews, an indigenous element reinforced by immigrants from Spain, were more numerous and more active in all aspects of the life of the country.

The Marinid court resided at Fās, which replaced Marrakesh as the seat of the administrative appara-eratus. A Marinid sultan, bearing the title of amīr al-muslimin, and later also that of amīr al-mu'minin, was the supreme sovereign of his country, his involvement in government varying largely according to his personal inclination. Thus the sultan Abu 'l-Hasan was involved in all the bureaucratic activities of his state, especially the administration of the army, taxation—he even introduced a landownership and the fiscal system of al-dār al-layla—intellectual and religious activity, and even the administration of justice to citizens who complained of abuses on the part of his agents.

The responsibilities of the vizier, who was at certain times subordinate to the chamberlain, were on a day-to-day basis in the charge of various functions; head of finances, head of chancellery, chief of police, admiral, town governor, head of kasa, senior kādī, head of the mint and head of the mubātāhs. The Berber democratic and consultative nature of the Marinid government was maintained by the existence, throughout its history, of the council of chiefs of the Marinid tribes, which was convened at the invitation of the sovereign and mainly discussed military affairs. The economic life of Morocco under the Marinids attests to a prosperity which was unconnected with the rise, in the 8th/14th century, of the kingdom of Mali [q.v.] and the development of the gold trade. This prosperity was reflected in three sectors: agriculture, urban industry and trade with Africa and Europe. Agriculture was dominated by a system of land-ownership largely similar to that of the Hafsids: land was classified into three categories, these being public land (gīza), from which territory was leased to individuals and granted as iktcf-"malik (private property), and land endowed for religious institutions and individuals (hubus).
According to al-Umari, the revenues of ikta land were reserved for senior chiefs of the army, high dignitaries of the court, palace secretaries, kādis and Suffi ajizyas. The Marinid fatwas attest to the existence of small and medium-sized plots of land, cultivated by the owner with one or more tenant-farmers. There is no indication of the existence of large agricultural holdings, except those in the possession of members of the reigning family. All co-operation in this regard was regulated by one of three agricultural contracts agreed upon by Muslim jurists, muzaara, mughdrasa and muisakāt; khamasa also existed. The sources speak of abundant yields of fruit and vegetables cultivated in the countryside but also in the proximity of towns, wheat being the major exported product.

The local industries of the towns, textiles, tanneries, building, metal-working, ceramics, food-stuffs and glassware, gave rise to an important craft milieu which achieved prominence in the 8th/14th century with its participation in royal processions, where members of each procession marched in a group displaying a flag showing the tools of its trade, as well as written texts. Commerce with Christian countries passed especially through the town of Ceuta, but other Atlantic ports were also frequented from the 7th/13th century (660/1262), Salé, Safi, Arzila and Anfa, where in 705/1305 an agent was in residence, acting on behalf of Majorcan merchants. The duties levied by Marinid customs on imported and exported goods varied from one port to another. Christians imported into Marinid Morocco wine, cotton, pepper, flour, finished silk, camphor, cinnamon, metals, cloth, linen, fine fabrics, ropes, tackle, gum, lac, cloves, gall-nuts, Brazil wood, jewellery. They exported copper, wax, cotton goods, coral, wool, salt, leather, and above all wheat, which was cheaper than in Ifrikiya and held as a monopoly by the palace administration. No less important for Marinid Morocco was trade with Black Africa across the Sahara, whence caravans brought salt, ivory, ostrich-feathers, gum and incense, musk, Guinea pepper, ambergris, and above all gold from the Sudan in ingot and powder form, which arrived through the town of Sidjilmāsa. The vigour of external commerce explains the importance of Ceuta and of Sidjilmāsa throughout the Marinid period, as well as the aggressive character of theMagribi policy of the Marinids, which had the object of gaining control of the revenues of the Oriental, Saharan and European trade which converged in the coastal cities of the Maghrib. An abundance of yellow metal characterises the Marinid economy, as is manifested by the payments in gold (dinars) made by Marinid sovereigns especially to Spanish monarchs and recorded in their archive documents. Silver was scarce. The Marinids struck gold dinars of high quality; they followed the tradition introduced by the Almohads in minting a double dinār, the dinār ashhabī of the sources, of a weight of 4.57 gr., alongside the traditional dinār with inscription in naskhī and kufi, the dinār fidā or wasīt of the Marinid sources, of 2.26 gr., thus called because it was worth ten dirhams. Coins found indicate the existence of halves, quarters and eighths for dinārs and dirhams. The Marinids also maintained the square shape of the Almohad dirham, with an inscription also in Almohad style and in naskhī script. The quality of the striking seems, however, inferior. Marinid coinage was struck at Azemmour, Ceuta, Sidjilmaša, Fās, Marrakesh, and Salā, as well as in Maghrībi towns occupied by the Marinids: Tlemcen, Algiers, Bougie, Tuns and Tarifa. The taxes levied on the subjects of the Marinid state were usually numerous, for the most part non-Kur'ānic and, except during the reform introduced under Abu 'l-Ḥasan, leased out to waqāt. In addition to maghrībī and mukasī of all kinds [see maksi], three major taxes were in evidence: the rural population paid the khirās, which corresponded to the canonical khasādī [q.v.], also imposed on citizens who cultivated fruit trees; city and country dwellers also paid the kānūn, a capital tax similar to the dīżya [q.v.] levied on the Jews; shepherds paid the kūgr, a tax on the lands used for pasture, and each user of the irrigation systems also paid a tax on the water.

The diverse manifestations of religious and intellectual life and of literary production under the Marinids were to a large extent conditioned by changes undergone by urban society and by the development of new political and social structures. Thus from the earliest days of the dynasty, the sovereigns had to deal with a numerically strong and powerful religious establishment, which claimed for itself the role of spokesman of society and was in evidence especially in Fās. The popular revolt which took place in this city obliged the Marinids to confront the opposition of an autonomous urban movement to their régime, and to neutralise it by the creation of their own religious and intellectual circles. In order to achieve this aim, there was introduced into Morocco for the first time the institution of the madrasa [q.v.], which led to the creation of a body of Zanātā fahahārid whose loyalty to the régime could not be doubted. At the same time, because of the hostility of the city dwellers, even the administrative and literary circles of the court had to be recruited from among the new immigrants from Andalusia, from Ifrikiya, from the central Maghrib and even from the countryside (Shatzmiller, Les premiers Merinides et le milieu religieux de Fès: l'introduction des madrasa, in SI, xliii [1976], 109-18).

In general, the religious life of the period was marked by the restoration of Mālikism as an official rite, a process which had been well advanced under the last Almohads, but even more by the diffusion of Sufism which, spreading to the countryside and practised in a particularly Maghrībi form, degenerated into maraboutism. In the towns, Sufism was also practised, but in a more refined form, with the participation of the sultans, the dignitaries and the men of letters.

Literary production under the Marinids was multiple and varied, with Oriental and Andalusian elements of style and structure playing a dominant role. The areas cultivated were classical: fikā, biography, hagiography, poetry, geography (Ibn Baṭṭūta and al-Abdārī) at the same time as philosophic and natural sciences (Ibn al-Banna). Only history experienced an extraordinary development in this period, both in general and in detail, a phenomenon illustrated by the composition of the great regional histories of the mediaeval Maghrib (Ibn 'Ishārī and Ibn Khaldūn) and the appearance of local history, of towns and of dynasties, the mouthpiece of the social milieu and of territorial nationalism. The Marinid sovereigns encouraged the writing of their history, driven by a desire for legitimisation which their authority lacked.

The decline which struck the Marinid dynasty, immediately after its period of greatest prosperity, continued throughout the second phase of its history. This process was characterised by a crisis of succession of which the Kitāb al-Burāq provides the details: a multitude of children of the Marinid family were successively placed in power by innumerable revolts on the part of Arab and Berber tribes and by palace
revolutions, while real power passed into the hands of viziers. The absence of a strong central authority weakened the authority of the Marmid dynasty and was accelerated by socio-religious changes, which took place in proximity to the major towns and disrupted the might of the tribal countryside. It remains true, however, that under the Marinid dynasty there were introduced into Morocco, for the first time, the idea and the political structures of national and geographical unity which were to become modern Morocco.


AL-MARIS, the term applied to the area of the ancient kingdom of Nobatia, northermost of the Nubian Christian kingdoms, and occasionally also to its people. Broadly, it encompassed the area from Aswân to the northern border of al-Mukurra [q.v.], and was under the control of the king of Dunkûla [see Dongola], the "Lord of Mukurra and Nubia". The northern frontier, according to al-Manûfî, quoting al-Djâhiz, was indicated by two rocks jutting into the Nile five miles beyond Aswân; the southern limit was at Basûn (and variants) where al-Mukurra proper began. The capital was at Faras, and there were also important forts, including Kasr Ihbrûm. The administration was vested in the "Lord of the Mountain" (Sâhib al-Djâbal, or "Lord of the Horses", Sâhib al-Khalî, in Ibn al-Furât), the Eparch of Nobatia, under the authority of the king at Dunkûla. This official's duties were to receive correspondence and visitors destined for the king, and to control passage southward into Nubia. The population of al-Maris contained an admixture of Arabs, and al-Masûdî mentions a case in 218/833 between the king of Nubia and the Muslim citizens of Aswân who owned estates in al-Maris. The king held that land could not be sold since it was his property, worked by his subjects only in their capacity as his slaves. The case was judged in favour of the purchasers. According to Yusûf the Egyptian, there was a bishop of al-Maris (perhaps the bishop of Pachoras (Faras)). The provinces of al-ʿAlli and al-Djâbal, part of al-Maris, were apparently ceded to Egypt by the treaty of 674/1276, and the Muslim Banû ʾI-Kanz [q.v.] gradually became prominent in the region, eventually taking the throne at Dunkûla. Several of the Arab writers tell of the Marisî wind, which brought a pestilence to Egypt, so that people took on the habit of wearing the Djibbs and covering their heads with mourning black scarves or veils and for their funerals the designation "Maurotania" in Abba Mina's Coptic Life of the patriarch Isaac (ca. 700 A.D.), would appear

**MÂRISTAN [see BÎMÂRISTAN].**

**MARITTA [see MURÎD].**

**MÂRIYA,** a Copt maiden, according to one statement, daughter of a man named Shâmânî, who was sent with her sister Sirîn by the Mukawkîs [q. v.] in the year 6 or 7/627-9 to Muhammad as a gift of love for her excited such jealousy among his other wives that he might divorce them in order to marry her. He was very devoted to her and gave her a house in the upper town of Medina, where he is said to have visited her by day and night; this house was called after her the mashraba of the mother of Ibrâhîm. To the great joy of the Prophet, she bore him a son whom he called Ibrâhîm, but he died in infancy. According to tradition, an eclipse of the sun took place on the day of his death, an interesting statement by which we can get some idea of the esteem in which Muhammad's followers held him. The Prophet made her his concubine, while he gave Sirîn to Hassan b. Thabit [q. v.].

There is no reason to doubt the essential correctness of the story, as there is no particular bias in it and it contains all sorts of details which do not look in the least like inventions, so that it is exaggerated scepticism when Lammens supposes that the "mother of Ibrahim", after whom the mashraba was called, was some Jewess. On the other hand, in view of the fact that all the marriages of Muhammad after the hidjra were childless, it would have been surprising if evil-minded people had not cast suspicions on the paternity of Ibrâhîm, and that this actually happened is evident from some traditions, the object of which is to defend Mâriya from this suspicion.

On the other hand, it is not so easy to justify the part which Kur'anic exegesis makes Mâriya play in the exposition of sûra LXVI. In this sûra, the Prophet speaks in a very indignant tone against one of his wives, because she has betrayed a secret to another, which he had imparted to her under a promise of the strictest secrecy. At the same time, Allah blames him, because, in order to please his wives, he had bound himself by oath to refrain from something which is not definitely stated and because he does not use the right grant given him by Allah to release himself from his oath. In addition, there is a word of warning to the two women who had disobeyed him and a threat to all his wives that he might divorce them in order to marry more pious ones (cf. XXXIII, 28-9). According to the usual explanation, the two wives are Hafsa and 'Aishah, and the revelation is said to have been provoked by the fact that Hafsa, on returning from Medina, found Mâriya and the Prophet in an intimate tête-à-tête and that on that day by which rotation belonged to her (or 'Aishah). In his embarrassment, he pledged himself by oath to have no more relations with the Copt girl. But after Hafsa's breach of faith, Allah tells him to release himself from his oath. This explanation fits very well in some respects, and that the promise of continence is connected with marital complications is illuminating. That there are hadîths, which explain his quarrel with his wives quite differently, does not mean very much, for they are no doubt invented to drive out of currency the popular, less edifying version. But, on closer examination, there is one flaw which makes the latter uncertain, for it does not answer the question how Muhammad could call the situation in which Hafsa caught him and Mâriya a secret that is said to have been entrusted to her.

**MÂRIYYA** is the Arab name for the Spanish town of Almería. According to some authors, it was originally called Mâriyât Badjja, for it had been the port or maritime suburb of Pechina (Badjja) [q. v.], the ancient Roman Urâ. Today, Almería is the chief town of the province (which has the same name) in the most easterly part of Andalusia on the Mediterranean coast. It is surrounded by bare mountains with steppe-like vegetation, and this means that its countryside is very similar to that of some parts of the North African coastline opposite. The only part not surrounded by rocky mountains is the area towards Cape Gata, and it has always been a region of low rainfall. The land is very eroded and marked by numerous râmelis, which have been hollowed out by raging torrents during the time it does rain. By contrast, the Rio de Almería valley, the Andarax (Andarash), is a green fertile zone producing an abundance of fruit. This land of violent contrast has been witness to many splendid years of the Islamic era and has been described often in great detail by Arab writers, from East and West alike.

The Islamic history of Almería is closely linked with that of Pechina which, thanks to its own location on the coast, existed before Almería, gave it birth and saw it develop. Soon after its rapid conquest from 93/713 to 95/715, it was populated mainly by Yemeni Arabs throughout a large area extending almost as far as the Guadix (Wadi Agh), but there were also several Berber settlements, especially in the region of the lower valley. During the middle ages, the area was still part of the Guadalquivir, and this part of the North African coastline opposite. The small village and port of al-Mariyya became
more important than the neighbouring Aguilas, and it was an administrative dependency of the kura (iklim, iklim) and Dallás (Dallaya) also dependent on Pechina. Dallás was the birthplace of al-Udhri, the well-known geographer of the 5th/11th century, who provided a careful description of al-Mariyya with much interesting information (see Taṣrīḥ al-ṣāḥib, ed. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz al-Ahwānī, Madrid 1965, index). Other towns are Adra towards the fortresses of Vélez Rubio (Báñish), Belicena (Balísana), Purchena (Barahína), Sénés (Shanish), Andarax (Andarash), to name but a few mentioned by al-Idrīsī (Opus geographicum, v, 537, 536-4) and by Abu ʿl-Fida. All these towns, as well as Vera (Bayra) and some others, were taken as dependencies of Nasrid Granada during the last centuries of Islamic rule.

The region of al-Mariyya is surrounded by steeply sloping sierras which make overland communications difficult. The town was established in 344/955 by order of ʿAbd al-Raḥmān III al-Nāṣir [q.v.], its special maritime importance arises from the fact that it faces the North African ports of Tēnēs and other Algerian and Tunisian ports, as well as Alexandria and the extreme Eastern Mediterranean. Arab geographers, therefore, chose an apt name for it, "the gateway to the East", the key to commerce and trade of every kind. The name of al-Mariyya (sic, not al-Mariyia) has given rise to various explanations. The idea of "watch-tower" could have come from the time when men reported there for guard duty, for it was a look-out post during the raids by the Berbers, excluding the fortress which was called kal-ʿat Khayrdn, renowned for this and without rival in al-Andalus. The town, and that there were as many looms for production of textiles, as can be seen from the names given to some of the cloths, like lāyā, siglaton, baldachin, and all sorts of silk, which was known to be better (and more expensive) than the fabrics of Cordova and Seville. This had the effect of reducing the economic potential. It can be argued that it prospered most in the second half of the 5th/11th century and the first half of the 6th/12th century; then it suffered the first Christian conquest in 1147, by Alfonso VII of Castile, which is celebrated in the Chronica Adephonsi Imperatoris. Its economic development and its military and naval importance showed itself in the commercial and industrial ventures that were undertaken and its growth as a city and artistic centre. Beginning with al-Idrīsī, many geographers from the 6th/12th to the 8th/14th centuries, including the compiler al-Makki, agree that the cloth and brocade (dīḥāq) produced there were as fine as the products of Cordova; the town became highly renowned for this and without rival in al-Andalus. Among the materials and brocades which had built up the reputation of the town's industry were cloth of gold (waṣīl [q.v.]) (which was also made at Malaga [q.v.]), siglaton, baldachin, and all sorts of silk, which was known to be better (and more expensive) than that from other areas. There was an obvious eastern influence on the manufacture of textiles, as can be seen from the names given to some of the cloths, like ṣafāḥūn and ṣūrānihūn, which sound Persian, and ʿṭāṭib, which was probably ʿṭrākī. Al-Zuhri (Kāṭib al-Dirāfīya, ed. M. Hadij-Sadok, in BEO, xxii [1968], 101/206) mentions other white-coloured fabrics brocaded with gold, which, according to many sources, were favoured by the women of al-Mariyya for their garments. Other reliable authorities claim that there were 800 or 1,000 factories for tīrāz in the town, and that there were as many looms for producing other fabrics as well. Naturally, this would have given employment to a considerable number of weavers.

Beside textiles, other industries included the building of warships (in the dīr al-tāwaf [sic]), and the town thus came to be known as a centre of commerce, with a great number of markets, inns and baths. The population of Pechina, situated several kilometres inland, was absorbed by al-Mariyya, and it was used for their garments. Other reliable authorities claim that there were 800 or 1,000 factories for tīrāz in the town, and that there were as many looms for producing other fabrics as well. Naturally, this would have given employment to a considerable number of weavers.
manufacture of tools and weapons from copper and iron. Agricultural products of the region came especially from the valleys of the Andarax and the Almanzora (source of the Rajá). Where there were olive trees, vineyards, aloe trees, and fruit trees, the land was used for plantations and sugar-cane. The marble from the Macael quarries in the Sierra Filabres was particularly famous because it was used for covering plinths and for paving palaces, especially the one called al-summadiyya (see L. Seco de Lucena, Los palacios del taifa almorávide del Mu'tàsim, in Cuadernos de la Alhambra, iii [1967], 15-20; J. Bosch Vilà, Mostrabes en el arte de la taifa de Almería, in Cuad. Hist. Isl. 19, v [Granada, 1977], 156). Mine-working in the area was to produce silver and gold; some writers say there were precious stones. The marble was also used to make columns, capitals, tombstones (makbariyya) and fountains.

From the time when the town was taken by the Christians in 1147 and its recapture by the Almohads in 1157, the commercial and cultural prosperity there dwindled. The most eminent citizens emigrated to North Africa, and several of the more densely populated and busier areas of the town were destroyed. Muhammad b. Yâyá al-Ramími (or Rumaymi), who had recognised the authority of Ibn Húd [see HÚDIK], was to be assassinated in al-Mariyya. These factions and subsequent internal political struggles considerably weakened the influence of the capital; and, after it had been incorporated into the kingdom of Granada by Muhammad I in Jshawwál, 635/May-June 1238, it ended its Islamic life under the Nasríds. There was a major attack on the town in August 1309 when it was besieged by the Aragonese of James II (see R. Basset, Le siège d'Almería en 709, in JA, 10th ser., x [1907], 275 ff.; I.S. Allouche, La relation du siège d'Almería en 709 (1309-1310) d'apres de nouveaux manuscrits de la Durre d'al-hiyal, in Hesperis, xvi [1933], 122-38; E. Lévi-Provençal, Un "zayád" hispanique sur l'expédition aragonaise de 1309 contre Almería, in Al-And., vi [1941], 377-99). It continued to suffer from internal troubles and was involved in the dynastic rivalries and civil wars which weakened the kingdom of Granada and cast a shadow over the future of the Muslims of al-Andalus.

Al-Zaghal, the uncle and enemy of Boabdil, took refuge in al-Mariyya and was delivered into the hands of the kings of Castile on 22 December 1449.

Bibliography: References have been given in the text to Arab authors and the principal geographical and historical sources relevant to al-Mariyya and Maláka. See also G. Gilbert, La ville d’Almería à l’époque musulmane, in CT, xviii/69-70 (1970), 61-72; J.A. Tapia Garrido, Almería musulmana (711-1417 y 1417-1482) = vols. ii and iii of Historia General de Almería y su provincia, [Almería] 1976-8; and finally, E. Molina López, Algunas consideraciones sobre la vida socio-económica de Almería en el siglo XI y primera mitad del XII, in Actas del IV coloquio hispano-tunecino de Málaga en 1979, Madrid 1982. There is also Abd al-Azíz Sálím, Algunos aspectos del florecimiento económico de Almería islámica durante el periodo de los Taifas y de los Almorávides, Madrid 1979; idem, Ta’ifi mudání al-Mariyya al-islamiyya, Beirut 1969. (J. Bosch Vilà)

AL-MARKAB, observatory [see MARSAD].

Al-MARKAB, a fortress situated on the Syrian coast.

The name of al-Markab, from the root rakaba "observer, watch", denotes any elevated site from which it is possible to see and observe, such as the summits of a fortified castle or of a watch-tower (LA, ed. Beirut 1955, i, 424-8; Yázúr, ed. Beirut 1957, v, 108-9). Arab authors generally call this stronghold al-Markab; also found are Ka‘afat Markab and Híin Markab. There are also Arabic transcriptions such as Már Kábus for Markappos, Már Kábus for Markab, Már Qábir for Markab, Már Qábir for Már Gábir for Marghtam or Márqáth for Margat. In western works various spellings are encountered, including El-Marcab, Margat and Margath, Markab or Marqab.

1. Geography of the site. On current maps, the castle is situated at 35°27' E. by 35°10' N., between Lá’dhikíyya [q.v.] and Tárút, standing at an altitude of 1,187 ft./362 m. at the summit of a broad and steeply-sloping promontory, separated from a plateau of lava deposits. This barely accessible summit is one of the western foothills of the Djabal Aššáriyya range which extends towards the north, evidence of very ancient volcanic activity marked by streams of basalt in the regions of al-Markab.

The castle affords a unique panorama towards the east over land consisting of calcareous hills with outcrops of quaternary and pliocene clay, the territory of the Assassins or Hashishiyya [q.v.], and towards the west over the coastal plain which is fringed by basaltic sand and intended with small coves. At the foot of the castle there is a cove which is sheltered from the wind and capable of accommodating ships of limited tonnage; Walpole (Travels, iii, 289) noticed here in the 19th century some remains of masonry, possibly possibly the medieval harbour installations. At this latitude the coast is one-and-a-half days’ sailing distance from Cyprus.

The castle overlooks the main coastal road, at the point where the coastal expanse is narrowest. It is also at the foot of al-Markab that the road from Hamât [q.v.] by way of Masyad [q.v.] reaches the sea.

The barrier constituted by the basalt mass of al-Markab is skirted to the north by the Nahr Baniyas, which is swollen by a prolific water-source upstream from Bânîyas, and to the south by the Nahr Markiya, which flows between al-Markab and Khírîb Markiya (ruins of Muracela, Murachea); this coastal stream, according to The itinerary from Bordeaux to Jerusalem, constituted the northern frontier of Phoenicia. According to William of Tyre, this place marked the frontier between the Principality of Antioch and the County of Tripoli.

2. History. Among the early Arab geographers and travellers who made mention of al-Markab, al-Idrísi (Opus geographicum, 644, tr. Jaubert, 130) says that "it is a fortress built on a mountain inaccessible from all directions"; Yázúr says in his Musád that "it is a town and a castle overlooking the shore of the Syrian Sea. It protects the city of Bulunyás and the coast of Djabal [q.v.] All those who have passed by it say that they have never seen anything of comparable might." At the beginning of the 8th/14th century, Ibn Batútá (i, 183) visited al-Markab and mentions it as one of the great castles of Syria constructed on the summit of a high mountain and recalls that Sultan Kaláwín [q.v.] captured it from the Christians (in 684/1285). His contemporary al-Dináqí (ed. Mehren, 288) says that "Híin al-Markab is an impregnable fortress on a 'tongue of land' overlooking the sea". Abu `I-Fidá’î is more laconic, saying only that "al-Markab and Buluníyas are situated on the coast of Híin; al-Markab is the name of the castle overlooking the sea". Finally, al-Kalákshádí, in the 9th/15th century, stresses that "al-Markab is mentioned neither in the Ta’ráj nor the Masálik al-ahbár"; he used material from Abu `I-Fidá’î in his Sud, i, 145-6), saying that "it is a fortress near the coast of the ‘Roman Sea’ (al-Bejr al-Rúm) in the
fourth region and according to the $\text{Zagh}$, (corrective tables of the Ptolemaic measures, one dating from 360/965, the other from 1240/35) situated at long. 60°, lat. 34°45'. It is a powerful and finely-constructed fortress overlooking the sea; at a distance of about one parasang, the town of Biliñyās (sic = Bāniyās) is located.\(^\dagger\)

According to the chronicle of Abū Qālibi Ḥumām b. al-Ḵafīḍ the Muḥādhdhib al-_MAGIC was quoted in Yakut, and according to the $\text{Təwqı̄d al-Kulz}$ wa T-ḫuṣna of Abū Mūḏirī quoted in Abu T-Fīḍah (ed. Reinaud and de Slane, 255), the fortress was built by the Muslims in 454/1062. Al-Dimashqī (ed. Mehrere, 208) states that al-Markan was constructed with stones from previous ruins, often with well-cut blocks found on the site, and attributes its foundation to al-Rahīd. It is hardly probable that the person in question is Ḥārūn al-RaḥĪd, considered by Van Berchem (Voyage, 304, n. 4) to be a proverbial expression, and even less likely is the opinion of G. Le Strange (Palestine, 506) that the reference is to Raṣīḥīd al-Dīn (Sinān) a contemporary of Șaḥāl al-Dīn. It is not impossible that the Raṣīḥīd mentioned by Usāmā b. Munkīdīn and then by al-Dimashqī could be Raṣīḥīd al-Dawla Muḥmūd b. Naṣr, who was Mūḏiṣd amīn of Ḥalab in 452/960-1 and again from 467/1075, a supposition which is not contradicted by the secondary use of ancient materials and which is confirmed by the presence of relics dating back to the 5th/11th century. The citadel was intended to block the advance of the Byzantines, who controlled the province of al-Anṭākiyya, towards the south.

In 494/1101, al-Markan and its hinterland were in the hands of the Banū Mūḥriz, who were also in command of the castle of Kaḍmūs. In the course of an expedition conducted in 497/1104 by the Byzantines against the Syrian coast, the Admiral Cantacuzenus, having been repulsed before the citadel of Ladhīkiyya, disembarked at Bulunīyās, disembaraekd at Bulunīyās (Bāniyās) and took possession, according to Anna Comnena in the Alexiad (\'Ayyūṣ, ed. B. Leib, III, liv, XI, 40), of the important strategic point known as al-Markan (tō xaλloun-μενος Mavrogénov, the Marchapin of the historians) and of other fortified sites in the region such as Sūfiḫā (tō te Ἀργυροκόστερον) and Djabala (tō Υβάλα). In 506/1116-17 the heights of al-Markan represented the frontier of the principality of Antioch. In 510/1116-17 the crops failed as a result of inclement weather and drought and the situation was aggravated by financial inflation; Ibn Mūḥriz, master of al-Markan, was placed in an increasingly difficult position, in that he did not have the means to maintain the citadel and was threatened by the Franks. He even went to the extent of offering to cede the castle to Tughṭākin. The Atābeq of Damascus sent the kāṭīb Ibn Shūlayhā, the former master of Djabala, to his aid. On the advice of Tughṭākin, Ibn Shūlayhā took possession of the fortress and allowed the family of the Banū Mūḥriz to remain there. The same year, Roger of Antioch, having concluded a treaty with the eunuch Lūnū, who governed Aleppo, marched against al-Markan. Pons de Saint-Gilles, Count of Tripoli, came to his aid, but following a quarrel, they abandoned the siege.

Soon afterwards the Atābeq of Damascus negotiated an agreement with the Franks, ceding al-Markan in exchange for Kafanea and the cessation of their attacks on Ḥanām and Ḥimṣ. Ibn Mūḥriz resisted the attacks of Renaud Mazoyer, the master of Bulunīyās/Bāniyās, eventually negotiating with him in 511/1117-18. Renaud took possession of the castle, promising Ibn Mūḥriz that he would be allowed to remain, but the new castellan expelled him twenty-five days later, allotting to him in exchange the fortress of Manīkā in the Djabal Bahrā.

Thus Renaud Mazoyer, High Constable of the principality of Antioch, belonging to an important family mentioned in the Lignages, became the first Frankish governor of al-Markan, with territory embracing the mountainous hinterland as far as Abū Kubays, which overlooked the valley of the Qābih (sic). Frankish and Armenian settlers were established at al-Markan.

After the death of Roger of Antioch at the battle of Ager Sanguinis at Sarmada on 17 Rabi'* 5/1532/28 June 1119, the situation in the principality became tense, and the Mazoyers had difficulty retaining control of the stronghold.

If the Syrian historian al-\(\text{Aṣūmī} \) [g. v.] is to be believed, it seems that the Muslims occupied al-Markan between 525/1130 and 534/1140 during the dispute between the Franks of Antioch and the Franks of Tripoli. The situation caused anxiety to the Franks, as freedom of movement in the coastal area was threatened. According to the Genoese historian Caffaro (d. 1166), the castle of al-Markan was taken from the Muslims by trickery in 534/1140 and seized by Renaud II Mazoyer, who seems to have received the Patriarch at al-Markan. In order to meet the cost of maintaining the castle and its garrison, the castellan of al-Markan was obliged to sell, piecemeal, to the Order of the Hospitallers, his huge domains, part of which lay in the Rūḏ between Anṭākiyya and Afāmiyya [g. v.]. After the death of Renaud II, his son Bertrand Mazoyer, having insufficient resources at his disposal, renounced his claims to the castle; on the advice of the Patriarch Aimery and with the consent of the Prince of Antioch, he ceded to Roger de Moulins, Grand Master of the Hospitallers, by an act of donation concluded at al-Markan on 9 Dhu 'l-Ka‘a’d 581/1 February 1186, the castle with all its territories and dependencies including Bāniyās, Kaḍmūs, Ulāyka and Abū Kubays. On 30 June 1186 Pope Urban III appointed Brother Henry as castellan.

"The fief of Markab corresponded approximately to the bishopric of Bouloúniyya (Valania); after 1188 the bishop of Valania and his hierarchal superior, the archbishop of Apamea, were constrained by the military situation to take refuge within the walls of Markab" (Cl. Cahen, Syrie, 519).

After the victory of Hīṣṭil [g. v.], Șaḥāl al-Dīn was intent on the reconquest of Syria. In Dhumād I 584/July 1188, coming from Tartus, he was obliged to pass by the foot of al-Markan on the coastal road dominated by the Burdāj al-Ṣabī, linked to the castle by a wall. In his advance along the coast he had been followed by the Norman fleet of Sicily,
commanded by the Admiral Margaritus of Brindisi. The ships moored in the cove of al-Markab, and their crews showered missiles on the Ayyubid army, which was only able to continue its northward march with the protection of a veritable palisade erected along the sea-shore, as described by Ibn al-Din al-Ishâhînî (tr. Massê, 125-6). In the principality of Antioch, only the city itself and the fortress of al-Markab remained in the hands of the Crusaders at the end of Salâb al-Din's campaign.

The Prince Isaac Commenus, who became the independent ruler of Cyprus in 1184, gave the Crusaders an unfriendly reception on his island and was taken prisoner, at the battle of Tremithousia on 5 Dhu al-Maharram 587/31 May 1191, by Richard Coeur-de-Lion, who incarcerated him at al-Markab, where he remained until his death in 591/1195.

By means of the tribute levied on the Assassins of Djabal Bahra and their own resources, the Hospitallers were able, after 588/1192, to restore the defences of al-Markab. This site, with Hisn al-Akrâd, became one of the most important items in the defensive apparatus of the Crusaders against the Muslim domain, an apparatus comprising 3'âkkâr, 5'arks, Kdâ'yât, Sâfî'hât (Chastel Blanc), Uraymâ, Kdâ'Fât Yahmûr (Chastel Rouge) and Tartûs, in addition to the towers and subsidiary points linking these various places.

In 601/1204, a general chapter of the Order of the Hospitallers was held at al-Markab under the presidency of the Grand Master. From the beginning of the 7th/13th century, the garrison of al-Markab was in a state of constant conflict with the chieftain of Aleppo. In 601/1204-5, al-Malik al-Zahir Ghâzî [q.v.], whose domains bordered on that of al-Markâb, sent an army to attack the castle; several towers were destroyed but when its leader was killed by an arrow the army withdrew.

In the account of his travels in Syria in 1212, Wilbrand von Oldenburg gives the most complete description available of al-Markab: “A huge and very strong castle, defended by a double wall and surrounded by numerous towers. It stands on a high mountain. This castle belongs to the Hospitallers and is the most powerful defence of the whole country.... The ‘Old Man of the Mountains’ and the Soudan of Aleppo pay to it every year a tribute of 2,000 marks. Each night, four Knights of the Hospital and twenty-eight soldiers mount guard. In addition to the garrison, the Hospitallers maintain 1,000 persons there. The territory surrounding the fortress yields every year crops in excess of 500 loads of sheaves. The provisions gathered there are sufficient to last five years.” (Laurent, Peregintatores, 170). The same author informs us that “for quite a long time, Margat has been an episcopal seat” and that the bishop of Valânia (Bâniyâs) had transferred his residence there.

In this period, pilgrims embarked from al-Markab en route for Sûrâydiyya in the Principality of Antioch, with the aim of avoiding the Muslim towns and territories of the coast.

On the eve of the Fifth Crusade, in 613/1216, Pope Honorius III, successor to Innocent III, sent Jacques de Vitry to preach the Holy War in Syria, where he visited all the Crusaders’ strongholds and praised especially the might of al-Markab. In the same period, Yâkût wrote that al-Markab “is a castle such that all men declare that they have never seen its equal” (v. 108).

The following year, in 614/September 1217, Andrew II, king of Hungary, disembarked at ‘Âkkâ with a Crusader army; at the beginning of

Rama’dân 614/early December 1217 he suffered a defeat before Mount Tabor (Djâbal Thawr) and subsequently returned to Europe. Before leaving Syria, he halted at al-Markâb; he was impressed by its defences and made a substantial donation towards their maintenance. At the end of 614/early 1218, the castellan of al-Markâb enlarged his territory and made himself master of Djabala, whose ruler and inhabitants were obliged to perform an act of allegiance to the Hospitallers.

Having refused Frederick II, the excommunicated German Emperor, any support for his crusade in 1229, the Hospitallers received no aid from him towards the upkeep of al-Markab and Hisn al-Akrâd.

In Rébi’â II 628/February 1231, the troops of Aleppo began once more to pillage the neighbourhood of al-Markab; a truce was concluded at the end of spring 628/1231. In 639/1242, the truce was revoked and the Grand Master of the Order, Pierre de Vieille Bride, resumed a campaign of harassment against the territory of Aleppo from al-Markab.

Towards the middle of the 7th/13th century, al-Markab became an official episcopal seat when the bishop of Valânia (Bâniyâs) transferred his residence there.

From 659/1261, Sultan Baybars [q.v.] launched offensives against the strongholds of the Hospitallers, who paid a heavy price for their defence. The frantic appeals of the Grand Master of the Order, Hugues Revel, went unanswered. But, inasmuch as the Mamlûk sultans feared a revival of the Crusades and an expedition of Christians from Cyprus or from the West, al-Markab, like Hisn al-Akrâd, retained its strategic value. An agreement was reached between the Hospitallers and the Templars regarding the possessions of the Hospitallers in the region of al-Markâb.

In 665/1267, a treaty was concluded between Baybars and Hugues Revel in regard to these two fortresses for a period of ten years, ten months and ten hours; the enforcement of his treaty, accompanied by considerable sums of money, was supervised by the qa’d of the sultan at Hims. In 666/1268, Baybars took possession of Antioch, and seized Djabala and Lâdhîhiyya. In 1270, the sultan pillaged the neighbourhood of al-Markab and of Hisn al-Akrâd. In Shâbân 669/March-April 1281, after the capture of Hisn al-Akrâd by Baybars, the Hospitallers were left with only one fortress, al-Markâb; the Grand Master of the Order was only able to obtain a truce of ten years and ten days—negotiated through the intermediary of the amîr Sayf al-Din Balâban al-Dâwâdâr (Munkhal, no. 689)—in exchange for the cession of half of the coastal region (sâhib) of Tartûs, al-Markab and Bâniyâs and on condition that no new fortresses were to be constructed.

In Dhuâl-Hijjah 670/November 1279, taking advantage of the unrest which broke out in Syria with the accession of Sultan Calâwûn, the Hospitallers launched a raid in the direction of Bukâyâ [q.v.], but withdrew when attacked by the Muslims. On reaching the coast, they turned and routed the Muslims. After the defeat of the Armeno-Mongolian troops, the sultan commanded the amîr Sayf al-Din Balâban al-Tâbbâkî (Munkhal, no. 692), governor of Hisn al-Akrâd, to lay siege to al-Markâb. In Shawwâl 679/September 1281, the Hospitallers made a sortie and repelled the Muslims, inflicting heavy losses. On 22 Muharram 680/13 May 1281, a truce of ten years and ten months was concluded between Kalâwûn and Nicholas Lorgne, the Grand Master of the Hospitallers.
In autumn 680/1281, the latter appealed in writing for help from Edward I, King of England; in September 1281 a Mongol invasion took place in Syria. Kalâwûn succeeded, in Dîjmâdâ II/October, in repelling the Mongols near Hîms, whether the Hospitallers of al-Markâb had sent a contingent to aid the Iljîkân.

In 682/1283, the pilgrim Burchard de Mont Stion mentions in his account the “castrum Margath” — whose defensive might he extolled as belonging to the Hospitallers of St. John — and as the residence of the Bishop of Valania (Laurent, Persgrinitores, 30, 70).

In 1285, the sultan sought to punish the Hospitallers of al-Markâb for the assistance that they had provided to the Mongols. Having assembled at Damascus, in great secrecy, a considerable quantity of siege materials, Kalâwûn appeared before al-Markâb on 10 Sa‘ar 684/17 April 1285. The siege lasted 38 days, and was especially remarkable for the work of the Muslim sappers and miners who dug numerous tunnels under the walls. An exploding mine caused the collapse of the angle of the salient (bashûrd) near the Ram Tower at the southern extremity and sowed panic among the attackers, who withdrew on 17 Rabî‘ 1/23 May. Discovering the number of tunnels dug around the castle, the Hospitallers abandoned their struggle; the amir Fâkhr al-Dîn Muxrî received the surrender, and Kalâwûn entered the castle on 19 Rabî‘ 1/25 May, having given ammas to the vanquished. Aware of the strategic importance of al-Markâb, the sultan, after installing a strong garrison, repaired the defences as is indicated by the large inscription on white marble (cf. RCEA, 310-15, where the French translation by Reinaud is also provided).

In the treaty concluded on 1 Rabi‘ II 684/6 June 1285 between Kalâwûn and Leo III of Armenia, al-Markâb is mentioned among the possessions of the Mamlûk sultan; the district (niydbã) of al-Markâb is the sixth dependency of the mamlûk of Tarâbulûs. The maintenance of the fortress was charged to the private resources of the sultan. Curiously, al-Markâb is mentioned neither in the Masâlik al-Mamalik nor in the district (niydbã) of the governors of the region and that it could be reached from Bâniyâs in an hour and a half by way of a steep incline, in a south-easterly direction. In his Kitâb al-Jamik, Ibn al-Bawwâs indicates that the fortress is one of the important sites of the province of Tarabûls, “the precipitous site of the precipitous sites” including “the precipitous site of al-Markâb”. He gives no description of it and in fact does not seem to have seen it.

From the time of the period of the Burdjiyya Mamlûks [q.v.], al-Markâb is primarily mentioned in the texts in its capacity as a state prison. Among the unwilling guests of this castle were: Sayf al-Dîn Aynabak al-Bâdri, atabak al-‘azîrik (Manhal, no. 622; Ibn Taghibûrî, Nûdûm, xi, 154) and his kinsman Sayf al-Dîn Karatây Ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azîz al-Aghfâri (Manhal, no. 1850), both imprisoned in 778/1376-7. Dîjrâmûr, known as Akhî Tû [Manhal, no. 831; Ibn Kâdi Şubhâ, 98] was sent there on the order of Kîmidâ in Sa‘har 784/October 1382, an experience which did not prevent him becoming governor of Damascus in 791/1389 (Laoust, Gouverneurs, 16). In 785/1383, Sayf al-Dîn Ahmad Akgûba b. ‘Abd Allâh al-Dawwâb (Manhal, no. 478; Ibn Kâdi Şubhâ, 106, 113; Nûdûm, xii, 202, 303) joined him there and was freed a few months later at the same time as the former.

In 791/1389, three amrûs were incarcerated there: Nasr al-Dîn Ibn al-Hadhâmî, nabl of Hamît (Ibn Kâdi Şubhâ, 291), Timûrûghûn known as Mintâkh (Manhal, no. 772) and Bahâdûr al-Shîhûtâ al-Tawâshî (Manhal, no. 702) who arrived there in Dîjmâdâ II/June.

In 800/1397-8, Sayf al-Dîn Shaikh Ibn ‘Abd Allâh al-Šâfawî al-Khîsâshî (Manhal, no. 1184) arrived as a prisoner at the castle and died there a year later. The amir âdhdûk al-Dawadar (Ibn Kâdi Şubhâ, 621) was imprisoned there in 805/1402-3. In the same year, Sudûn min al-Murâbîn al-Bûbûrî known as Tûz (Manhal, no. 1126; Nûdûm, xii, 177, 298) was transferred from the prison of al-Iskandariyya to al-Markâb. Sayf al-Dîn Baktîmûr Dju’llâk al-Zâhirî known as Tûz (Manhal, no. 676) was present there for a short period; imprisoned in 810/1408, he was freed the same year. Sayf al-Dîn Damdûn Ibn Dju’llâk al-Zâhirî (H. Sauvaire, Description de Damas, in JA [1895], x, 308, no. 135) was interned there for a period of time on the orders of al-Malik al-Mu‘ayyad Shaikh and then released in 818/1415. The amir Kâni-Bay b. ‘Abd Allâh al-Muhammâdî (Manhal, no. 1811; Darrag, L’Egoïste sous Barisbey, 14) governor of Damascus who, following a rebellion in 818/1415 was recalled to Cairo, was appointed governor of Tripoli in Rabi‘ II 821/May 1417; shortly after this he suffered a defeat at the hands of the Turcomans, was dismissed and imprisoned at al-Markâb, where he stayed for two years before being freed. Finally, in Rabi‘ II 905/November 1499 (Ibn Iyâs, Mamloouks, 466), the sultan-al-Malik al-Zâhirî Kânswî ordered the imprisonment at al-Markâb of the amir Khâïr-Bak, prefect of the province of al-Qutbûyîn, but then released him.

After his return from Florence, in autumn 1027/1618, the amir Fâkhr al-Dîn b. Ma‘ûn [q.v.] took steps to strengthen his power in Syria; he succeeded in gaining the support of a number of places which had belonged to Yûsûf Çafî, including al-Markâb.

Among the travellers of the 18th century, Richard Pococke, who passed through Syria ca. 1740, noted in his Description (ii, 200) that the castle of al-Markâb, of which he gives a good description, was the residence of the governors of the region and that it could be reached from Bâniyâs in an hour and a half by way of a steep incline, in a south-easterly direction. In his Voyage (ed. Gaulmier, 284), Volney mentioned, in the Syrian coast “various villages, which were formerly fortified towns” including “the precipitous site of Markab”. He gives no description of it and in fact does not seem to have seen it.

3. Description of the fortress. Numerical and alphabetical references are those of the plan drawn up by E. G. Rey (Arch. milit.), copied by Max
van Berchem and Ed. Fatio (Voyage) and by P. Deschamps (Terre Sainte Romane, 140-1).

The configuration of the terrain is responsible for the plan of the castle, which is shaped like an isosceles triangle with its base line facing north. The latter measures 350 m., while the east and west walls each measure 400 m.; the area is more than three hectares. In the southern part is the "body of the site" separated from the remainder of the surface by a wall; the space located to the north of this internal defence is the "bailey", used as a farmyard and containing some outbuildings, enabling the population and the livestock of the immediate vicinity to be gathered within the walls in the event of hostilities.

On the west from of the perimeter wall of al-Markab, some 50 m. above the southern point of the triangle, is a rectangular tower (1), in the short southern side of which a door is located, giving access to the castle; further along are two square towers (2,3) both typical of the architecture of the period between 1140 and 1186. At approximately the mid-point of this slightly concave face, is a large square barbaric (A) to which access is gained by a stepped north-south ramp, then turning at a right-angle, by a small west-east bridge with three arches above the ditch. This entrance permitted access to the "bailey" which extended towards the north and east and to the entrance giving access to the "body of site", the castle as such. It is fitted with a loggia supported by four corbels; the door is framed with two archery apertures and provided with a trap-door and a portcullis.

Continuing towards the north, are found four semi-circular towers (4,5,6,7) lacking their battlements and curtains and in a poor state of repair. In the north-west angle is a large tower (8) which was restored after the siege of 1285. The north face of the perimeter, slightly concave, measures 350 m. This face is in a badly ruined state, with the relics of two towers, one in about the centre and the other (9) further east, 75 m. from the larger tower in the angle (10).

The eastern face is convex as far as tower 16. As on the remainder of the diagram, the perimeter wall with its archery apertures is double; it overlooks quite steep inclines and juts out at this point over a ditch, both sides of which are bricked from a depth of 5 to 7 m. There are the remains of five towers (11 to 15). It is from tower 16 that there began the east-west wall which separated the "body of the site" from the huge expanse of the "bailey", and the stones of which were used in the 19th century by local peasants for the construction of their houses.

The semi-circular tower R, 11.2 m. in diameter, constructed astride the double perimeter wall, comprises several stories. On its defensive front it has a stone "jacket" 17 m. in diameter (16). With the donjon (L), it is the finest construction of al-Markab. To the north of this tower, there was a defensive emplacement (Q) and a square tower (P). In 1211 the perimeter towers of al-Markab greatly impressed Wilbrand von Oldenburg, who said of them that they were "built to support the heavens rather than to provide defence".

By the entry A, there is access to the "bailey"; proceeding further east, a second door (O) is found, also provided with solid defensive structures and its right-angled passage opening on the courtyard (G). The latter is surrounded by a "series of buildings which were places of domestic use. In one of them, are two bread-ovens" and two millstones. The castle maintained five years' reserve of food.

Built on to the south-east wall of these premises (I), there is a building (S) with two superimposed stories, cradle-vaulted and 46 m. long to correspond with the tower (R).

To the south of the "body of the site" are located a chapel (H), a donjon (L), a hall (K) and two other halls (M, N).

The Gothic chapel (H) dates from 1186. It is of rectangular shape with two doors, the one to the north opening on the courtyard (G), the other an ogival portal opening to the west and allowing descent to the parvis by way of a flight of steps. The nave, 23 x 10 m., with walls more than 5 m. thick, has two spans of arched ribs; it is larger than that of Hüs al-Akrâd. Two small sanctuaries open on the sides of the chancel, that on the north side apparently showing the remnants of a fresco. This chapel has retained foliated capitals which resemble those of the first stage of construction of the cathedral of Tartus [q. v.].

Following the Muslim occupation, a mîhrâb was constructed in the sanctuary of the chapel.

The donjon (L), built on the southern angle of the castle, is a powerful tower with circular south front facing a nearby and potentially threatening escarpment. This tower is 21 m. high with basalt walls 5 m. thick, and in the interior are the remnants of a great hall.

Lower down, before the donjon, is a projecting structure (C) the base of which is protected by a "batter". The south face, 21 m. in breadth, is rounded in its central section—hence, by allusion to the prow of a ship, its technical name of "Ram Tower". At the top, under the watch-posts of this tower, a monumental inscription (RCEA, xiii, no. 4858), on a long band of white marble, written in enormous Mamlûk nâshîr characters, commemorates its construction by Sultan Kalâwîn in 684/1285.

A huge building (K) in three stories was constructed at the same time as the donjon (L), as is proved by "the common staircase which serves their upper rooms". This structure, shaped like a parallelogram, has three archery apertures opening towards the south-east and three doors, including a small one opening to the west on a triangular space giving access to the donjon or to the parvis of the church and the courtyard.

To the west of the donjon and the building (K), there are two buildings in two stories of vaulted rooms: M, in which there is a room "decorated with finely sculpted marble capitals", and N, closely linked to the donjon with which it shares a partition and a common passage.

The birka at al-Markab, as in many other places, is located outside the perimeter wall. In this case it is a stone-built reservoir 40 m. long and 10 m. wide; currently, it is less than 4 m. deep. Laid out on a north-south bearing, it was fed with water from mountain springs situated to the north. In times of peace, it supplied the needs of the men and livestock living within the perimeter of al-Markab. During sieges, the garrison made use of a reservoir and above all a well in the interior of the castle.

Ernest Renan, in 1863, referring to the testimony of his two colleagues, Thobois and Lockroy, wrote (Mission, 106) in regard to al-Markab: "Here there is
no sculpture or fine decoration, the design is that of a French 12th century castle. It is evident that in Syria the Crusaders did not have a uniform style of construction. Each of the nations which took part in its building followed its own taste, and all were subject to the constraints of the materials which they found."

According to the testimony of W. N. Thomson, to which Ritter (Erdkunde, xvii, 883) and M. van Berchem (Voyage, 305 n., refer, "it seems that the fortress was still in a good state of repair before the middle of the 19th century".

4. The village of al-Markab. In an assessment of tithe, dating from 589/1193, it is noted that al-Markab exported must, wine, sumac, almonds, figs and pottery. The same products are mentioned in an agreement signed between the Order of the Hospital and the Templars in 630/1233. The "wine of Margat" was extolled by the traveller Burchard de Mont Sion at the end of the 13th century.

This is probably the suburb, built to the north and east at the foot of the slopes of the castle, which is mentioned by Ibn Batuta (1, 183). It was in the spring of 726/1325 that the latter, coming from Ladhikiyya, passed before the fortress of al-Markab, of which he said that it resembled Ḥṣn al-Akrād, constructed on a high eminence; he noted that it was forbidden to enter the castle and that foreigners were obliged to halt an hour before the suburb.

In the early 19th century, the castle of al-Markab does not seem to have greatly attracted the interest of travellers. When George Robinson visited Syria and Palestine in 1828, he took the coastal road and passed through Baniyās on his way to Tripoli; he marked al-Markab on his map, but made no mention of it in the text of his account (ii, 94).

The Ottoman kāmāl residing in the castle of al-Markab, administrative centre of the district of the same name which comprised some 1,500 inhabitants, for the most part Nusayris. In 1884, at the request of the Kāmālīn, the seat of government was transferred to Baniyās.

In 1893, according to V. Cucinet, the kādār of al-Markab was situated to the south of the sandāq of Ladhikiyya: it was then bounded to the north by the kādār of Djabal, to the east by the vilâyet of Syria, to the south by the sandāq of Tripoli and to the west by the Mediterranean. This kādār was divided administratively into three nāhiyās which are Marqāb, Qadmous and Ghaouabi. It contains 393 towns, villages and hamlets. The nāhiyās are administered directly by the cānīmāk (deputy governor), with the exception of that of Qadmous which has a resident mudir in a fort of the nahī of Ghaouabi" (Cucinet, 169-70).

The total population of the kādār rose to 39,671 inhabitants, 27,121 Anṣāriyya. There were almost 200 schools there for 2,060 pupils. The main agricultural products were olives and onions, tobacco and silk which was sold for the most part to merchants in Beirut. Also found in the kādār of al-Markab was the raising of livestock, especially goats.

In 1895, Max van Berchem and Ed. Fatio noted (Voyage, i, 308) that "the mosque, recognised from a distance by a cupola and a minaret-lantern whitewashed with lime, contains some Arabic inscriptions. The most important are two decrees announcing the abolition of taxes, promulgated by two governors of the province of Tripoli, one under Sultan Barquq in 795/1393, the other under Sultan Jaqmaq in 860/1463" (Wiet, Divers, nos. 8, 166).

In 1914 al-Markab was the regional centre, as it was again in 1920. Between 1920 and 1937, this kādār comprised three nāhiyās: al-Markab, Kadmūs and

Ennaya. In 1938 there were, between Baniyās and al-Markab, five Sunni villages, of which one, close to the foot of the castle housed 321 inhabitants in 1945. These villages were dependent upon the kādār of Baniyās. In the neighbourhood there were Maronite, Greek Catholic and Greek Orthodox villages.

Since 1968 this region has experienced considerable economic prosperity with the development of the I.P.C. pipeline and the petroleum port of Baniyās.

5. The isolated tower. At a distance of 1,500 m. in a direct line from the castle, in the coastal plain, on an isolated hillock, stands a tower called Burjud al-Sābi ("Tower of the Boy").

This is a massive square guard-tower, 15 m. high, constructed of blocks of black basalt, held together with white mortar. On each face are constructed five archery apertures 2 m. high in walls 2.8 m. thick. A low door opens in the south-west face, giving access to a groin-vaulted hall; in one of the walls a staircase is constructed, leading to an upper room and thence to a terrace. This guard-tower was closely linked to the castle; its role was to watch over the small bay of the port of al-Markab and to control the coastal road. It is possible that there was a tunnel linking the tower to the castle, permitting the garrison, in time of siege, an outlet to the road or to the port.

The traces of a long defensive wall, which was covered with earth and still visible; apparently in the Middle Ages it linked the coast to the castle. The road passed through a gate in the wall and, in all probability, there would have been a customs-post here.

6. The place of pilgrimage. Nearby, 150 m. from the gate to the south of the castle of al-Markab, is a cave called "el Baiyeh" where, according to popular belief, the Virgin Mary sheltered with the Infant Jesus. At the end of the 19th century this was a place of pilgrimage much visited by the Christian and Muslim inhabitants, especially on 8 September, feast of the Nativity of the Virgin.

AL-MARKAB — MARK(I)SIYYA


MÄRK(IS)IYYA: Marxism

1. Terminology. Marxism is denoted in numerous Islamic languages by a pure borrowing from Anglo-French forms, already adopted by the Russian: marxism (or marxism) in Turkish, Persian, Pugh'tu, Uzbek, Tashkent, Kazakh, etc. The abstract form has been derived from the name of Karl Marx: Arabic márkiyya (often márktisyya on account of the antipathy of the phonological system to a succession of three consonants), Urdu märk-sïdd ("tendency of Marx"). In some languages there is a distinction, as there is in Russian, between an individual Marxist, märkisi, and a Marxist concept or practice, märkisî in Persian, Pugh'tu etc., márktisî (or Uzbek (Russian márktisiki as opposed to märkisî). In Arabic, both adjective and substantive are márkti. On the same model, more recently terms have been coined for "Marxism-Leninism", "Marxist-Leninist" etc.

2. The concept. In the Muslim world as elsewhere, that which is called Marxism is most often conceived as a complete doctrine claiming to explain the world and society, upheld by a school of thought and by a social and political movement designed to bring into reality the conclusions which it draws from this doctrine. There are orthodox forms of the doctrine and of the movement, in other words forms consistent with the thought of the founders (Karl Marx, 1818-83 and Friedrich Engels, 1820-95) and with the reality of things, as opposed to deviant, heretical and erroneous forms. This orthodox concept, official doctrine in the USSR and most other countries, has been adopted, among other places, in the Muslim world, following the tradition of religious or classical religious tendencies attached to a particular founder (cf. mânâwiyya, hanâfiyya, etc.). But its supporters ultimately make of "Marxism" a particular (though very general) science, like physics.

Specialists without affiliation to a "Marxist" organisation tend towards a quite different vision. "Marxian" ideas (those of Marx and Engels) in questions of sociology, economics, philosophy, politics, etc., qualified, fluctuating and often recast by themselves, have formed the basis of multiple doctrinal syntheses, starting with Engels himself. Groupings of political and social campaigners have set themselves up, declaring that they take as their guide one of these syntheses which they claim to be the sole legitimate interpretation of "Marxism" and consistent doctrine. One of these groupings, the Communist Bolshevik Party of Russia, on coming to power in Russia in November (October in the Julian calendar) 1917, codified under the title of Marxism-Leninism the interpretation propounded by its leader Vladimir Iliç Ulyanov, known as Lenin (1870-1924). Under its direction, a large number of Communist Parties were formed, united in the Communist International (Komitern according to the abbreviated Russian form) between 1919 and 1943, and some of these gained power after 1945. Differences of interpretation have continued to appear in these parties (whether in power or not), with dissident groups and parties seceding from them.

It is not to be denied that there are common traits in all these doctrinal syntheses, in certain ideas which are the basis of them or which derive from them. It is only in this sense that it is possible to speak of a "Marxism" which would encompass the many variants. On the level of history, it is also possible to speak of a Marxist ideological movement, comprising numerous branches, derived in the final analysis from the ideas and activities of Marx. Clearly, these terms should be used with caution.

3. Knowledge of Marx and of Marxism before 1917. In the 19th century there was for the first time talk of "Marxism" or "Scientific Socialism" as a complete and coherent doctrine, there emerged, within the vast
European socialist movement, organisations calling themselves "Social Democrats" (united after 1889 in the Second International) which claimed inspiration from the doctrinal synthesis and tolerated numerous variations.

In the first decade of this century, a few isolated intellectuals from the Muslim world became aware of these ideas in Europe, through reading or through contact with organisations. Thus, in Paris, the Tatar student from Simbirsk, Yàsu'uf Ak'kùrà, who published in 1902 in the Young Turk periodical Ġhâni-yi ʿummat (Crimea-Paris) an economic analysis of the Eastern question with reference to Marx, and the Copt Salâma Mùsâ in 1908. For them, as for many others, Marx was an eminent socialist thinker alongside others.

In the Russian empire, the Russian Social Democratic Labour Party, founded in 1898, encompassed or influenced Marxist factions and study groups among Muslim intellectuals and workers, at Kazan from 1902 (among Tatars) and at Baku from 1904 onwards (with Iranians, Armenians, Georgians, etc.). At Baku, one group adopted the name of "Muslim Social Democratic Party Hammâti" (with the sense of effort, energy, co-operation, from the Arabic himmâ). In Iran itself, a social-democratic group was in existence at Tabrîz already in 1905 (with many Armenians involved), requests to join the Marxist theoreticians Georgii V. Plekhanov and Karl Kautsky. At about this date, another group adopted the name of Social Democratic Party of Iran (fîrka-yi iqitima'iyûn-i ʿummiyyân-i İrân). In the course of the Iranian Revolution, the latter seems, through the intermediary of a more substantial clandestine organisation, the mujãhidin, to have taken action aimed at a profound social revolution, invoking the Kurîn and the Shàrrâ.

In the Ottoman empire, tendencies of the same order existed within the Christian minorities. From 1911 to 1914, Yàsu'uf Ak'kùrà, who resided there after having been one of the leaders of the movement of the Muslims of Russia during the revolution of 1905, appointed the German Marxist economist of Russian Jewish origin Alexander Helphand, known as Parvus, to edit (with personal editorial responsibility) the economic column of his journal Türk Yurdu at Istanbul.

The more radical social democrats of the colonising countries sometimes supported the nationalists of the Muslim lands and guided them in the direction of social struggle. An outstanding example was the Dutch social-democrat H. J. F. M. Sneevliet who, taking up residence in 1913 in the Dutch East Indies, founded there in 1914 the Indian Social Democratic Association (Indische Sociaal Democratische Vereeni- ging) whose members included other Dutchmen, Eurasians and a few Indonesians.

4. Knowledge of Marx and Marxism after 1917. Within the Russian Social Democratic Labour Party and the Second International, V. I. Lenin defended his own stance and defined the other tendencies as "an anti-Marxist current in the bosom of Marxism". He thus made the struggle for an exclusive orthodoxy a primary pre-occupation for his own tendency, that of the majority (Russian bolsheviks) in the Party (a temporary majority in this case), which became virtually an autonomous party in 1912 and seized power in Russia in October/November 1917.

The new Soviet power, endowed with considerable means and considering itself the first territorial resort of a worldwide revolution, consequently saw as a priority the diffusion of the works of Marx and Engels, as well as those which condensed their doctrine according to the canonical interpretation, the writings of Lenin in the first instance.

The accepted leaders of all the Russian communist parties (united in the Third International from 1919 to 1943) which were founded throughout the world on the model and the inspiration of the Russian Communist (Bolshevik) Party and of the parties and groups produced by schisms within the communist movement. Each grouping added to the so-called "classic" works of the founders other texts, those of the successive supreme leaders of the Soviet Union (especially Lenin and Stalin), those of the leaders of the various national parties, those of heads of groups of tendencies (above all Leon Trotsky), those of certain theoreticians considered particularly orthodox, or text-books defining the various orthodoxies. Meanwhile the Second ("Socialist") International continued to attempt a parallel diffusion of texts, but on a much smaller scale and with much less exclusive reference to a Marxist orthodoxy.

This massive activity of editing and diffusion was naturally performed in the languages relevant to each party or group. The Soviet state also published translations of selected texts into the many languages of the Union or of the outside world. In the Muslim countries, parties, groups and sub-groups undertook the diffusion of works published in Soviet and (later) Chinese editions and (often in association with the latter) in editions emanating from the Communist publishers of the major western countries. Often, in times of isolation or difficulty, they produced and diffused, by impropers means, their own translations and the texts of local leaders.

There exists no general bibliography of this immense literature, written in so many languages. Only a bibliography of bibliographies of editions of the "classics" of Marxism, edited in the USSR and elsewhere in the Azeri, Albanian, Bashkir, Kazakh, Tatar and Uzbek languages, is to be found in L. Levin, Bibliografija bibliografii proizvedenij K. Marks, F. Engelsa, V. I. Lenina, Moscow 1961 (see index by language).

For the purposes of a typical example, it may be noted that one of the texts most widely translated and distributed in the Stalinist era was the second section of Chapter iv of the Istoriya vseusskogo kommunisticheskoy parti (bolshevik) of the "History of the Party of the Soviet Union (Bolshevik), short course", Moscow 1938. The sub-title was "course composed by a commission of the Central Committee of the C(b)P of the USSR, 1938". The section in question (it was leaked out that the author was Stalin himself) entitled "Historical materialism and dialectical materialism", set out to summarise (in 30 pages in the French edition of Moscow) "the theoretical basis of communism, the theoretical principles of the Marxist Party". Every communist group considered it a duty to distribute this text, reckoned to be fundamental. Cf. for example, in Arabic, Yàsu'uf Sàllîn, al-Mâṭdiyya al-dàyâliyya wa-l-ta'rîkhîyya, Baghdad, Mathâ'am al-Râshîd, 1944, 50 pp., in the collection Rasā'îl al-bâth "Essays of the Renaissance" (there was no connec- tion here with the still embryonic Ba'th Party).

5. The Marxist groupings. Bearing in mind that which has been stated above, it is difficult to characterise a group as Marxist unless (directly or indirectly) it expressly declares itself so. On the other hand, it is not possible here to give a complete list of the Marxist groupings present in the Muslim world. Such a list would have to include: (a) Marxist study
groups; (b) groups and parties which called themselves “social democrats” before 1919 (some of them continuing to do so today), which those declared themselves “communists” (Arabic ghiyūţ, in other languages usually transcriptions of the European or Russian word) after this date; (c) groups and parties which adopt other designations, but which declare themselves inspired by Marxism and whose ideological and political programmes are to be identified with those of social democratic and communist parties, such as the Tādi (‘Masses’) Party of Iran; (d) trade unions and so-called mass or popular organisations (of women, students, youth, peace campaigners, etc.), such as communist parties customarily create around themselves, in order to be assured permanently of a number of sympathisers, when it is established that these “popular” groups closely follow the line of a Marxist movement, mostly of a communist movement; (e) groups, parties or organisations which declare themselves “socialists”, groupings or association which are attached to them, but only when they state categorically that their main inspiration is from Marxism.

6. Attitudes to Marxism. In the Muslim world, attitudes in regard to what is known and understood from Marxist ideas have varied as much as have attitudes in regard to organisations, and then states, which, although Marxist or were supposed to be so, the whole being most often considered as constituting a coherent unity.

The attitude of men of religion has been influenced above all by the atheism which they considered to be the corner-stone of Marxist thought and even to be the major innovation of Marx, thus displaying their ignorance of the irrereligious tendencies of European thought before Marx and alongside the Marxists. The anti-religious policies and atheistic propaganda of the Soviet State have inevitably reinforced this concept, still very widespread. The connection in actual fact of this philosophical atheism with Marxist economic and social principles has evoked memories of Muslim religious history: the Ismā‘īlī heresy being especially perceived on the basis of accounts of the Carmathian [see Carmathi, “communards”] and the Nizārī terrorism [see Ismā‘īliyya], with its supposedly non-Muslim instigators, the “communists” Plato and Mazdak. Against these ideas, prominence was given to the right of private property guaranteed by the Kur‘ān and the Sunna.

A quite different attitude, developed especially in certain circles after the Second World War, has seen in Marxism a kind of encyclopaedic scientific and philosophical synthesis giving sure guidance on action in the social sphere. Its role has been compared with that played by the Aristotelian encyclopaedia in the mediaeval Muslim world (cf. A. Larroui, L’idéologie arabe contemporaine, Paris 1967, 152 f.).

Attitudes have been particularly influenced by the policies of states claiming to be Marxist. During the 1920s and again after the Second World War, a series of states and movements have seen in them allies against Euro-American imperialism. In many cases, the sympathy engendered by this alliance was extended into attraction towards the doctrine reckoned to be basic to the general attitude of Marxist states and movement. In other cases, alliance of the external level has been able to coincide with the persecution of local Marxists.

Nationalists of Muslim countries have been able to denounce the internationalism which is an essential principle of the Marxist movement, with its antipathy towards total and unhesitating adherence to purely national objectives. Similarly, they have denounced the nationalism which could be disguised by this theoretical internationalism: the Russian nationalism of the Soviet State, the nationalism of the community parties of the colonialist countries (France, Britain, etc.), Zionist Jewish nationalism, etc.

7. Influence of Marxist ideas. The Marxist movement, most often indirectly, has diffused in the Muslim world ideas and elements of Weltanschauung which, although alien in many cases, it has systematised and popularised in its own way. They have been widely adopted, even in circles hostile to theories and political initiatives emanating from the Marxist movement.

This applies in the case of appeal in a voluntarist vein for the structural transformation of the social sphere, the traditional structures being judged to constitute permanent causes of exploitation and oppression. Dissatisfaction with the established order and the demand for justice are given a great value at the expense of the traditional attitude of Islam (among other religions and philosophies), which sees in this a culpable rebellion against the order willed by God. Transformation cannot be achieved by a moral change, by conversion, but by an organised struggle on the part of the disadvantaged against the privileged, by pressures exerted by strikes, demonstrations, etc., and the like (reformism) or by a genuine civil war, a revolution. Circumstances having favoured the revolutionary options, the term “revolution” (Ar. thawra) and its synonyms (imkādāb, etc.) have acquired a quasi-mystical quality.

The Marxist movement, born in Europe, had given the primary role to the transformation, reformist or revolutionary, according to the tendencies, of industrial European society. In its communist branch, it had however also appealed for the revolt of colonised or dependent peoples, reckoned to be exploited and oppressed by the western ruling classes just like the proletarians of the industrial world. This appeal was taken up to the point of a complete inversion of priorities. Some doctrinarians, starting with the Tādi (‘Masses’) Party of Iran; the Tudes, the Tūdī Sultan Ghaliev (see below) in Soviet Russia in the 1920s, placed on the primary level the struggle of “proletarian nations” against the totality of industrial nations, reckoned to exploit and oppress them with the complicity of and for the partial benefit of their own proletarians.

This theme of the exploitation of the colonial world by the industrial capitalist world which robbed it of its riches had been developed by Lenin as an appendix to the primary doctrine of internal exploitation. It had enormous success in all circles of the Islamic world. The term of imperialism which expressed this process, often confused with that of “colonialism” (Ar. isti‘mārīyya), was taken up by the most anti-Marxist elements and became a leitmotif (with some conceptual efforts to distinguish in a more precise fashion between “colonialism” and “imperialism”) in the Islamic world.

The diffusion of these dynamic ideas has been combined with an internal evolution, complex in origin, which tended towards a veiled secularisation, a recoil from specifically religious values (the quest for salvation, etc.) in favour of the primacy of earthly activism (which has always been regarded as important in Islam). This activism is often invested in the defence and promotion of the Muslim umma or one of its parts but this objective henceforward takes precedence over piety and religious observance. Biographies of Muhammad place far greater emphasis
on his earthly works than on his rôle as a messenger of the divine will.

There are limits to the influence exerted by communism more or less Marxist in source in the world of Islam. The nationalism which is such a dominant force in this world (including the form of nationalism attached to the Muslim umma [see KAWMIYYA]) inspires distrust, to say the least, of any analysis of the classical Marxist type which identifies, within the struggling nation itself, exploiters and oppressors to be resisted. The vision of an end of history and an egalitarian classless society has not easily taken root; traditional Islam with its hierarchies of wealth and power being considered to constitute already a society without classes as such. Similarly, the internationalism which is fundamental to Marxism (although often abandoned in practice) could hardly be expected to tempt a public opinion moulded by nationalism.

A very widespread moralism also spurns the essential determinism of Marxism (even though Marxists have often been inconsistent on this subject in practice). Finally, in spite of the logical possibility of dissociating from atheism the political, sociological, social and strategic conclusions of historical Marxism, in spite of the sporadic efforts by communist parties to emphasise this dissociation, there is avoidance of any affiliation which could be interpreted as a public proclamation of atheism or (perhaps even more repugnant) a falling into question of the supra-human origin of the sacred books, the Qur'an in particular. Atheistic propaganda, often amounting to restraint of religion in the communist states (without going in general to the extreme lengths of Albania, which has radically suppressed churches and mosques), causes unease, even among the leaders of movements or states which have chosen for strategic reasons to ally themselves with the former in a given period.

8. Marxist view of Islam and the Muslim world. Marx and Engels were not greatly interested in Islam as a religion, and as such it was subject to their general criticism of religious consciousness. Only the late reading by Engels of a book by the Anglican priest and orientalist Charles Forster, *The historical geography of Arabia* (London 1844) awakened in him reflections which he communicated to his friend and briefly commented upon by the latter (Marx and Engels, *Briefwechsel*, i, Berlin 1949 (= Moscow 1935), 568-90, letters of 18 (? May, 2, 6 and 14 June 1853. At the end of his life, Engels, inspired by the revolt of the Sudanese Mahdi [see AL-MADHIYYA], compared Muslim revolts to the religious uprisings of the Christian Middle Ages, more "progressive" in his opinion (*Zur Geschichte des Urkristentums*, in *Die Neue Zeit*, xiii/1 (1894-5), 4 ff., 36 ff. = Marx-Engels, *Werke*, Berlin 1963, xxii, 446-73, at p. 450). In general, both authors tend to explain the religious phenomena of Islam in terms of historical sociology and insist on the "stagnant" character of the "Orient" in general (cf. also *Marxisme et Algérie*, texts edited by R. Gallissot and G. Badia, Paris 1976).

The two founders followed much more closely the international events affecting the Ottoman Empire, the "Eastern Question". A favourable attitude towards the Ottoman Empire, inspired by their hatred of Russia, Turkey's enemy and supposedly the bastion of international reaction, led them to take a certain interest in Ottoman institutions following the example of their ally against Russia, the passionately Turkophile (and Turcophone) British parliamentarian, David Urquhart (1805-77), a conservative member of the House of Commons, who as a parliamentarian had been at pains to dampen the enthusiasm ("sentimentalist" and "poetic") of French Marxists (the Guesists) for the revolt of 'Urabi, in his opinion a *puits* like any other (cf. his letter to E. Bernstein, 9 August 1882, in Marx-Engels, *Werke*, Berlin 1867, xxxv, 349 ff.).

The Marxist theoreticians of the Second International showed even less interest in the world of Islam, with the exception of Parvus (see above) and some examples of the destruction of the "natural economy" by capitalism in Kabylia mentioned Rosa Luxemburg, quoting the Russian sociologist M. M. Kovalevsky. Indignation at the traumas wrought by colonisation was counter-balanced, as it had been among the founders, by the conviction that socialist revolution could only be produced in the industrialised world as a result of the maximum development of capitalism. Only subsequently would the event have world-wide repercussions.

After the Russian Revolution, the Third International included in its strategy the insurrection of colonies against the capitalist metropolitan powers, while maintaining the priority of revolution conducted by the proletariat in these metropolises themselves. This often led to more or less elaborated attempts at analysis, both on the part of communist parties (and eventually dissident factions) established in the colonial and dependent countries, including Islamic countries, and on the part of those of the metropolises whose duty it was to support, even encourage, the revolt of their colonies.

In Soviet Russia itself (subsequently transformed into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), the Tatar Mir Sa'id Sul'tan Qhaliev and his companions, originally from nationalist and reformist [see ւալըռ 5. Central Asia, in Suppl.] circles but impregnated with Marxist ideas, adhered to the Bolshevik Communist Party and initially collaborated with the new power. Sul'tan Qhaliev then elaborated his doctrine on the specificity and the globally "proletarian" nature of Muslim society, the primacy of the Muslim East in the struggle against world capitalism, the "progressive" and "democratic" nature of the Muslim religion. Expelled from the Party in 1923, his ideas evolved still further. He drew up plans for a Colonial Communist International and for a Socialist State of Turan (researching Muslim and Turco-Mongolian sources under Marxist concepts). He was forced to go underground and finally eliminated.

Studies of Islam and of the Muslim peoples have been developed in the USSR, naturally on Marxist lines as soon as the level of somewhat generalised conclusions has been reached. Particular attention is paid to the Muslim peoples of the Union, from among whom specialists have emerged. Advantage has been taken of the pre-revolutionary tradition of Russian orientalism which took a special interest in problems of economic and social history. In the communist states of Eastern Europe, studies have followed the same model on the basis of somewhat different academic orientalist traditions. In addition to numerous detailed studies, attempts at synthesis have been hampered by the ideological monopoly of the Party which reserves for itself the right to any general conclusion, however minor. Interpretations have also been required to follow the lines inspired by fluctuations of official ideology in general and above all by successive strategic attitudes adopted in relation to Islam, the Muslim populations of the interior and the Muslim states of the exterior.

The communist parties of the capitalist countries or of the Third World have undertaken virtually no research in general on Islam, other than sometimes encouraged their members to study a particular Muslim country or patronised their works. Outside or
on the margin of the orbit of communist states and parties, Marxist or quasi-Marxist studies have been published in increasing numbers with, in general, a great deal more originality.

Among the most interesting studies are economics-based analyses of contemporary developments in the Muslim world, some of them written by natives of these countries. More generally, intellectuals of the Muslim world tend to take as their guide in numerous domains the neo-Marxist synthesis codified in the Soviet Union, presented as “the authentic Marxism” and regarded as a kind of new science throughout the Third World. For this reason there is frequent recourse to the works inspired by this synthesis even in circles hostile to the political, social and ideological options of the states and parties laying claim to Marxism.


MARMARA DENİZI, the Turkish name of the Sea of Marmara.

1. The Sea itself.

(a) Geography. This is a small sea within the borders of Turkey, communicating with the Aegean Sea through the Dardanelles [see ÇANAK-KALE' BOĞAZI] and with the Black Sea through the Bosporus [see BOŞPORUS]. Istanbul is the most prominent city on its shore.

The Sea has a surface area of 11,550 km²; its greatest length, from the Dardanelles to the end of the Gulf of İzmit, is 260 km; its width between Silivri on the Thracian side and Bandırma on the Anatolian side is 80 km. Its greatest depth reaches 1,355 m roughly in its geographical centre, but it is much shallower around the central depression, mostly under 200 m. The salinity of its water is relatively low, from 22/1000 near the surface to 38.5/1000 at 30 m. and deeper. A surface current flows towards the Dardanelles, while a deeper counter-current moves in the opposite direction.

In antiquity, it was called Propontis, and was thus distinguished from the Dardanelles and the Bosporus; this distinction was continued by mediaeval European authors, but not by the Muslim ones, who usually bracketed all three phenomena under the term al-Khalīja “The Strait”, often specified as that of Constantinople: Kahlīj al-Kustantīniyya or al-Khalīj al-Kustantīni. This lack of terminological discrimination on the part of early Muslim authors was symptomatic of their unfamiliarity with the exact configuration of the area, although some seem to have been aware of the considerable variation in the width of this “Strait”; thus al-Masʿudi, writing in 934/966 (Tanbih, 66) states that the width at “Filās” is 40 miles. A hint of this sea appears on al-Idrīsī’s map of A.D. 1154, although there too we find the usual single name of Kahlīj al-Kustantīniyya. The attempt by the Arabs to conquer Constantinople, especially those of 979–9715–17, during which their fleets sailed through the Sea of Marmara, were obviously too brief and transitory to leave a clearer idea of this sea. The difficulty of sailing through the Dardanelles, and the fact that armies and travellers usually crossed from Anatolia to Thrace through this strait, may also have attracted the Muslims’ attention thither and have obscured the small sea between it and Constantinople. A better understanding of the actual geographical nature of the area appears in Abu ’l-Fidāʾī’s Tākīm al-buldān, composed by 721/1321, where the Sea of Marmara is described without, however, being assigned a name: “When travellers have entered it [i.e. the Kahlīj al-Kustantīniyya], it widens and resembles a lake (bi‘rā).” Abu ’l-Fidāʾī’s lack of any specific name for the Sea of Marmara is also illustrated by his description of the passage to the Marmara Island as “one of the islands of the Mediterranean (Bahr al-Rūm)”, with the remark that “it is in the midst of al-Kahlīj al-Kustantīnī” (Tākīm, 34, 188-9).

(b) History. The Sea of Marmara came permanently within the Dār al-Islām with the Turkish conquest of Byzantine territory. The beylik of Karaf [q.v.] was the first Turkish principality to reach the Sea of Marmara, occupying, during the first half of the 8th/14th century, its southern shore from the Kapatdagi peninsula to the Dardanelles. Karaf, extending also along the Anatolian side of the Dardanelles and along the adjacent part of the Aegean shore, became a maritime power: its principal naval base was Edineği on the Gulf of Erdik. The experience of Karaf sailors, gained in their encounters with the Byzantines, proved useful to the Ottomans after the latter had absorbed Karaf towards the middle of the 8th/14th century and after they had further extended Turkish domination to the remaining, eastern part of the Anatolian coast of the Sea of Marmara. At that point, the arsenal of Edineği was joined by other naval installations such as Mudanya, Karamürsel and İzmit. Although these shipyards and bases were eventually eclipsed by those of Gallipoli [see GELİBOLU] and Kâşımğaç, those on
Marmara's southern shore, so significant in the incipient period of Turkish maritime history, retained their importance, some of them to this day.

In contrast to the northern, Thracian shore of the Sea of Marmara, the northern, Thracian shore was occupied by the Turks more gradually and as byproduct of the Ottoman penetration into the Balkans and of the eventual conquest of Constantinople. Lacking the bays and natural or man-made harbours characteristic of the southern shore, the northern shore never played a similar role in Turkish maritime affairs, except for Istanbul itself, of which the Kadırga Limanı was developed by Mehmed II and had some importance until Selim I founded the arsenal of Kâşifpaşa on the Golden Horn.

After the Ottomans had established themselves in Rumelia and had taken Constantinople, the Sea of Marmara became a Turkish lake and has remained so to this day; a certain limitation on Turkish sovereignty over this sea, however, has existed since the 19th century, for the special status of the Straits of the Dardanelles and the Bosphorus affects Marmara as well. Its secure domination by the Ottomans was in part responsible for the relatively uneventful place this sea had in Ottoman naval history, and for the neglect it received in Ottoman literature. The Sea of Marmara is not described in the text of the Kilâb-i Bahriyye, the 10th/16th century Turkish portolan by Piri Re'is [q.v.], although the first, “draft” version of the work does include brief chapters on the Marmara Island and the Princes' Islands, and its map does appear in some manuscripts. It is still anonymous in the Tuhfat al-kibrî fi asfar al-bîhâr by the 11th/17th century author Kâtip Celebi [q.v.]: “It (i.e. the Mediterranean) ends at Bûzqâ-ada (= Tenedos). Between the inner side of the Strait (i.e. the Dardanelles) and Istanbul, there is a small sea whose circumference amounts to 700 miles... There are islands in it: Marmara, Imlâlî, Kîzîl adalar (= the Princes' Islands)...” (1729 ed., p. 2b). In the Liḥân-nâmâ, the cosmography by the same author, however, there is already a reference to this sea as “Bahr-i Marmara” (1732 ed., p. 667). This name, derived from that of the Marmara Island, had received in Ottoman literature. The Sea of Marmara, the northern, Thracian shore was usually within the eyâlet of Djaza'î al-Kustantiniyya); Pauly-Wissowa, s.vv. MARRAKUSH (popular pronunciation Merrdksh, Merrâkush, Marrakkush, Merrâksh, Merrâksh, Marraksh), one of the residences of the Turkish Republic, the island remained uninhabited until in 1955 a penitentiary was placed on it, the inmates practising some of the traditional occupations of the former inhabitants.

2. The island after which the Sea of Marmara is named.

Marmara, the classical Proconnesos, is the largest island in this sea, with an area of 200 km². It is the principal one in a cluster that includes Avşa (also called Türkeli), Pashalimani, and a few other smaller ones, near the Kaplâdağ peninsula, the latter originally also an island but eventually linked to the southern shore by a process of marine sedimentation. Marble quarries, exploited on Marmara Island since antiquity, gave rise to its later name. The population of these islands was until the recent exchange chiefly Greek-speaking, but was then replaced by Turkish immigrants from Crete and Bulgaria. While fishing, fruit and olive growing, and vegetable gardening (and until recently, lumber exportation, which has disappeared with the completion of deforestation), were the traditional occupations of the population, tourism has now taken precedence as the main industry of these islands, with regular boat service between Istanbul, Marmara (the chief town and harbour on Marmara Island) and Avşa. Administratively, the Marmara Islands form a bucakt within the ilâ of Edeke of the il of Balıkesir. The second group of islands within the Sea, the Princes' or Prince Islands, in Turkish simply Adalar or Kızıl Adalar, is a cluster situated between 15 and 22 km from the northernmost point of Istanbul and about 5 km from the Anatolian coast. They consist of four larger islands (Kınalı, Burgaz, Heybeli and Büyükada) and five small ones. Together they form an ilçe within the il of Istanbul; Büyükada, Heybeli, and Burgaz-Kinah form individual bucaks within this ilçe. The largest of these, Büyükada, lit. “the large island”, was called in Byzantine times Frinkibo, but its classical name as mentioned by Pliny, that of Megale (Naturalis historiae...), v, 151 was a semantic ancestor of the Turkish name. In the Byzantine period, these islands were the occasional place of banishment or seclusion for members of the ruling family or for other important persons; in recent times, they have been the favourite resort of Istanbul's wealthier citizens. Heybeli harbours two establishments which train officers for the Turkish navy: the preparatory Deniz Lisesi, and the higher Deniz Harp Okulu, the latter the continuation of an older school at Kâşifpaşa, whence it had moved in 1851.

Aside from these two groups of islands, there is the isolated İmralı, Byzantine Kalolimni, an elongated island near the beginning of the Gulf of Gemlik. After the departure of its Greek-speaking population during the period of exchange, it was seen by the Turks as a by-product of the Turkish Republic, the island remained uninhabited until in 1955 a penitentiary was placed on it, the inmates practising some of the traditional occupations of the former inhabitants.

3. Administrative organisation.

In administrative terms, during the Ottoman period the greater part of the coast of the Sea of Marmara was usually within the eyâlet of Dja'ârî-alî-Bâhriî (q.v.); the special province under the Kapudan Paşa [q.v.] administered from Gallipoli.

Today, these shores are distributed among six ilçes, named after their administrative centres: Istanbul, İzmit (also called by its historical name of Kocaeli), Bursa, Balıkesir, Çanakkale and Tekirdağ.

about 1890 the town was always known as Morocco.

The kingdom of Morocco, distinct in origin from those of Fás and the Súís, finally gave its name to the whole empire. At one time it only consisted of the country south of the wádí Umm Rabís as far as the range of the Great Atlas.

Marrakesh is situated in 31° 37' 35" N. lat. and 7° 59' 42" E. long. (Greenw.). Its mean height above sea-level is about 1,510 feet. The town is 150 miles south of Casablanca. It is through the latter that the main road to Marrakesh and Europe passed.

The temperature which is very mild in winter is very hot in summer. The average maxima of 39°6 in the month of August 1927 have nothing unusual and imply extreme temperatures reaching or passing 50° on certain days. Rainfall is low (284.5 mm. in 1927, against 706.5 in Rabat and 1,007.3 in Tangier). But water fed by the snows of the Atlas is found at a great depth. It is collected by a system of long subterranean tunnels (khattdra, plur. khadir; [see KANAT] which bring it to the surface by taking advantage of the very slight slope of the terrain. This method of obtaining water has enabled the vast gardens which surround the town to be created. The Almohads and the dynasties which succeeded them also built aqueducts and reservoirs to supply the town with water from the springs and streams of the mountains.

Contrary to what was until quite recently believed, Marrakesh has for long been the most thickly populated town of the empire. The census of 7 March 1926 gave 149,263 as the total population, 3,652 Europeans, 132,893 Muslims, 12,718 Jews. In 1936 the figures were respectively 190,314, 6,849, 157,819 and 25,646; in 1947, the city had a total of 241,000 inhabitants. The probable growth of the population is not sufficient to explain the difference between the present-day figures and the old estimates, almost all far too low. The figures vary greatly among themselves: from 20,000 (given by Dieudonné de Torres in 1585 and Hóst in 1768), 25,000 (Saint Olon, 1693), 30,000 (Ali Bey al-Abbassi, 1804), 40 to 50,000 (Gatell, 1864, and E. Aubin, 1902), 50,000 (Lambert, 1868), 60,000 (Beaumier, 1868), 80 to 100,000 (Washington, 1830) up to the obviously exaggerated figure of 270,000 given by Jackson in 1811.

About 40 miles north of the Atlas, the vast silhouette of which, covered by snow for eight months of the year fills the background, Marrakesh is built in a vast plain called the Hawz which slopes very gently towards the wádí Tansift, which runs 3 miles north of the town. The extreme uniformity of the plain is broken only in the north-west by two rocky hills called the Tansift and to the east stretches a great forest of palm-trees, the only one in Morocco north of the Atlas. It covers an area of 18,000 hectares and possesses over 100,000 palm-trees but the dates there only ripen very imperfectly.

The town is very large. The ramparts of sun-dried mud which run all round it measure at least 7 miles in length. The town in the strict sense does not occupy the whole of this mass. The town consists mainly of little low houses of reddish clay, often in ruins, among which were scattered huge and magnificent dwellings without particularly imposing exteriors built either by the viziers of the old Makhzen (e.g. the Bāhiya, the old palace of Bā Hmād [q. e. in Suppl.], vizier of Mawlāy al-Ḥasan) or by the great kāşiks, chiefs of the tribes of the country around. The narrow and overhanging streets in the central area broaden towards the outskirts into sunny and dusty squares and crossroads. The colour, the picturesque architecture, the palm trees, the branches of which appear over the walls of the gardens, the presence of a large negro population, all combine to give the town the appearance of a Saharan ksar of vast dimensions.

The centre of the life of the city is the Djámā al-Fná, an irregular, ill-defined open space, surrounded in the early years of this century by wretched buildings and reed huts, overshadowed by the high minaret of the Kutubiyya Mosque. Its name comes, according to the author of the Tarīḥ al-Sūdān, from the ruins of a mosque which Ahmad al-Manṣūr had undertaken to build there; "As he had planned it on a wonderful scale, it had been given the name of mosque of prosperity (al-ḥanā); but his plans being upset by a series of unfortunate events, the prince was unable to finish the building before his death and it was therefore given the name of mosque of the ruin (djamā' al-ḥanā')." This origin having been forgotten, an attempt was made later to explain the name of the square from the fact that the heads of rebels used to be exposed there. It was there also that executions took place. Lying on the western edge of the principal agglomeration of buildings, it is the most thickly populated part, close to the sāk, connected with the principal gates by direct and comparatively quiet roads, Djámā al-Fná is the point of convergence of the roads. At all hours swarming with people, it is occupied in the morning with a market of small traders: barbers, cobblers, vendors of fruit and vegetables, of medicines, of fried grasshoppers, of tea and of soup (harīta); in the evening, it is filled with acrobats and jugglers (Awlād Sīlīm ʿAbbās ʿUz Mūsā of Tazaerwalt), sorcerers, story-tellers, fire-eaters, snake charmers and gūlāb dancers. The audience consists mainly of people from the country who have come into town on business and want to enjoy the distractions of the town for a few hours before going home. These visitors are always very numerous in Marrakesh. Besides the regular inhabitants there is a floating population, the number of which may be of the order of 10,000 persons. For Marrakesh is the great market for supplying not only the Hawz but also the mountain country, the Sūís and especially the extreme south, Dādes, Dar'ā (Dra') and the Anti-Atlas. Marrakesh used to be the starting-point for caravans going through the Sahara to trade with Timbuktu. They brought back chiefly Sudanese slaves from Marrakesh was an important market. The conquest of the Sudan by France put an end to this traffic.
To the north of the Djama al-Fna begin the suks, which are very large. As in Fas and in the other large towns of the valley, the suks are extended by the authority of the muhtasseb [q.f.]. The most important suks are those of the cloth merchants (kisiriyya), of the sellers of slippers, of pottery, of basket work, of the embroiderers of harness, of the dyers and of the smiths. An important Thursday suk (al-khamis) is held outside and inside the walls around the old gate of Fas which has taken the name of the market (Bab al-Khamis). This suk was already in existence in the 10th/11th century.

There is no industry to speak of in Marrakesh. The most important is the making of leather (tanning). The manufacture of slippers occupied 1,500 workmen who produce over 2,000 pairs each working day. There are the only articles manufactured in the town that are exported. They are sold as far away as Egypt and West Africa. For the rest, Marrakesh is mainly an agricultural market. The whole town is a vast fondouk (funduk) in which are warehoused the products of the country, almonds, carraway seeds, goat-skins, oils, barley, wool, to be exchanged either for imported goods (sugar, tea, cloth) or for other agricultural produce (wheat, oil, which the tribes of the mountains and of the extreme south for example do not have).

The town is divided into 32 quarters, including theMuslim law is administered in Marrakesh by three kadis: one is established at the mosque of Ibn Yusuf; the other at the mosque of al-Mwāsīn and the third at the mosque of the kisba. The latter's competence does not extend beyond the limits of his quarter. That of the others extends over the whole town and even over the tribes of the area governed from it who have no local kādis.

Marrakesh is not numbered like Fas, Rabat and Tetuan among the kadārisiya towns, i.e. it has not, like them, an old-established citizen population, of non-rural origin, with a bourgeoisie whose tone is given by the craftsmen and by the merchants driven from Spain. In the 10th/11th century, however, Marrakesh did receive a colony of Moriscoes large enough to give one quarter the name Orgiba Diadjida, a reminiscence of Orgiba, a town of Andalusia from which they came. The foundation of the population consists of people of the tribes for the most part Berbers or Arabs strongly mixed with Berber blood. Shīlah (shaghīla) is much spoken in Marrakesh although the language of the tribes around the town (Rḥámma, Īḍāya) is Arabic. The movements of the tribes, the coming and going of caravans, the importation of slaves from the Sudan have resulted in a constant process of mixing in the population, and the old Masmūda race which must, with the Almoravids, have been the primitive population of Marrakesh is only found in combination with amounts difficult to measure of Arab, Saharan and negro blood. Even to-day this process is going on: the newcomers come less from the valleys of the Atlas than from the Sūs, the Dra and the Anti-Atlas, from the extreme south which is poor and overpopulated. The greater number of these immigrants soon become merged in the population of the town; but the Enquête sur les corporations musulmanes, conducted by L. Massignon in 1923-4 (Paris 1925) yielded some very curious information about the survival in Marrakesh of vigorous groups of provincials, specialising in particular trades: the makers of silver jewellery (at least those who are not Jews) owe their name of tāgānasīyin to the fact that they originally came from Tagmut in the Sūs; the Meshîwa are charcoal-burners and greengrocers, the Ghrîba, the Ghîrâba, the Todgî, the ghâfas, the khatībīyin, i.e. diggers of wells, who specialise in water-channels (khatībi); those of Tafîlîl, porters and pavers; those of Warrâzîr, watercarriers and of Tātâa (Anti-Atlas), restaurateurs; of the Dra, water-carriers and khatībīyin, etc. This division is not the result of specialisation in their original home nor of privileges granted by the civic authorities but arises from the fact that artisans once settled in Marrakesh have sent for their compatriots when they required assistance. Thus groups grew up, sometimes quite considerable. The list of the corporations of Marrakesh gives a total of about 10,000 artisans. These corporations lost much of their power under the pressure of the Makhzen. Some of them, however, still retained a certain social importance: in the first authorities that arose from the fact that artisans once settled in Marrakesh have sent for their compatriots when they required assistance. Thus groups grew up, sometimes quite considerable. The list of the corporations of Marrakesh gives a total of about 10,000 artisans. These corporations lost much of their power under the pressure of the Makhzen. Some of them, however, still retained a certain social importance: in the first authorities that arose from the fact that artisans once settled in Marrakesh have sent for their compatriots when they required assistance. Thus groups grew up, sometimes quite considerable. The list of the corporations of Marrakesh gives a total of about 10,000 artisans. These corporations lost much of their power under the pressure of the Makhzen. Some of them, however, still retained a certain social importance: in the first authorities that arose from the fact that artisans once settled in Marrakesh have sent for their compatriots when they required assistance. Thus groups grew up, sometimes quite considerable. The list of the corporations of Marrakesh gives a total of about 10,000 artisans. These corporations lost much...
Marrakesh was in ruins. In the inter-war period, in the town of the Kutubiyya there was not a single bookseller. A certain number of Jews still live in the medina (Youssef, 'Abd al-'Aziz, 'Abd al-Salih, M. Beretta, K. H. Abi Asaf), but the teaching in Marrakesh has neither the prestige nor the traditions which still give some lustre to the teaching at al-Karawiyyin in Fāṣ, much decayed as it is. Although they attempt to imitate the customs of Fāṣ (they celebrate notably the "festival of the sultan of the jura") every spring, the students are far from holding in spring), the students are far from holding in

Even though a dahir of 1357/1938 established Marrakesh the position their comrades enjoy in Fāṣ, neither the prestige nor the traditions which still give some lustre to the teaching at al-Karawiyyin in Fāṣ, the teaching in Marrakesh has now possesses a modern university.

One should note that the city for the training of the Jews had no permission to settle in the town. They are limited to certain trades. The Jews have little influence on the corporations and various demonstrations of piety. The Jews early began to leave the bounds of the town of Marrakesh and the cemeteries which stretch to the east, where the people of Fāṣ share with the people of Fāṣ the wholesale trade. They trade particularly with the Lūhūn of the mountains.

History. The Roman occupation never extended so far as the region of Marrakesh. It is quite without probability that some writers, following the Spanish historian Marmol, have sought at Agmāṭ or at Marrakesh the site of Bocanum Emerum (Boxxocvov Μαλλαχ), a town of Tingitana, the site of which is now unknown. The earliest historians agree that the place where Marrakesh was built by the Almoravids was a bare marshy plain where only a few bushes grew. The name Marrakesh gives no clue to the origin of the city. The etymologies given by the Arab authors are quite fanciful (see Deverdun, Marrakesh, 64 ff.). It was, it appears, in 449/1057-8 that the Almoravids advanced from Sūs north of the Atlas and took Agmāṭ Urika. It was there that they settled at first. But after the campaign of 452/1060 in the course of which they conquered the country of Fazāz, the Almoravids also affiliated to the religious brotherhoods. In Massignon's investigation may be found details of the attraction which some of the latter had for certain trades.

The Jews. At the foundation of Marrakesh, the Jews had no permission to settle in the town. They came there to trade from Aghmat Aylan where they lived. 'Abd al-Ghalib, the sultan of Marrakesh, in about 967/1560, settled the Jews on the site they occupied later, along the wall of the kasba to the east, where the stables of the palace had been. At the beginning of the 11th/17th century, there was here, according to the French traveller Mocquet, "like a separate town, surrounded by a good wall and having only one gate guarded by the Moors; here live the Jews who are over 4,000 in number and pay tribute". A century later, there were about 6,000 Jews and many synagogues. The Jewish quarter, called melih (see MALLAH) after the example of the Jewish quarter of Fāṣ (the name melih is attested for Marrakesh as early as the end of the 10th/16th century), was placed, as regards policing, under the authority of the kasba but otherwise is administered by an elected Jewish committee. Questions of personal law were judged by a rabbinical tribunal of three members nominated and paid by the Mahzen. The Jews of Marrakesh early began to leave the bounds of the melih. The older ones wore the ritual costume: gaber-dine, skullcap and black slippers, but the younger Jews were more Westernised and participated in the general world of Marrakesh. The Jews have little influence on the corporations of Marrakesh. They are limited to certain trades (jewellers, tinsmiths and embroiderers of slippers) and share with the people of Fāṣ the wholesale trade. They trade particularly with the Lūhūn of the mountains.
would threaten the Masmuda of the mountains and could be used as a connecting link between the south from which they came and the kingdom of Fäs. Yusuf b. Tabghin therefore purchased from its owner an estate on the frontier between two Masmuda tribes, the Haylana and the Hazmira, and pitched his camp there. So far was he from thinking of founding a great capital, a thing for which this Saharan nomad felt no need, that at first he lived in a tent here, beside which he built a mosque to pray in and a little kasha in which to keep his treasures and his weapons; but he did not even attempt to build a surrounding wall. The native Masmuda built themselves dwellings surrounded by palisades of branches beside the Almoravid camp. The town grew rapidly to a considerable size, if it is true, that, in the reign of 'Ali b. Yusuf it had at least 100,000 hearths, but it did not lose its rural character until Ibn Tumart appeared and the threat of the Almohad movement revived by him forced 'Ali b. Yusuf to defend his town and surround it by a rampart which was built in eight months, probably in 520/1126. Some historians give the date 526/1132, but it is certain that the walls were already built in 524/1130, when the Almohads attacked Marrakesh for the first time. Marrakesh, the creation and capital of the Almoravids, was to be the last of their strongholds to yield. When Ibn Tumart had established his power over the tribes of the mountains he tried to attack Marrakesh; he then sent an Almohad army under the command of the shaykh of the Banu Amghar, brothers of the Mahdi Ibn Tumart, against the town and tried to raise the inhabitants against 'Abd al-Mu'min who was away at Salé. The rising was speedily put down and ended in the massacre of the rebels and their accomplices. But on the decline of the dynasty, i.e. after the battle of Las Navas de Tolosa (609/1212 [see AL-I^4AS]) and the death of al-Nasir, son of al-Mansur, Marrakesh became the scene of the struggle between the royal family descended from 'Abd al-Mu'min and the Almohad shaykhs descended from the companions of Ibn Tumart who, quoting traditions of the latter, claimed the right to grant investiture to the sultans and to keep them in tutelage. Abü Muhammad 'Abd al-Wahid, brother of al-Mansur, was strangled in 621/1224. His successor al-Adil was drowned in a bath in the palace (624/1227) and the Almohad shaykhs appointed as his successor the young Yahya b. al-Ma'mun, brother of al-Adil, was proclaimed in Spain. The whole country was soon in the throes of revolution. Yahya, fearing the defection of theickle Almohads, fled to Tinmal (626/1228). Disorder reigned in Marrakesh, where a governor named by al-Ma'mun was finally appointed. But four months later, Yahya returned to Marrakesh with fresh troops, put al-Ma'mun's governor to death and after staying seven days in the town was forced to go to Gililiz to fight a battle (627/1229), for al-Ma'mun had arrived from Spain to take possession of his kingdom. Ferdinand III, king of Castile, had given in return for various concessions, a body of 12,000 Christian horsemen with whose assistance al-Ma'mun defeated Yahya and his followers, entered Marrakesh and installed an anti-Almohad regime there, marked not only by a terrible massacre of the inhabitants and a flagellation of the community but by new oriental practices in religious matters quite opposed to that of the preceding reigns. On his arrival in Marrakesh, al-Ma'mun mounted the pulpit of the mosque of the kasha, recited the khatba, solemnly cursed the memory of Ibn Tumart and announced a whole series of measures, some of which are given by the Kitâb and Ibn Khaldun in which show he intended to do everything on opposite lines to his predecessors. His innovations revived the discontent so that two years later (629/1232) while al-Ma'mun and his militia were besieging Ceuta, Yahya again occupied Marrakesh and plundered it. Al-Ma'mun at once turned back to the rescue of his capital but died on the way (30 Dhî 'l-Hijja 629/17 October 1232). His widow, al-Habab, succeeded in getting her son al-Ra^qid, aged 14, proclaimed by the leaders of the army, including the commander of the Christian mercenaries. In return she gave them Marrakesh to plunder if they could reconquer it. But the people of the town, learning of this clause in the bargain, made their own terms before opening their gates to the new sultan. The latter had to grant them amân and pay the Christian general and his companions the sum they might have expected from the plunder of the capital—according to the Kita'b ad-Dhull of 40,000 dinars. In 633/1235-6, a rebellion of the Khlot [see KHLIT] drove al-Ra^qid out of Marrakesh, and he took refuge
in Sidjilmasa while Yahya recaptured Marrakesh. Al-Ra'iqat, however, succeeded in retaking it and Yahya fled. It was assigned to the governor of the Almohad al-Sa'id (645/1242-8) that the Marinids who had arrived in the east of the country in 613/1216, seized the greater part of the kingdom of Fas. His successor 'Umar al-Murtadā proclaimed in 646/1248, found himself in 658/1260 reduced to the solitary kingdom of Marrakesh, to the south of the Umm al-Rabī'. In 660/1261-2, the Marinid Abū Yusuf Ya'qūb b. 'Abd al-Hakk came to attack Marrakesh. He encamped on mount Gizzīl, whence he threatened the town. Al-Murtadā sent his cousin, the sayyid Abū 'l-Ulā Idrīs, surnamed Abū Dabbūs, to fight him. The amīr 'Abd Allāh b. 'Abū Yusuf was slain in the battle and his father lost heart, abandoned his designs on Marrakesh and returned to Fas at the end of Rajāb 661/beginning of June 1262.

From this time, one feels that the dynasty was lost although peace was made, which moreover showed the humiliation of the Almohads who consented to pay tribute; but they were to destroy themselves. Falling into disfavour with his cousin al-Murtadā, Abū Dabbūs, this great-grandson of 'Abd al-Mu'min, who in the preceding year had defended Marrakesh against the Marinid sultan, sought refuge with the latter and obtained from him the assistance necessary to overthrow al-Mu'tamid. The custom of giving the governorship of Marrakesh to a prince of the ruling family was kept up. Towards the end of Dhū 'l-Ka'dā 706/May 1307, under the walls of Tlemcen, the sultan Abū Ḥabīb gave his cousin Yusuf, son of Muhammad b. Abī Tyād b. 'Abd al-Hakk, the governorship of Marrakesh and the provinces depending on it. By the end of the year, Yusuf rebelled and proclaimed himself independent at Marrakesh after putting to death the governor of the town, al-Hādīj Mas'ūd. Defeated by the imperial troops on the banks of the Umm al-Rabī', the rebel fled to the mountains, plundering Marrakesh on his way (Rajāb 707/January 1308). The punishment inflicted on the rebels was severe. Yusuf b. Abī Tyād, handed over by a ḥaddār with whom he had taken refuge, was put to death and the heads of 600 of his followers went to adorn the battlements of the town. Abū Sa'id Uthmān stayed at Marrakesh on several occasions. He did much rebuilding in 720/1320. Peace and comparative prosperity seems to have reigned there under the rule of Abū 'l-Hasan until this prince, as a result of reverses suffered in his struggle with the Hafsids, found his own son, the ambitious Abī 'Inān, rebelling against him.

During the troubles which now broke out, Ibn Khaldūn tells us, the town was serious threatened by being sacked by the Masmūda of the mountains led by Abī Allāh al-Saksīwī. Abī 'Inān was able to consolidate his power and avert this danger. The struggle between father and son ended in the region of Marrakesh. Abū 'l-Hasan, defeated at the end of Safar 757/May 1350, near the town, sought refuge in the mountains with the amīrs of the Hintātā and died there just after becoming reconciled to his son and designating him his successor (Rabī' II 753/June 1352).

During the course of the 8th/14th century, the amīrs of the Hintātā played a very important part in the country. The position of the tribe on an almost inaccessible mountain, from which it commanded Marrakesh, gave its chiefs comparative independence and protected them from the influence of the Masmūda tribes. Abī 'Inān took no steps against the amīr Abū al-'Azīz who had given asylum to the fugitive Abū 'l-Hasan. He retained him in the command of his tribe, which he gave a few years later to his brother Abī 'Amir. In 754/1353 the latter, becoming chief of all the Masmūda tribes and sufficiently powerful to keep under his thumb the governor of Marrakesh al-Mu'tamid, son of Abī 'Inān, very soon succeeded in making himself completely independent. He received and for a time held as hostages two rebel Marinid princes Abū 'l-Fadl, son of the sultan Abū Šālim, and Abī al-Rahmān, son of sultan Abū 'Ali. Quarrelling with his protegé Abū 'l-Fadl whom he had made governor of Marrakesh, he retired into his mountains and for several years defied the armies of the sultan. He was in the end captured and put to death in 771/1370.

After the death of Abū al-'Azīz, the pretender Abū 'l-'Abbās, son of Abū Šālim, had himself proclaimed in Fas with the help of his cousin Abū al-Rahmān b. Abī Ḥellūsīn, a pretender to the throne. The latter as a reward for his services was given the independent governorship of Marrakesh and the country round it (Muharram 776/June 1374). The empire was thus completely broken. The old rulers soon began to quarrel but then signed a treaty of peace in 780/1378. There was a new rupture and a
new truce two years later after Marrakesh had been besieged for two months without result. Abu 'l-Abbas in the end took Marrakesh in Dhumâdâ 784/July-August 1382, and 'Abd al-Rahman b. Nasir was slain. Abu 'l-Abbas, dispossessed in 1384 and exiled to Granada, succeeded in reconquering his kingdom in 789/1387 and sent to Marrakesh as governor his son al-Muntasir. This event is the last recorded by Ibn Khaldûn. From the time when his record ceases and throughout the 9th/15th century, we are incredibly poor in information about the history of Marrakesh. The south appears to have continued to form a large and independent governorship in the hands of princes of the royal family. The only information at all definite that we have comes from a Portuguese historian who records that during the three years which followed the capture of Ceuta by the Portuguese (1415-18), Morocco was a prey to the struggles among the pretenders. While Abu Sa'id 'Uhmân was ruling in Fás, Mawlay Bû 'Ali, king of Marrakesh, was fighting against another Marind prince called Fâris. The "kingdom" or governorship of Marrakesh does not seem to have completely broken the links which bound it to the kingdom of Fás, for the governors of Marrakesh supplied contingents to the army which tried to retake Ceuta. But they very soon ceased to take part in the holy war in the north of Morocco, and their name is not found among the opponents of the Portuguese. Marrakesh by 914/1508 seems to have been of very little importance if not de jure independent but we do not know within fifty years at what date theHintâta amirs established their power; they were descended from a brother of 'Amir b. Muhammad. They were "kings" of Marrakesh when in 914/1508 the Portuguese established themselves at Safi, taking advantage of the discord that had broken out in the enemy ranks. cAbd al-Malik, son and successor of Zaydan, has left only the memory of his cruelty and massacres and punishments so terrible that a portion of the population having sought refuge in the Gillz, zaydan withdrew into Marrakesh on 21 Shawâwí 986/1578 to 1594 the famous al-Badî palace. The sultan, enriched by several years of peace and good government, and by the gold brought from the conquest of the Sûdân (1000/1591-2), lived almost continually in Marrakesh, to which he restored a splendour and a prosperity that it had not enjoyed since the end of the 6th/12th century. But the death of al-Mansûr opened a period of trouble and civil war "sufficient to turn white the hair of an infant at the breast", to use the expression of the historian al-Fârûnî. While Abu Fâris, son of al-Mansûr, was proclaimed at Marrakesh, another son, Zaydân, was chosen sultan at Fás. A third brother, al-Shâykh, came and took Fás, then sent against Marrakesh an army led by his son 'Abd Allah. He was defeated on 21 Shawâwí 1015/22 December 1606. But Zaydan, who sought refuge first in Tlemcen, then made his way to the Sûs, via Tafilaât and coming suddenly to Marrakesh, had himself proclaimed there while 'Abd Allâh b. al-Shâykh, while escaping with his troops, was attacked in the midst of the gardens (jânâ Bekkâr) and completely defeated (29 Shawâwí 1015/25 February 1607). In Dhumâdâ II/October of the same year, 'Abd Allâh returned after defeating Zaydan's troops on the Wad Tifâlîfât (10 Dhumâdâ II/2 October, 1607), fought a second battle with them at Râs al-'Ayn (a spring in Tansift), regained possession of the town and revenged himself in a series of massacres and punishments so terrible that a portion of the population having sought refuge in the Gilliz, zaydan withdrew into Marrakesh on 19 Shawâwí 1015/20 May 1612. But Yahyâ, succumbing to ambition, rebelled himself at the end of 19 Shawâwí 1022/30 November 1613. But Yahyâ, succumbing to ambition, rebelled himself at the end of 1027/1618, against the ruler whose cause he had once so well sustained. Zaydân had again to take refuge in Fâs. He was soon able to return to Marrakesh, taking advantage of the discord that had broken out in the enemy ranks. 'Abd al-Mulk, son and successor of Zaydân, has left only the memory of his cruelties and
debauchery. He was murdered in Shawwal 1040/May 1631. The renegades, who killed him, also disposed of his horse and successor al-Walid in 1636. A third brother, Muhammad al-Shaykh al-Asghar, succeeded him but had no subjects. His son, Abu Bakr, succeeded him however to reign till 1065/1655, but his son Ahmad al-Abbas was completely in the hands of the Shabbana, an Arab tribe who assassinated him and gave the throne to his kadi 'Abd al-Karim, called Karram al-Hadjd, in 1659. "The latter", says al-Ifrani, "united under his sway all the kingdom of Marrakesh and conducted himself in an admirable fashion with regard to his subjects. He managed to return to Marrakesh again after the battle, died a few days later in the palace (Qumada II 1206/February 1792). Marrakesh remained faithful to the party of Mawlay Higham, but very soon the Rhamna abandoned him to proclaim Mawlay Husayn, brother of Higham, as the new governor in the kasaq (1209/1794-5). While the partisans of the two princes were exhausting themselves in fighting, Mawlay Sliman, sultan of Fas, avoided taking sides in the struggle. The plague rid him at one blow of both his rivals (Safar 1214/July 1799), who had in any case to submit some time before. The last years of the reign of Mawlay Sliman were overcast by troubles in all parts of the empire. Defeated twice at the very gates of Marrakesh, he was taken prisoner by the rebel Shharda. He died at Marrakesh on 13 Rabi' II 1238/28 November 1822. Mawlay 'Abd al-Rahman (1824-59) did much for the afrocrestion of Agdal and restored the religious buildings. His son Muhammad completed his work by repairing tanks and aqueducts. These two reigns were a period of tranquillity for Marrakesh. In 1862, however, while Sidi Muhammad b. 'Abd al-Rahman was fighting the Spaniards at Tzetwan, the Rhamna deserted, plundered the Siiik al-Khamis and closely blockaded the town, cutting off communications and supplies, until the Sultan, having made peace with Spain, came to relieve the town (Dhu '1-Hidjdja 1278/June 1862). Mawlay al-Hasan hardly ever lived in Marrakesh, but he stopped there on several occasions, notably in October 1875, to punish the Rhamna and the Bu 'l-Sabas, who had rebelled, and in 1880 and 1885, to prepare his expiditions into the Siius. During the last years of the reign of Mawlay 'Abd al- 'Aziz (1894-1908), it was at Marrakesh that the opposition to the European tastes and experiments of the sultan made itself most strongly felt. The xenophobia culminated in the murder of a French doctor named Mauchamp (19 March 1907), and the spirit of separatism in the proclamation as sultan of Mawlay 'Abd al-Hafiz, brother of 'Abd al-'Aziz and governor of the provinces of the south (24 August 1907). But 'Abd al-Hafiz becoming ruler of the whole empire (24 August 1907) and having signed the treaty of 24 March 1912 establishing the protectorate of France and of Spain over Morocco, the anti-foreign movement broke out again in the south. The Mauritanian marabout al-Hiba [see AHMAD AL-HIBA in Suppl.] had himself proclaimed and established himself in Marrakesh. He only held out there for a brief period. His troops having been defeated at Sidi Bu 'Ug&mam on 6 September 1912, the French troops occupied Marrakesh the next day.

Relation with Europe. Five minor friars sent by St. Francis were put to death at Marrakesh on 16 January 1220, for having attempted to convert Muslims and having insulted the Prophet Muhammad in their discourses. Their martyrdom attracted the attention of the Holy See to Marrakesh. A mission and a bishopric were established by Honorius III in 1225 to give the consolations of religion to the Christians domiciled in Morocco: merchants, slaves and mercenaries in the sultan's army. In the Almoravid period, the sultans had Christian mercenaries recruited from prisoners reduced to slavery or from the Mozarab population of Spain whom they had from time deported to Morocco by entire villages. In 1227, Abu l-Ulai Idris al-Ma'mun, having won his kingdom with the help of Christian troops lent by the king of Castile, found himself bound to take up quite a new attitude to the Christians. He granted them various privileges, including permission to build a church in Marrakesh and worship openly there. This
was called Notre Dame and stood in the kasha, probably opposite the mosque of al-Mansur: it was destroyed as early as 1292. The Christian soldiery continued to enjoy the right to worship, at least privately, and the bishopric of Marrakesh supported by a source of income at Seville, existed so long as there was an organised Christian soldiery in Morocco, i.e. to the end of the 8th/14th century. The title of Bishop of Marrakesh was borne till the end of the 10th/16th century by the suffragans of Seville (cf. Father A. Lopez, Los obispos de Marruecos desde el siglo XIII, in Asuntos Ibero-Americanos, xlii [1920]). A Spanish Franciscan, the prior Juan de Prado, who came to re-establish the mission, was put to death in 1621 at Marrakesh. A few years later (1637), a monastery was re-established beside the prison for slaves in the kasha.

It was destroyed in 1659 or 1660 after the death of the last Sa'di. Henceforth the Franciscans were obliged to live in the mellah where they had down to the end of the 18th century a little chapel and a monastery. As to the Christian merchants, they had not much reason to go to Marrakesh in the Middle Ages. Trade with Europe was conducted at Ceuta from which the Muslim merchants carried European goods into the interior of the country. In the 16th century, 'Abd Allâh al-Ghâlibî had a fondak or "bonded warehouse" built in the sâd where the Christian merchants were allowed to live. A majority of the Sa'di began to come to Marrakesh preferred to settle in the Jewish quarter. It was here also that foreign ambassadors usually lodged, at least when they were not made to encamp in one of the gardens of the palace.

Monuments. The present enceinte of Marrakesh is a wall of clay about 20 feet high, flanked with rectangular bastions at intervals of 250 to 300 feet. Bâb Aghawîn, Bâb Ayâlan and Bâb Dâlîlûn which still exist more or less rebuilt, are mentioned in the account of the attack on Marrakesh by the Almohads in 524/1130. Bâb Yântân and Bâb al-Makhzen, mentioned at the same time, have disappeared. Bâb al-Sâliha (no longer in existence: it stood on the site of the mellah) and Bâb Dukkâla (still in existence) figure in the story of the capture of the town by the Almohads (524/1130-1). The plan of the wall has therefore never changed. It has been rebuilt in places from time to time, as the clay crumbled away, but it may be assumed that a number of pieces of the wall, especially on the west and south-west, are original, as well as at least three gates all now blocked up, to which they owe their survival, but have lost their name. According to Abu 'l-Fidâî (8th/14th century), there were in Marrakesh seventeen gates; twenty-four at the beginning of the 10th/16th century, according to Leo Africanus. It would be very difficult to draw up an accurate list, for some have been removed, others opened, since these dates or the names have been altered. Ibn Fâdl Allâh al-'Umari (beginning of the 8th/14th century) adds to the names already mentioned those of Bâb Ñifs, Bâb Muhrîk, Bâb Messûla, Bâb al-Râhâ, all four of which have disappeared, Bâb Taghûtû, Bâb Fâs (now Bâb al-Longûn) and Bâb al-Rabb, which still exist. The only important changes, which have been made in the walls of Marrakesh since they were built, have been the building of the kasba in the south and in the north the creation of the quarter of Sidi bel 'Abbas. The sâdâya which as late as the 10th/16th century stood outside the walls beyond the Bâb Taghûtû, was taken into the town with all its dependencies.

The kasba of the Gunyah and the palace of Dâr al-4Umma built by Yusuf b. Tashfin, lay north of the present "Mosque of the Booksellers" or Kutubiyya.

'Ali b. Yusuf added in the same quarter other palaces called Sûr al-Hadjjar, or Kâshr al-Hadjjar because they were built with stones from the Giljûs, while all the other buildings in the town were of brick or clay. It was here that the first Almohads took up their quarters. According to a somewhat obscure passage of the Istibâr, Abu Ya'qûb Yusuf seems to have begun the building of a "fort" in the south of the town but it was Ya'qûb al-Mansûr who built the new kasba (385-93/1189-97); that is to say he joined to the south wall of the town a new walled area within which he built palaces. A few years later, in the 10th/16th century a pleasure house of the sultans. The only remains of the Almohad palaces, but from pieces of wall and other vestiges one can follow the old wall, at least on the north and the east side. There also the line of the wall has hardly changed. The magnificent gateway of carved stone by which the kasba is now entered, must be one of al-Mansûr's buildings. Its modern name of Bâb Agnaw (the dumb mute's = Negro's Gate) is not found in any old text. It probably corresponds to Bâb al-Kuhi (Gate of the Negroes'), often mentioned by the historians.

Ibn Fâdl Allâh al-'Umari, in the 8th/14th century, Leo Africanus and Marmol in the 10th/16th have left us fairly detailed descriptions of the kasba, in spite of a few obscure passages. In the Almohad period, the kasba was divided into three quite distinct parts. One was the whole wall in which the Sa'di continued to enjoy the right to worship, at least privately, and the bishopric of Marrakesh stood outside the prison for slaves in the kasha.

The Almohads (542/1147). The plan of the wall has therefore never changed. It has been rebuilt in places from time to time, as the clay crumbled away, but it may be assumed that a number of pieces of the wall, especially on the west and south-west, are original, as well as at least three gates all now blocked up, to which they owe their survival, but have lost their name. According to Abu 'l-Fidâî (8th/14th century), there were in Marrakesh seventeen gates; twenty-four at the beginning of the 10th/16th century, according to Leo Africanus. It would be very difficult to draw up an accurate list, for some have been removed, others opened, since these dates or the names have been altered. Ibn Fâdl Allâh al-'Umari (beginning of the 8th/14th century) adds to the names already mentioned those of Bâb Ñifs, Bâb Muhrîk, Bâb Messûla, Bâb al-Râhâ, all four of which have disappeared, Bâb Taghûtû, Bâb Fâs (now Bâb al-Longûn) and Bâb al-Rabb, which still exist. The only important changes, which have been made in the walls of Marrakesh since they were built, have been the building of the kasba in the south and in the north the creation of the quarter of Sidi bel 'Abbas. The sâdâya which as late as the 10th/16th century stood outside the walls beyond the Bâb Taghûtû, was taken into the town with all its dependencies.

The kasba of the Gunyah and the palace of Dâr al-4Umma built by Yusuf b. Tashfin, lay north of the present "Mosque of the Booksellers" or Kutubiyya.
have been created in the 6th/12th century by 'Abd al-Mu'min. Mosques. Nothing remains of the early Almoravid mosques, in the building of one of which 'Abd Allah b. Tashfin himself worked along with the masons as a sign of humility. But the Friday mosque of 'Ali b. Yusuf, where Ibn Tümar had an interview with the sultan, although several times rebuilt, still retains its name. The Almohads, on taking possession of Marrakesh, destroyed all the mosques on the pretext that they were wrongly oriented. The mosque of 'Ali b. Yusuf was only partly destroyed and was rebuilt. 'Abd Allah al-Ghalib restored it in the middle of the 10th/16th century. The present buildings and the minaret date from Mawlay Sliman (1792-1822).

Kutubiyya. When the Almohads entered Marrakesh, Abd al-Mu'min built the first Kutubiyya of which some traces still remain and it has been possible to reconstruct its plan. As it was wrongly oriented he built a new mosque, the present Kutubiyya, in prolongation of the first but with a slightly different orientation. It takes its name from the 100 capitals and magnificent pulpit (minbar) orientation. It takes its name from the 100

kubbahs which cover the tombs of the Sa'dian dynasty must have been built at two different periods. The one on the east under which is the tomb of Muhammad al-Shaykh seems to have been built by 'Abd Allâh al-Ghalib. The other, with three chambers, seems to have been erected by Ahmad al-Mansûr (d. 1012/1603) to hold his tomb.

Bibliography: Arab writers: see the indexes to the editions of Bâkri (tr. de Slane, 1859); Idrisi (ed. tr. and Dozy and de Goeje, 1866); Ibn al-Athîr (tr. Fagnan, 1901); Documents inédits d'histoire almohade (ed. and tr. E. Lévi-Provençal, 1928); Chronique almohade anonyme (ed. and tr. E. Lévi-Provençal, in Mélanges René Basset, ii, 1925); Zarkaqlî (tr. Fagnan, 1895); Marrâkûshî (tr. Fagnan, 1895); Abu 'l-Fidaî' (tr. Solvet, 1839); Ibn Fadl al-Dîn al-Marrakushî (tr. de Beaumont, Demobenybes, 1927); Ibn Khaldûn, 'Uthîr (tr. de Slane, 1852); Ibn 'Arabî, Nuzhat al-hâdî (ed. and tr. Houdas, 1889); Zayyâni (ed. and tr. Houdas, 1886); Naṣîrî, Istiklîl (part tr. in AM, ix, x, xxxi). Extraits inédits relatifs au Maghreb (tr. Fagnan, 1924); see also: Kûshâb el-Listihîrî (tr. Fagnan, 1899); Al-Hulal al-mawshiyya, Tunis 1329, Ibn Abî Zârî', Raud al-kirâm (ed. Tornberg, 1846, tr. Beaumont, 1860); Leo Africani (tr. Épaulard, Paris 1956); Ibn al-Muwallakît, al-Sâ'dat al-abâdiyya, Fas 1336; al-Abâbîs b. Ibrâhîm al-Marrûkûshî, Izhâr al-kamâlî, Fas 1334.
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MARRASH, FRANSÉS B. FAT'I ALLÀH B. NAS, Syrian scholar and publicist of the Nahda (1835-74 according to M. 'Abbûd and S. al-Rayyûlî, or 1836-73 according to Brockelmann, Dâghîr and al-Zirîkî).

He was born and died at Aleppo, coming from a Melkite Christian family of literary men (Brockelmann, S II, 755), and in the opening stages of the modern Arabic literary renaissance, the Nahda [q.v.], tried to introduce "critical reasoning" into a sphere at that time in a state of cultural effervescence. For this, he employed pseudo-scientific terms in order to prove, in his early works, the need for freedom and peace in the world, and then in his later works, the existence of God and the divine law (the shari'a which, in his eyes, goes beyond the sphere of the Islamic law alone). In order to free human thought from the yokes of tradition and respect for the ancients, he used extra-literary methods, the discoveries of the botanical, geological and zoological sciences; but, so as not to frighten off his public, he did not endeavour to free himself from traditional signes of expression (wajh, the makâmû genre, numerous poetic citations). The whole of his work involved religion and history in an epistemological revision, and in this, he contributed with Faris al-Shîidyâk and Farah Antîn [q.v.] in the development of critical reasoning, fed by multi-disciplinary aspects of knowledge, in contemporary Arab thought.

He was aided in this by his milieu. Aleppo was at that time a lively centre of thought about the Arab future, within a society still under Ottoman rule. It was in the French religious schools that the Marrâgh family learnt Arabic with French and other foreign languages (Italian and English). The father, Fath Allâh, and the brother, 'Abbûd Allâh, achieved a certain literary fame. A young sister, Maryâna, born in 1848 (Brockelmann, S II, 756, erroneously calls her "daughter", Dâghîr, ii, 697), was to conduct a literary salon and seems to have been the first Arab woman to write in the daily newspapers (al-Djinân and Lisan al-hâfî).

Since he was 4 years old, as a consequence of measles, Fransís Marrâgh began to lose his sight. He studied science and learnt medicine with an English physician in Aleppo. He continued his studies in 1867 at Paris, where he had already been in 1850 for treatment for his eyes. But as his sight deteriorated, he had to return to Aleppo completely blind. During the last
years of his life, he was able to dictate a relatively abundant body of work.

His biographers approach him for using a linguistic style at times incorrect and inelegant (Dāghīr, ii, 693; al-Zirikli; Kustākī; M. ʿAbbūd, 115), but they speak with appreciation of the quality of his personal thought and insight (kātib mākūbi wa-tājīf... min al-tīrāz al-aʿwaqal, Dāghīr, ii, 693) at a time when bidʿa, innovativeness and originality, were still viewed with disfavour by traditional cultural circles. From the titles onwards, his works reveal a clearly marked-out form and a new range of contents: Daʿūlī al-burrīyya al-insānīyya “Guide to human liberty”, Aleppo 1861, 24 pp.; al-Mirāʾ al-jayfiyya fi l-mabādiʾ al-tabfayya “The clear mirror of natural principles”, Aleppo 1861, 60 pp. of pseudo-scientific text; Ṭaʿīzīyat al-makrib wa-bid`ār al-maṭlah “Consolation of the anxious and repose of the weary one”, Aleppo 1864, a philosophical and pessimistic discourse on nations of the past; Qāḥat al-hakk “The forest of truth” (Brockelmann, S II, 756; Ghayāl al-hakk), Aleppo 1865, Cairo 1298/1881, Beirut 1881, his most famous and most often printed work, “almost a novel” (Dāghīr, ii, 695; ʿAbbūd, 131; Kayyālī, 57), a kind of apocalyptic vision and pleading for the liberty of peoples and for peace; Riḥṭa al-Bārī, a description of his trip to Paris, Beirut 1867; al-Kabīr al-jayfī, a collection of poems. Artistic treasures concerning the symbolic visions of Maymūn, a poem of almost 500 verses, a kind of symbolic vision whose hero is called Maymūn; Māqṭāḥ al-abwāl “The witnessing of the stages of human life”, Beirut 1870, 1883 (Brockelmann, S II, 756, gives an edition of 1865 [?]), these editions testifying to the work’s success, as confirmed by ʿAbbūd—with 183 130 pp. (the in 1870 edition, 75 being in verse and 55 in prose), the book sets forth the author’s philosophical ideas on beings and things: minerals, vegetable and plant life, animals and human kind; Durr al-sadfi fi ḡanāb ʿal-sadf “The pearl of nacre concerning the curious aspects of change”, a social narrative which appeared at Beirut in 1872; Mirāʾ al-haṣna “The mirror of the beautiful one”, Beirut 1872—1873, a collection of poems; and his posthumous work, ʿAbdāḥat al-ṭabīḵa fi ṭamāl al-inbāl wa-l-taḥrīr “The proofs of nature for the existence of God and the divine law”, Beirut 1892.

In his articles published in al-Dīnān, Butrus al-Bustānī’s journal [see AL-BUSTANI, 2., in Suppl.], he reveals himself as favourable to women’s education, which he limited however to reading, writing, and a little bit of arithmetic, geography and grammar. He wrote that it is not necessary for a woman “to act like a man, neglect her domestic and family duties, or that she should consider herself superior to the man” (al-Dīnān, 1872, 769-70, cited by A. al-Makdisī, 268-9). He nevertheless closely followed his sister Maryānā’s studies not suspecting that the first poem which she would publish in the public press—actually in al-Dīnān—would be her elegy on him (ʿAbbūd, 173).


**MARRIAGE** [see S MAHR, MARA, NIKAH, ʿURS.]

**MARS** [see AL-MIRĪBKĀ.]

**MARSÁ [see MINĀ].**

**MARSĀL [see ʿIkīlīYYA.**

**MARRASH — MARSAD (A).** Originally means a place where one keeps watch, whence comes the meaning of obser-vatory, also described by the word raṣād. The first astronomical observations carried out in the Islamic world seem to date back to the end of the 2nd/8th century, i.e. to the period when Indo-Persian astronomical materials were introduced and the first Ptolemaic data appeared. According to Ibn Yūnūs (d. 399/1009), Abūd b. Mūḥammad al-Nīhāwī (174/790) made some observations in Dūndiẓhāpūr in the time of the minister Yahāb b. Ḵālīl b. ʿĀrām (i. d. 190/805) and used their results in his Ziqī maṣūfamī, unfortunately lost. The same Ibn Yūnūs informs us, on the other hand, that in 519/776 the first determination of the obliquity of the ecliptic was made with a result of 23° 31′, but he does not cite the one responsible for these observations, who may have been al-Nīhāwī himself.

The first systematic programme of observations concerning which we have solid information is that which was implemented under the patronage of the caliph Al-Maḏmūn (g.v.) (198-218/813-33) who gave an impulse to this research, perhaps because of his own interest in astronomy or his desire to achieve a permanent solution of the problem presented by the contradictory parameters used by the three astronomical schools known to Muslims: Indian, Persian and Greek (D. Pingree, The Greek influence on early Islamic mathematical astronomy, in JAOs, xciii (1973), 38-9). This second hypothesis would also explain the careful measurement of a meridian degree undertaken by al-Maḏmūn’s order, in the Syrian desert (between the towns of al-Raqqa and Palmyra) and in Irāk (between Baghdad and Kufa and on the Sindjar plain; see T. Backus, Measurement of one geographical degree undertaken and carried out by the Arabs in the 13th century, in Actes du IX Congrès International d’Histoire de Sciences, Barcelone-Paris 1960, 635-8). The observations encouraged by al-Maḏmūn were undertaken in Baghḍād and Damascus, not simultaneously, it seems, but consecutively, although we possess a reference to the collation of the results of an observation of the autumnal equinox carried out in the two towns. In Baghḍād, the observations took place in al-Shāmhīsyya quarter, but the sources do not say if there was an observatory, properly speaking, in a building reserved for this purpose; in any case, the insistence in the introduction of the ẓīq attributed to Ḫāyā b. Abī Maṣūr (d. ca. 215/830) on the use of the “circle” (al-ṭābīḵ) of al-Shāmhīsyya makes us think of a large scale instrument requiring a fixed installation and a minimal permanent space (cf. J. Vernet, Las “Tabulae Probatoriae”, in Homenaje a Millás Vallicrosa, ii, Barcelona 1956, 508, repr. in Estudios sobre historia de la ciencia medieval, Barcelona-Bellaterra 1979, 198). The situation was the same in Damascus, where the observations took place in the monastery of Dayr Murrān on Mount Kāsīyun (g.v.). A sun-dial ten cubits high (about 5 m.) was built there and a marble wall dial, whose interior radius also measured ten cubits, in any case, it was not necessary for the installations to be of a permanent character, for the
programmes were brief; in Baghda'd the observations were carried out in 213/828 and 214/829 under the direction of Yahyā b. Abī Ma'sūr with the collaboration of Sanād b. 'Ali and al-ʿAbbās b. Saʿīd al-Diwhārī. They had to be interrupted for a year, to be repeated later in Damascus, where they took place at the end of a solar year between 216 and 217/931-2, under the direction of Khālid b. 'Abd al-Malāk al-Marwarīdī, perhaps with the assistance of Sanād b. 'Ali and al-ʿAbbās b. Saʿīd al-Diwhārī. The question as to whether Baghda'd and Marwarīdī (ed. between 230 and 260/846-74) was involved in these observations, especially as head of the team in Damascus, has been much discussed, but there does not seem to be sufficient proof and Habash himself, in the introduction of his zij, where he alludes to these observations, does not say that he took part personally. The caliph's death, in 218/833, interrupted, according to some sources, the programme of observations, but the matter is not clear, for, on the one hand, some evidence shows that this work preceded al-Ma'mūn's death and, on the other, we possess some references to later observations carried out by al-Ma'mūn's astronomers in Damascus (Khālid in 219/834) and in Baghda'd (Khālid, 'Ali b. ʿIsā al-Harrānī and Sanād b. 'Ali in 230-1/843-4). It is furthermore possible that the observations in question survived to be followed up by a later imitator or that the latter's addition is to be made (such as those of Hābaš in Baghda'd between 210 and 220/823-33 and in 250/864) were carried out on the fringe of the official programme laid down by the caliph.

The observers of al-Ma'mūn's time seem to have given themselves to the systematic observation of the sun and moon, although observations were also made of the fixed stars and no doubt of the planets. The results of these labours were recorded in a certain number of zij̱s, outstanding among which are those attributed to Yahyā b. Abī Ma'sūr and Habash. As far as the sun is concerned, these zij̱s improve upon the Ptolemaic parameters, and it is also known that al-Ma'mūn's astronomers established a new method, which offers some advantages as against that of Ptolemy for establishing the parameters of the solar (W. Hattner and M. Schramm, Al-Birûnî and the theory of the solar apogee: an example of originality in Arabic science, in A.C. Crombie (ed.), Scientific change, London 1963, 208-9). Various calculations of the obliquity of the ecliptic (see al-Birûnî, Tahdīd nihdydt al-amādān, ed. P. Bouglakov, in RIMA, vii [1962], 90-1) and of the duration of the tropical year were undertaken. However, the observation of the moon, stars and planets proved to be less fruitful, and we can only say, by way of example, that the estimation of the preces- sion of the equinoxes (1 every 66 years) obtained by Yahyā b. Abī Ma'sūr (following an observation of the autumnal equinox carried out on the 27 Radjab 215/19 September 830) is suspect, for D. Pingree (Precession and trepidation in Indian astronomy before A.D. 1200, in Jnl. of the Hist. of Astronomy, iii [1972]), has demonstrated that the parameter cited above is of Sanskrit origin.

The status given to astronomical observations by al-Ma'mūn's patronage was to be followed by a period during which the same work had to be pursued, on a lower level, in small private observatories: this is the case with the brothers Muhammad and Abū Ahmad Mūsā b. Ṣāḥīk who observed the sun and fixed stars between 270-1/881-2 and between 290-1/900-1, but also in Sāmarrā and Nīghāpūr. This activity of the Banū Mūsā is easily explained, for they had at their disposal a considerable fortune and became patrons of other scholars, among whom figured Thābit b. Qurra [q. v.], who also made observations himself, but is distinguished essentially by his use of the results of those which dated back to antiquity and al-Ma'mūn's period. Between the 3rd and 4th/9th-10th centuries, attention should be drawn to the work undertaken by al-Mahānī (observation of conjunctions and eclipses of the sun and moon between 239 and 252/853-66), the 30 years (273-305) of systematic observations of al-Battānī [q. v.], in al-Raʾka which are crystallized in his famous zij (edited by C.A. Nallino, Milan 1899-1907) and the labours of the Banū Amīdūr in Baghda'd between 271 and 321/885-933, who made observations not only of the sun but also of the moon.

The 4th/10th century had already begun when the interest of the Buwayhid dynasty in astronomy brought a revival of official patronage which facilitated the undertaking of very extensive work. Abu l-ʿFaḍl Ibn al-ʿAbbās [q. v.], minister of the ruler of al-Rayy, Rukn al-Dawlā (d. 366/977), subsidised the construction of a large-scale instrument with which Abu l-ʿFaḍl al-Harawī and Abī Dījaʿarī (4th/10th century) made solar observations in 348/950. This same minister also had in his service Abī al-Rahmān al-Ṣūfī (d. 376/986), who was also patronized by al-Ma'mūn, by another Buwayhid, ʿAdūd al-Dawlā (d. 372/985). Al-Ṣūfī's observations resulted in a systematic revision of Ptolemy's catalogue of stars; simultaneously, Ibn al-ʿAṭām, also for ʿAdūd al-Dawlā, made some planetary observations which are recorded in his famous zij (cf. E. S. Kennedy, The astronomical tables of Ibn al-ʿAṭām, in JHAS, i [1977], 13-21). This work was further developed under Sharaf al-Dawlā (372-9/982-9), who commanded Abī ʿAllāh al-Khāṣībī to observe the seven planets, which resulted in the construction of an observatory in the royal palace garden at Baghda'd where some large-scale instruments were used. Astronomers such as Abu l-ʿWāfī al-Būzjānī [q. v.] and Ahmad b. Muhammad al-Sāḥībī must have taken part in the first observations, which took place in 378/988. Unfortunately, his three zij̱s, al-amāq, have very little existence, for its activities ended with the death of Sharaf al-Dawlā. Even so, the patronage of Fakhr al-Dawlā (366-87/977-97) supported the solar observations of al-Khudjandī [q. v.] (d. 390/1000) carried out in Rayy with the help of a large sextant called al-nadīd al-fakhrī. The Buwayhīs' example must obviously have awakened a desire to emulate it among members of other dynasties, and this was the case with the Kākhaydīd Alī al-Dawlā Muḥammad (d. 433/1041-2) who supplied Ibn Sinā (q. v.) (370/428/980-1037), with funds to carry out observations of the planets in Hamadān around 414/1023-4, and with Maḥmūd al-Ghaznī (d. 421/1030), under whose patronage al-Bīrūnī [q. v.] (362-442/977-1050) also made certain observations and wrote a main part of his astronomical work.

From the 4th/10th century onwards, observations began to take place further west. In Egypt, there emerges the remarkable figure of Ibn Yūnūs (d. 399/1009), despite the fact that the account according to which this astronomer is said to have had at his disposal a well-equipped observatory, thanks to the patronage of the Fāṭimid caliph al-Ḥākim (386-411/996-1021), appears entirely legendary; he probably had at his disposal only an armillary sphere, although a number of his observations (described in the introduction to his zij) were carried out in various places in the town between 367/977 (or 380/990) and
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398/1007), such that we may assume that he used essentially portable instruments and obtained excellent results. In al-Andalus, the first observations known from documents are those of Maslama al-Madgrī [q.v.]. [d. ca. 398/1107; see J. Vernet and M. A. Catalá, Las obras matemáticas de Maslama de Madrid, in Al-And., xxx (1965), 15-47; repr. in Estudios sobre historia de la ciencia medieval, Barcelona-Bellaterra 1979, 241-71], while far more remarkable work in this respect was carried out by Azaquīl-al-Zarkāli (d. 493/1100), of whom we know that, with the assistance of several collaborators, he made observations of the sun, moon and fixed stars for more than 25 years, first in Toledo, then in Cordoba (J. M. Millas-Vallierosa, Estudios sobre Azaquīl, Madrid-Granada 1943-50, 279); yet there does not seem to be any proof of an organised observatory.

The observatory as an institution, if not permanent, at least longer lasting than the examples mentioned until now, seems to be an Eastern development dating from the later Middle Ages. The most obvious antecedent, although not well-known, is the observatory founded by Malik Şah (685-85/1092-93) around 467/1074, perhaps in Isfāhān and where ʿUmar al-Khayyām [q.v.] (440-526/1048-1131), in collaboration with other astronomers, completed a zīḏj and effectuated the revolution of the Persian solar calendar [see further, J. Vernet and M. [q.v.]], dated 1107. The first large-scale Islamic observatory whose organisa-

tion and structure we know about in detail, it contained several buildings, including a residence for Hūlegū, a mosque and a rich library (the sources speak of 400,000 volumes, which is a traditional figure). It had large-size instruments and was financed by the official revenues of pious foundations (waqf); this is the first time that we see an observatory subsidised in a manner ordinarily reserved for schools, hospitals and libraries. The motives behind this undertaking seem to have been, for Hūlegū, basically astronomical. The most important astronomers of the age, whose names are mainly associated with important modifications to the Ptolemaic system and undertakings, before the observa-

tory's foundation, by Muḥammad al-Kashi (932-93/1525-85), participated in the observatory's work. Outstanding among them, apart from al-Ṭūsī and al-ʿUrdī, are Muhīʾ ʿI-dīn al-Maghribī (d. between 680 and 690/1281-91) and Kūb al-Ḥānim al-Shīrāzī [q.v.] (634-710/1236-1311). The observatory, founded in 657/1259, survived Hūlegū. On the death of al-Ṭūsī (672/1274), the Zīḏj-i gurgānī had already been composed, i.e. some astronomical tables which constitute the basic result of the work completed in Marāgha. The observations thus lasted more than 12 years, and we know that they were pursued after al-Ṭūsī's death, until the end of the period of 30 years corresponding to a revolution of Saturn: following these new observations (around 672-703/1274-1304) some corrections were made to the Zīḏj-i gurgānī. It seems, on the other hand, that there was some activity at the observatory until around 715/1316 and that it was in ruins in 740/1340. So it was the first Islamic observatory to enjoy a remarkable longevity (55 or 60 years) and give birth not only to al-Ṭūsī's zīḏj but also to that of Muhīʾ ʿI-dīn al-Maghribī.

Marāgha provided a model for several imitations among which may be cited the observatory of Shāhm (a suburb of Tabrīz) which was built by the ruler Ghānī Khan (694-703/1295-1304) and survived 15 or 16 years (ca. 701-17/1300-17). However, no observatory of the size of that at Marāgha appears before the 9th/15th century. Thanks to the patronage of the great prince Ulugh Beg [q.v.], governor of the Samarkand region, in 823/1420 an important madrasa was founded in that town. It specialised in the teaching of astronomy at the heart of what constituted the nucleus of a scientific centre active for about 18 years, until the death of the ruler, whose son, Sandjar b. Malik Şah, patronised the planetary observations carried out in Marw by al-Khāzīmī (between about 509 and 530/1115-35). With regard to the observatory of Malik Şah, there appears for the first time the idea that the minimum time necessary to complete a programme of observations is 30 years (a revolution of Saturn). Naṣīr al-Ṭūsī al-ʿUrdī [q.v.], (597-672/1201-74) was to recall this minimum period in the course of his negotiations with the Mongol sultan Hūlegū with a view to creating the Marāgha observatory; facing resistance from the ruler, the astron-

omer agreed to complete the same work in twelve years (a revolution of Jupiter). In the 9th/15th century, al-Kāgilī (d. 835/1429), the principal astronomer of the Samarkand observatory, was also to speak of a minimum period of between 10 and 15 years.

Hūlegū Khan (d. 663/1265) founded, at the suggestion of Naṣīr al-Ṭūsī al-Ṭūsī, the Marāgha observatory, on a hill situated near the town. It is the first large-scale Islamic observatory whose organisation and structure we know about in detail, it contained several buildings, including a residence for Hūlegū, a mosque and a rich library (the sources speak of 400,000 volumes, which is a traditional figure). It had large-size instruments and was financed by the official revenues of pious foundations (waqf); this is the first time that we see an observatory subsidised in a manner ordinarily reserved for schools, hospitals and libraries. The motives behind this undertaking seem to have been, for Hūlegū, basically astronomical. The most important astronomers of the age, whose names are mainly associated with important modifications to the Ptolemaic system and undertakings, before the observatory's foundation, by Muḥammad al-Kashi (932-93/1525-85) founded one in 982/1575 thanks to the patronage of Sultan Murūd III (982-1004/1574-95); the building was completed in 985/1577. This establishment is said to have been a large observatory in a category analogous to those of Marāgha and Samarkand, but an unfortunate astrological prediction about a comet carried out by Naṣīr ʿI-dīn in this same year 985/1577, as well as the hostility of the most conservative sectors of society, made the sultan order the destruction of the buildings in 980/1580.

The last large Islamic observatories are those which were founded by Dājīg Singh (SavaJayāsinīhā, māḥānātīk of Ambrāt from 1111/1669 (d. 1156/1743) who, wishing to bring up to date the astronomy of his
time, dedicated himself to collecting manuscripts of Sanskrit, Persian and Arabic astronomical works, as well as other books and manuscripts on Islamic and Hindu themes. In 1826, the Maharaja Mansingh II Library in Jaipur, under the direction of Zayd-i ajadid-i Muhammad Shâhî. The library was intended to serve as a repository for Islamic language following the Arabic tradition) to lament the passing of a beloved person and to celebrate his achievements.


AL-MARSAFI, AL-HUSAYN, Egyptian scholar and teacher (1815-90) from a family originating from the village of Marâghâ, near Baha; his father taught at the al-Azhar Mosque. Al-Husayn became blind at the age of three; however, he underwent the education. If it is read in the light of the debates of the time, his position appears to be that of a moderate, an advocate of a reasonable modernity, legitimised by constant reference to moral and cultural examples from the glorious ages of Islam; the author seems to be following, if one wished to revive Arabic language and letters, by a great number of Egyptian writers and teachers who had a diffuse but effective influence on the educational system. The best known are 'Abd Allâh Fikri and Hifnî Nâsîf. This programme for reviving the language was gradually spread through almost all the Arab countries—with or without reference to al-Marsafi—from the last years of the 19th century thanks to the efforts of the reformists [see ISLÂM, i and MUHAMMAD SA'DUH].

Al-Marsafi was also interested in the history of political ideas; in October 1881, he published an essay, the Risâlat al-Kalim al-thâman (Cairo 68 pp.) on eight words of political vocabulary in frequent use, he said, in modern debates; umma, nation or community according to language, territory or religion; watan, fatherland; hukûma, government; adab, culture; zulm, injustice; siyasa, politics; harîyya, liberty; and tarbiya, education. If it is read in the light of the debates of the time, his position appears to be that of a moderate, an advocate of a reasonable modernity, legitimised by constant reference to moral and cultural examples from the glorious ages of Islam; the author seems to be following, if one wished to revive Arabic language and letters, by a great number of Egyptian writers and teachers who had a diffuse but effective influence on the educational system. The best known are 'Abd Allâh Fikri and Hifnî Nâsîf. This programme for reviving the language was gradually spread through almost all the Arab countries—with or without reference to al-Marsafi—from the last years of the 19th century thanks to the efforts of the reformists [see ISLÂM, i and MUHAMMAD SA'DUH].

Al-Marsafi was also interested in the history of political ideas; in October 1881, he published an essay, the Risâlat al-Kalim al-thâman (Cairo 68 pp.) on eight words of political vocabulary in frequent use, he said, in modern debates; umma, nation or community according to language, territory or religion; watan, fatherland; hukûma, government; adab, culture; zulm, injustice; siyasa, politics; harîyya, liberty; and tarbiya, education. If it is read in the light of the debates of the time, his position appears to be that of a moderate, an advocate of a reasonable modernity, legitimised by constant reference to moral and cultural examples from the glorious ages of Islam; the author seems to be following, if one wished to revive Arabic language and letters, by a great number of Egyptian writers and teachers who had a diffuse but effective influence on the educational system. The best known are 'Abd Allâh Fikri and Hifnî Nâsîf. This programme for reviving the language was gradually spread through almost all the Arab countries—with or without reference to al-Marsafi—from the last years of the 19th century thanks to the efforts of the reformists [see ISLÂM, i and MUHAMMAD SA'DUH].
merits; ṣitha*, from the same root, denotes both lamentation and the corresponding literary genre.

1. In Arabic literature.

The origin of the marṭiya may be found in the rhymed and rhythmic laments going with the ritual movements performed as a ritual around the funeral cortège by female relatives of the deceased, before this role became the prerogative of professional female mourners (cf. M. Gaudefroy-Demombynes, *Introduction au Livre de la poésie et des poètes*, Paris 1947, pp. xvii-xviii). It was in fact customary for the mother, a sister, or a daughter of the deceased, originally perhaps with the intention of appeasing his soul, and in any event as a means of perpetuating his renown, to commemorate his noble qualities and exploits and to express the grief of the family and the tribal group, in a short piece composed in ṣadḥ, normalisation in verse form being a later development. These improvisations, probably of a rather stereotyped nature, have not been handed down to posterity, but one fairly scanty specimen (see J. Wellhausen, *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*, i, 1884, 47), said to be the work of the mother of Ta’abbata Sharīn [q.v.].

With the transition from ṣadḥ to verse, it seems that women retained their role in the lamentation and the celebration of the deceased, and there are many modern figures, traditionally credited to more or less obscure pre-Islamic poetesses; outstanding examples are Dakhṭan, mourning the death of her father Laktī b. Zūrār [q.v.] in the Shīb Djbala (Aghmīn, ed. Beirut, xi, 137-8) and al-Khīrnik, who was responsible for a number of elegies, most of them concerning her brother ɬa tarā[.q.v.] and his husband, preserved by the ṣawā (see L. Cheikho, *Shu‘asā‘* al-Najmīyya, 921-7); the most renowned is unquestionably al-Khansa* [q.v.], who gave ṣitha a polished form and to this very day enjoys unanimous admiration (see N. Rhodokan- skis, *al-Hansa* and ihre Trauerlieder, Vienna 1904).

In the early years of Islam, Laylā al-Akhayliyya [q.v.] enhanced her reputation with elegies, much appreciated by local critics, in which she mourns the death of Tawba b. al-Humayyir (Aghmīn, ed. Beirut, xi, 213-20) and even that of ɬulūmān b. Širāyš (Ibn Kutayba, Širī, ed. Cairo, ii, 123, 417-8). On account of their extreme sensitivity (and, according to Ibn Rāṣīk, *Umda*, ii, 123, their low capacity for endurance), women are able to express unreservedly their grief at the death of a member of the family and to celebrate merits which ultimately reflect upon the entire group; they give to their compositions a passionate tone of such intensity and spontaneity that the expert connoisseur of Arabic poetry, Père Cheikho, did not hesitate to gather together the more or less authentic works of these poetesses in his Riyād al-adab fi marṭīh ṣawādir al-ʿArab, Beirut 1897.

Men were also active in this area, and without entirely taking the place of women, composed verse pieces of various lengths which offer variations on the common themes. It is worthy of note that a number of pre-Islamic poets, Mutammīn b. Nuwāya [q.v.] for example, owe their reputations almost entirely to their elegies, and that among the four compositions regarded as most successful by the critics, there figures, alongside the marṭīh of Ibn al-Rūmī, al-Ṣāriḥ al-Radī and Mihyār al-Daylami (see below), an ʿaynīyya which has become proverbial (although it is probably in part apocryphal on account of the Kurʾānic influence discernible in it) by a poet of the last years of the Djbiliyya, Labīd [q.v.], who mourns his half-brother ʿAbī ṣirād, killed by lightning (Ibn Kutayba, Širī, ed. Cairo, 236-7; Aghmīn, ed. Beirut, xv, 300-1).

Some authors, no doubt sensitive to the sincere expression of profound emotions, go so far as to place the marṭīh of the Bedouin at the head of the other poetic works; al-Djbīḥī (Bayqīn, ed. Hārūn, ii, 320) quotes without comment the reply given by one of them when asked why their elegies were the best of their poems: “Because we speak [our verses], as our hearts burn [with grief]”. This affirmation of the sincerity and the poignancy of their feelings does not however explain the fact (judging from the texts currently available, which probably reflect the true position) that these poems continue to refrain from expressing their sorrow at the death of a mother, a wife, a daughter or a sister (the lines of a Bedouin on his wife in the ṣadḥ of Ibn ʿAbī ṣirād, ed. Cairo 1348/1926, ii, 181, are perhaps of a later date).

In fact, it is to a male parent or member of the group that the marṭīh are addressed; the intention is to exalt the deceased by presenting his death as a loss felt by the entire clan or tribe; there is, on the other hand, the hope of continuing to benefit from his protection, and to this end he is implored not to go far away (lā tabbād, the reading lā tabbūd, in LA, root bād, is inappropriate since it would mean “do not perish”), he is promised revenge if he has been a victim of murder, and there are forceful expressions of hatred for his enemies. In spite of the repetition, in the last years of the Djbiliyya, as for example to Dirār b. al-ʿAbī ṣirād, a group rather than that of an individual or members of the same family. During the wars and expeditions which took place in the lifetime of the Prophet, there were many poets, in both camps, who mourned the deaths of their comrades and hurled defiance at their adversaries. This applies, for example, to Dirār b. al-Khāṭāb, giving to the Kurayshites notice of the death of ʿAbī Djbāl [q.v.] at Badr and calling upon his fellow-tribesmen to avenge him (Ibn Ḥīṣām, Sīra, ed. Sakkā et alii, ii, 27-8), also to Umayyā b. ɬa Suṣal [q.v.] who, after the same battle, mourns the Kurayshites slain by the Muslims, against whom he likewise incites the members of his tribe (Sīra, ii, 30-3; Ibn ʿAbī ṣirād, Ṣad, Cairo 1346/1928, ii, 194-5); the Prophet is said to have forbidden the circulation of this poem (Aghmīn, ed. Beirut, iv, 126). Jewish poets did not hesitate to lament the massacre of their co-religionists and to threaten their enemies (e.g. Šammāk, in Sīra, ii, 198, 200, after the death of Ka’b b. al-ʿAshrāf [q.v.]).
Compositions of this type are sometimes ripostes addressed to Muslim poets, who were not slow to reply in their turn; the Sūrah echoes these exchanges, while giving prominence to the poems of Muslims, significant among whom are Ka'b b. Mālik, Ibn Rawāḥa and in particular Ḥassān b. Thābit [q.v.]. The Dīwān of the last-named contains a number of marāṭiḥ inspired by the death of Ḥamza b. Abd al-Muṭṭalib [q.v.], also by the deaths of the combatants who fell at Ḥirr al-Mu‘ānā and at Mu‘ātta (Dīwān, ed. W. ʻArafāt, GMS, xxvi/1, London 1971, respectively 321, 450 and 207-98; cf. 393). Among some thirty elegies which figure in this Dīwān, it is to be noted that one of them (234) breaks with tradition in that it concerns the poet’s daughter, that two or possibly three, where Kurānic inspiration is more clearly discernible, are dedicated to the Prophet (269, 272, 455), one to Abū Bakr (125), two to ʻUmar (273, 459), eight to ʻUkhmān (96, 120, 122, 311, 319, 520, 511) and the others to various individuals, but a large part of this enormous composition is definitely apocryphal. In general, it may be said that the difference between the works of the early Muslim poets and those of their pagan predecessors consists in the fact that they refrain from calling for vengeance and confine themselves to promising the fires of Hell to their adversaries killed in combat, while they stress the example set by the Prophet. To all these elements, and to the eulogy which later inspired the emergence of the genre -marāṭiḥ of the Bedouin. The latter are also perpetuated in the works of the major poets of the Umayyad era; thus some twenty elegies of classical construction are to be found in the Dīwān of al-Farazdāk [q.v.] and in that of Dājrī [q.v.] the latter, however, breaks with tradition—much to the indignation of the former (Dīwān, ed. Sāwī, Cairo 1354/1936, 465-74, in particular 471)—in devoting several verses addressed to the death of his wife Khālīda, at the beginning of a rather lengthy and highly-regarded poems. Dīwān, ed. Ghazali, Cairo 1953, 572-95; cf. E. Wagner, Abū Nuwas, 210, 611, 674, 676). The 2nd/8th century sees the birth of the poetic

The 2nd/8th century sees the birth of the poetic genre known as "ascetic poems" (zuḥdīyydt [q.v.]), which involves reflection on death and no doubt influences nihāḥ, in which gnostic themes, present since the pre-Islamic period, become increasingly numerous. Abū Nuwās [ar.], himself the author of zuḥdīyydt (see "A.A. al-Zubaydī, Zuḥdīyydt Abī Nuwās, Cairo 1959," has left no less than twenty marāṭiḥ in memory of distinguished persons, scholars and poets, friends and parents (although in some cases the individuals mourned were not yet dead), and even including himself (Dīwān, ed. Ghazali, Cairo 1953, 572-95; cf. E. Wagner, Abī Nuwās, Wiesbaden 1965, 349-60). It is often, in fact, the natural or violent death of an eminent person, the death of a distinguished scholar which inspires the poets. Thus Ibn Durayd [q.v.] writes funeral
orations for al-Shafici and al-Taban [q. vv.] and for his relatives slain in battle, demanding that they ...

This is not unlike the approach to the family of the Jdhiz,

... "ubi sunt qui ante nos in mundo mere 

There is no rule that forbids lamentations over the destruction of an object (see below, with regard to cities) or the loss of an animal (the funeral eulogy of a cat figures in Madżāni l’-adab, v, 135), and the poet is enticed to make reference to the sadness of Nature and of domestic animals; but he must beware of committing blunders, saying for example that a horse subjected to this sort of treatment in the course of his exploits is saddened by the latter’s passing, whereas in fact this is for him liberation. It is the moral qualities of the deceased which should be celebrated: intelligence, courage, generosity, decency.

The disintegration of the Abbasid empire brought virtually no change to the various aspects of marthiya, which seems however to become more and more influenced by “professional” exigencies. It is at the beginning of the 5th/11th century that Mihyār al-Daylami [q. v.] achieves renown with his successful tīgha† of ‘Ali or of al-Husayn (see Diwān, Cairo 1344-50/1925-31, ii, 259-62, 367-70, iii, 109, etc.) and especially with the mūfiyya in which he mourns the death of his master al-Sharif al-Radi (Diwān, iii, 366-70), regarded as a masterpiece. Previously, the proliferation of provincial dynasties had increased the number of occasions for the composition of elegies of a nature more formal and elaborate than personal and spontaneous; a tendency which has already been seen to emerge takes on a definitive form in the work of al-Mutanabbī [q. v.], who revives the classical theme of destiny, pays tribute to the deceased and adds a panegyric in praise of the latter’s lauds and treatment in the same reward, but without making mention of his own qualities (see R. Blachère, Mutanabbi, 46, 119, 250). This is not unlike the approach to the family of the

...
deceased noted by Aḥ. Dż. al-Tahir in the poetry of the Seljuk period (al-Shiār al-ʿarabī fi l-ʿIrāq wa-bi-ṣaḥāba al-Saljūqīn, Baghdād 1361, ii., 108-113). This author holds in high regard a ʿaybīya and a ʿaṣṣiya of al-Tuğhrāʾī (q.v.) dedicated, respectively, to the memory of a wife and of a concubine (see Diʿānūn al-Tuğhrāʾī, ed. ʿA. Dż. al-Tahir and Y. al-Jabābūrī, Baghdād 1396/1976, 151-5, 264-5), and rightly criticizes the matâlaʿ of the famous elegy of ʿUṯr (see above), in which his long ʿaṣṣiya manages to devote only a few verses to the memory of his wife. Otherwise, the marthiya continues to be largely conventional in character, and ʿUmār Mūsā Bāshā (Adab al-duwal al-mutāḥabīn ʿawwāʾ al-Zanġiyyin wa l-ʿAṣṣiyāwīyyin wa l-ʿMāmālīkī, Beirut 1386/1967, 579) finds nothing new that is worthy of note in traditional riṯāʾ; he does however make one honourable exception in the case of Usāma Ibn Munkiḏ (q.v.), who mourns, in a moving ʿaṣṣiya, the demise of members of his family who were victims of an earthquake at Shayzar (Diʿānūn, Cairo 1953, 304-5, 507-9). This same literary historian lays emphasis on the marthiya of Muslim warriors slain during the Crusades and is appreciative of certain poems by ʿImād al-Dīn l-ʿIṣḥānī (q.v.) on the death of ʿImād al-Dīn Zanģī, the death of Nūr al-Dīn and in particular that of Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn (Abū ʿAbd allāh ʿAlī, K. al-Rawdatayn, Cairo 1287-8, i, 4-5, 24-54, ii, 2, 53-85). These elegies bear emotional vigour in the description of events (Adab al-duwal al-mutāḥabīn, 305-12). As with the ḫāridiyya of former times, warriors are impelled to seek the pall of martyrdom (ṣalāb al-ṣahāda) which is the supreme reward (cf. E. Sivan, LʿIṣlam et la Croisade, 12). As with the Kharidjīs of former times, warriors upped their emotional tone to the wish, conventionally, that their fear of seeing recaptured cities falling again into the hands of the Christians, criticise those in authority for not having forestalled the defeats and mourn the loss of places seized by the Muslims.

The characteristic feature of this type of marthiya is the introduction, as objects of lamentation, on the one hand, of cities destroyed by foreign conquerors, on the other, of local dynasties which are overturned. Omissions excepted, the oldest specimen of this type is the long ʿaṣṣiya of 135 verses in which Abū Yaʿkūb al-Khuraymī (q.v.) describes in pathetic terms the desolation of Baghdād during the war which saw the confrontation between al-ʿĀmilī and his brother al-Maʿmūn (see al-Ṭabari, iii, 873-80; Diʿānūn al-Khuraymī, ed. ʿA. Dż. al-Tahir and M. Dż. al-Muʿayyibīd, Beirut 1971, 27-37); this poet is also the author of several interesting elegies, for his brother al-Maʿmūn (see ibid., 56-8). Another well-known ʿaṣṣiya is the mimiyā which begins, conventionally, with the evocation of sleeplessness and tears, and was dedicated by Ibn al-Rūmi to Basra, describing the condition of the town following its sacking by the Zandji (Diʿānūn), translated with commentary by J.T. Monroe, A curious Morisco appeal to the Ottoman Empire, in al-And., xxxi/1-2 [1966], 281-303). In general, when the lamentation is applied to places, the poets mourn over the alālī, ruins not to be regarded with greater significance than in the pre-Islamic period; they bewail the destruction of buildings (mosques in particular), atrocities committed by the enemy and the slaughter of peoples condemned to exile; the emotions experienced by the survivors give rise to lyrical developments which are supplemented by the nostalgia of emigrés and their desire to return to their lost homeland, where life was so enjoyable. Mustapha Hassan (Recherches sur les poèmes inspirées par la perte ou la destruction des villes dans
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in dialectical Algerian Arabic, an interesting poem is the Compléante arabe sur la rupture du barrage de Saint-Denis-du-Sig (in 1885), published and translated by G. Delphin and L. Guin, Paris-Oran 1886. The popular poetry of the Maghrīb, which includes some of the lyrics of the Prophet, some of which are sung at funeral ceremonies along with the Burda [q. v.], are hardly marthiya proper; the most remarkable is probably that which ʻAbd al-ʻAzīz al-Maghribī composed on the death of the sultan al-Mansūr al-Dhahabi in 1012/1603 (see Abū ʻAli al-Ghawthī, Kašī al-kīnā; an alāt al-samī, Aigliers 1322/1904, 83). The review Hunā al-Dīqā巴基斯坦 is ʻIšt-


in classical marthiya, gnomic themes dominate the prologue and are followed by an appeal to the deceased, then by a eulogy in his memory. The compositions also convey an echo of the major political, cultural and social events of the time (see A. Boudot-Lamotte, Ahmad Šaqqāq, l’homme et l’œuvre, Damascus 1977, 158-27). A similar point is made by J. Majed (Le presse littéraire en Tunisie de 1904 à 1955, Tunis 1979, 350-1) with reference to the funeral tributes paid to poets by their colleagues, who take advantage of the occasion to proclaim their determina-
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article, is that of M. Abdesselem, *Le thème de la mort dans la poésie des origines à la fin du IIIe/IXe siècle*, Tunis 1977. (Ch. Fellay)

2. In Persian literature.

The term *marthiya* in Persian is used primarily to designate poems in memory of someone who has died, wherein that person's good qualities are mentioned and regret is expressed at his death. This discussion will include *marthiyas* written for secular public figures, those written for family members and close friends, and those written for religious figures, especially for al-Husayn. Sometimes included in the category *marthiya* but not discussed here are poems lamenting old age and the loss of youth, poems complaining about the unfortunate state of the times, conventional gravestone inscriptions and chronograms.

Unlike the classical elegy, the *marthiya* is not a genre defined by its form. It is a thematic category of Persian poetry, appearing principally in the monorhyme forms of the *kasida*, the *kiśa*, the *rubā‘i* and the *ghażal*; the strophic forms of the *tarkīb-band* and *targīd-band*; and the *maṯnawī* form of rhyming hemistiches. After 1500, the popular religious *marthiya* began to develop certain formal characteristics of its own. In general, the language and style of *marthiyas* followed the language and style of the times in which they were written. The conventional imagery differs, however, among the public, private, and religious *marthiyas*.

The earliest known *marthiya* in New Persian is a *kasida* in Manichean script reconstructed by Henning (*A locust's leg*, London 1962, 98-104) and dated before the first half of the 3rd/9th century. It shows a blending of Islamic and Manichean elements and is probably a crypto-Manichean allegory. It is spoken from the grave by the deceased himself. The poem that established many stylistic characteristics of the Persian *marthiya* is Farrukhi Sistāni’s *q.v.* striking *kasida* of 69 lines for Sultan Mahmūd of Ghazna [*q.v.*] (Diwan, ed. Dabīr-SiyākT, Tehran 1335/1956, 90-3). The poem begins with the speaker describing the changed look of Ghazna as he walks about the city after a year's absence. He notes what he observes by different classes of society, questions an anonymous companion about what has happened, and begins to imagine reasons why the ruler has not appeared that morning. Not until line 21 does he allude to Mahmūd’s death. He expresses his own grief at the loss, calls upon the dead ruler to arise and resume his normal activities, finally becomes reconciled to the situation, and concludes by mentioning Mahmūd’s successor and praying for the dead sultan’s happiness in heaven.

Some specific characteristics of Farrukhi’s poem that often appear in later *marthiyas* are (1) the device of the speaker questioning a companion, or posing rhetorical questions about what has happened; (2) the use of euphemisms for dying, such as “he has gone”; (3) the speaker addressing the deceased directly as if he were still living; (4) the speaker making excuses for the absence of the deceased; (5) the frequent use of words such as *darād* and *darātigh* meaning “alas”; (6) the use of images appropriate to the status of the deceased, often as a means to enumerate the subject’s praiseworthy qualities; (7) descriptions of man and nature grieving for the dead; (8) the frequent use of anaphora; (9) the mention of the successor to the deceased; and (10) the use of a prayer for the happiness of the deceased in heaven.

The influence of Farrukhi can be seen in *marthiyas* written up to the 20th century. For example, Maš‘ūd Sa‘d Salmān [*q.v.*] (d. 515/1121-2) in a *marthiya* for Imad-al-Dawla Abu ‘l-Kāsim has the speaker refuse to believe that the prince addressed the deceased directly, praise his successor and wish the deceased well in heaven. The theme of the infidelity and unpredictability of fortune, which becomes very common in *marthiyas* after this, is used prominently in this poem (*Diwan*, ed. R. Yāsīmi, Tehran 1339/1960, 215-18) Amīr Mu‘izzī [*q.v.*] (d. 519-21/1125-7) in a *marthiya* for Nizām al-Mulk, has the speaker ask questions in disbelief, uses anaphora, addresses the deceased directly and wishes him well in heaven (*Diwan*, ed. A. Iḥkāl, Tehran 1318/1939, 476). Anwāri [*q.v.*] begins his *marthiya* for Maḥd al-Dīn b. Abī Ṭālib b. Nī‘mā, the nābī of Bālkh, by stating that the city of Bālkh is in an uproar because Maḥd al-Dīn did not hold his audience that day. The speaker questions a chamberlain, thinks up excuses for the nābī’s absence, blames fortune for this loss, uses anaphora and the word *darātigh*, and prays for his well-being in heaven (*Diwan*, ed. Mudarris Rādwāi, Tehran 1337/1958, i, 46-8). Among other famous *marthiyas* that display these conventions one can mention Sa‘dī’s *marthiya* for Sa‘d b. Abū Bakr, Muḥtaqākh Kāhānī’s for Shāh Tahmāsp and Abu ‘l-Kāsim Lāhūtī’s for Lenīn.

A variant of this form of public *marthiya* is the poem which combines mourning for the deceased and congratulations to the successor in approximately equal proportions. The earliest example is by Abū ‘l-‘Abbās Rabiḍjānī (*f. 331/942-3*) where he mourns the death of the Sāmānid ruler Naṣr b. Ahmad and congratulates his successor Nūh b. Naṣr (text and tr. in G. Lazarz, *Les premières poètes persans*, 2 vols., Paris and Tehran 1964., i, 87; ii, 60). Other examples may be found in the *diwān* of Dāmid al-Dīn Muhammad b. ‘Abd al-Razzāk Isfahānī, Khādżū Khvānnī, and ‘Urfi Shīrāzī.

The *marthiyas* written for relatives and close friends are very personal in tone, in contrast with the more formal and distant tone of those written for public figures. Less emphasis is placed on the universal mourning of man and nature and more on the poet’s own feelings. The poet does not address the persona of a puzzled observer who must discover what has caused the public grief, although other themes and devices typical of Farrukhi may be present, such as the use of anaphora, the direct address of the deceased, words meaning “alas”, and prayers for well-being in heaven. Fate is often blamed for the untimely death, and if the deceased died young, much use is made of images of gardens, flowers, young shoots, and the seasons of spring and autumn. An early example is Firdawsī’s [*q.v.*] *marthiya* for his son which comes at the beginning of the story of Bahram Čubīn in the *Shāh-nāma*. Maš‘ūd Sa‘d Salmān’s *marthiya* for his son is apparently the first use of the *tarkīb-band* form for a *marthiya* (*op. cit.*, 543-8). The most moving expressions of grief for the loss of a relative in all of classical Persian poetry are those of Khākānī Shirvānī [*q.v.*] for his son Rashīd al-Dīn. Khākānī was one of the most prolific writers of *marthiyas* before the Safawid period, and his *Diwan* (ed. M. ‘Abbāsī, Tehran 1336/1957) contains over 50 of these poems. In three of his *marthiyas* for his son, Khākānī displays his mastery of language and the poetic tradition, and his freedom from the restrictions of conventional imagery. He begins one (*Diwan*, 147-50) with the son’s illness and ends with his death. The father orders many preparations to cure the boy, but when he dies, Khākānī demands these back. In a powerful use of the radif “bāz dāhīd” (“give back”) the
poet proceeds through a long list of folk medicines and spells, and ends by asking for his son back. Another (op. cit., 142-6) begins with 33 lines containing imperative verbs expressing the sense "weep and mourn and contemplate this tragedy". He then orders various parts of his house and articles of clothing to be destroyed, his hair to be cut, and his face scratched. The abundant use of images of death and mourning and imperative verbs constitutes an unusual and striking innovation within the poetic tradition. Equally as compelling is a third unusual and striking innovation within the poetic tradition. Equally as compelling is a third unusual and striking innovation within the poetic tradition.

characteristics of the post-Safawid religious marthiyas, especially the motif of a speaker anticipating his own death and describing the mourning that will follow it.

Some other particularly moving marthiyas of this sort are Kamâl al-Dîn Ismâ‘îl’s for his son who was drowned (Diwân, ed. H. Bâr al-‘Ulûmî, Tehran 1348/1969, 429-32), and Humâm Tâbrîzî’s cycle of 16 short ghasals on the death of his beloved (Diwân, ed. R. ‘Aywâdî, Tâbrîz 1351/1972, 170-6). Dâ‘îmî’s [q.v.] marthiyas for his brother in the form of a tarkib-band of seven stanzas (Diwân, ed. H. Râfî’, Tehran 1341/1962, 115-18) echoes closely in the first stanza a line from Sa’dî’s marthiya for Abû Bâk r B. Sa’d Zagînî (Hâdwî, ed. H. Râfî’, Tehran 1354/1975), and includes (ta‘dÏmî) a ghasal written by his brother. Muhammad Tâlî Bârâ’s [q.v.] marthiya for his father (Diwân, Tehran 1344/1965, i, 1-2) with its images of the setting sun, night, dark mourning clothes, and of the conventional images of verse and writing, shows a clear departure from convention.

A special category of “personal” marthiyas consists of the poems marthiyas written on the death of other poets. Among these may be mentioned Rûdâkî’s short marthiya for Shâhid Bâlkhî, Labîbî’s for Farrukhi (with invective against ‘Unsûrî), Sanâ‘î’s for Mu‘izzî, Bâhâr’s for Dâ‘îmî Sâlîkî al-Dhâhâwi, Īrâd Mîrsâ, Parwîn I’tîsâmî and ‘Ishkî, and the collection of marthiyas by twelve contemporary poets for Furâgh Farraghzâd which were published in Diwân-dân-i Furâgh Farraghzad (Tehran 1347/1969) and includes (ta‘dÏmî) a ghasal written by his brother. Muhammad Tâlî Bârâ’s [q.v.] marthiya for his father (Diwân, Tehran 1344/1965, i, 1-2) with its images of the setting sun, night, dark mourning clothes, and of the conventional images of verse and writing, shows a clear departure from convention.

An unusual exception to the rule that marthiyas are composed in verse is the prose marthiya for Muhammad b. Ghîyâh al-Dîn Balbân by Hasan Dihlânî [q.v.] (in M.A. Ghânî, Pre-Mughal Persian in Hindustân, Allahabad 1941, 428-34). This begins with a complaint about the tyranny of fate, then recounts the circumstances of Muhammad’s death, describes all nature as mourning and ends with prayers for his happiness in heaven. It uses many of the conventional images of verse marthiyas, and has poetry interspersed throughout.

With the spread of Shî‘î Islam in the early Safawid period came the mourning ceremonies associated with the month of Muharram and centring on ‘asâ’ira, the day of al-Husayn’s death. The religious marthiyas that were written to recall the events at Karbala developed in two directions: long courtly poems in the classical tradition, and various less formal popular genres.

Just as Farrukhi had established a model for writing secular courtly marthiyas, so Muhtâsham Kâshânî (d. 996/1587-8) created the model for the courtly religious marthiya with his famous twelve-stanza tarkib-band on the death of al-Husayn (Diwân, ed. M. ‘A. Kârnâmî, Tehran 1344/1965, 280-5). Reminiscent of Farrukhi’s marthiya, Muhtâsham’s begins with questions asking why the world and the heavens are weeping and tumult. Anaphora are used prominently. Important images are those of shipwreck, floods of tears, waves and seas of blood, thirst, date palms and gardens, and the world and the heavens weeping. These images, and those of light and darkness which later became common in the ta‘ziyeh [q.v.], are the basic images of the religious marthiya in Persian. A great number of tarkib-bands were written after the example of Muhtâsham, and this remained the principal courtly form for the religious marthiya until the 20th century. Kâfîdân were also written, the most strikingly original being that of Kâ‘ûnî [q.v.] for al-Husayn. Employing the device, first used by Rûdâkî, of short questions and answers in each line, Kâ‘ûnî produced a powerful, ritual-like poem describing and lamenting the tragedy at Karbala (text and tr. in Browne, LHP, iv, 178-81).

The popular forms of the Shî‘î marthiya are the ta‘ziyeh, the raouda and nauhâ. The raouda takes its name from Kamâl al-Dîn Husayn b. ‘Ali Kâshânî [q.v.] Raoufa al-‘ahdâhâd, from which readings and recitations, called raouâda-khâns, were given. The marthiyas in raouâda-khâns sometimes involve considerable oral improvisation on well-known Karbala themes, and thus do not necessarily follow a prescribed literary form. Two popular 19th century books of marthiyas and Karbala accounts which have been reprinted many times are the Tûfân al-bukâh of Muhammad Ibrahim b. Muhammad Bâkîr Harawi Kazwînî “Djaywârî” (d. 1253/1837-8) and Muhammad b. ‘Abd Allah Shâhrâbârî Arjâstânî’s Tarîk al-bukâh. The latter seems to have been written especially for naâkhâs and raouâda-khâns.

The nauhâs, which are sung on occasions involving breast-beating (sîna-zani) of self-flagellation with chains (zandjîr-zani), are a genre of strophic poems in classical metres which often have unconventional rhyme schemes and arrangements of lines and refrains within the stanza. The number and placement of stresses in each line are important in nauhâs, those for breast-beating having a more rapid rhythm than those for chain-flagellation.

Bibliography (in addition to references given in the text): a popular anthology of marthiyas was compiled by H. Kûhî Kîrnâmî under the title Sîyâh-e adabi dar 伊朗, Tehran 1333/1954 (uncritical); Zayn al-‘Abîdîn Muhtâmân, Shî‘î wa adab-i Fârsî, Tehran 1346/1967, 74-106; Zahâr Ibîl (Nâmdir), Eleyg in the Qajar period, in P. Chelkowski, ed., Ta‘ziyeh: ritual and drama in Iran, New York 1979, 193-209 (uncritical).

(W. L. HANAWAY, JR.)

3. In Turkish literature.

Funeral laments, inscribed in stone or recorded in Uyghur manuscripts, belong to the pre-Islamic heritage of the Turks. For the marthiya proper to Islamic Turkish literature, the poetic forms were the kasîda, or among the Ottoman Turks, preferably the stanzaic tarkib-band or tarkib-band. Ottoman marthiyas present the same varied and cultivated style which we know from divân poetry. Bâkî’s (d. 1080/1660) elegy on sultan Suleyman is regarded as the classical masterpiece, but it has behind it a long tradition of formal marthiyas by Ahmedî, Sheykihi, Kiwânî, Ahmed Pasha, Nejâtî, Kemâlpâhâzâde and Lâmî, who composed “parallels” in the same metre and with the same radif (N. M. Çetin, art. Terci, in IA, xii, 172).

Underneath the high-flying imagery, a current of real feeling could flow. Closeness to the sultan could give power, office, and wealth; it was small wonder that there in the palace were profound anxiety. The favour of the princes, too, potential successors to the throne, could raise poets to high positions. When a
prince or a high dignitary died, the poets in his entourage lost not only a friend but often their livelihood. Nedjâri (d. 915/1509), who mourned two princes in moving marthiyas, lived on a pension, but survived his last patron prince Mâhmid by only two years. The abolition of the princes’ courts in the 16th/17th century removed from the Anatolian countryside many centres of culture. At the central court in Istanbul, fear and flattery did not always prevail. When the much-loved prince Muṣâfa was executed (960/1553), poets and prose writers expressed their grief, and Taṣāfi ʿIṣâf ʿAlî (d. 990/1582) in his famous marthiya took some risk when he openly accused the Grand Vizier.

Qâṣâlî (d. 942/1535 [q.v.]) lived in retirement in Mecca after he had written in praise of the executed Iskender Celebi. In the grand tradition of Ottoman marthiyas, but in a different vein, is the Marthiya-yi gurbi, in which the urbane Meṭâlî [q.v.] (d. 942/1535-6) commemorates his deceased cat with a mock solemnity in stanzas, from which also genuine affection emerges. In this way, the imagery of the marthiya, steeped in the panegyric convention, could be used for a deeper vein of feeling, for political criticism or for gentle irony. The form was in use until the end of the 19th century. The elegy written by Ǧâlib Dedê [q.v.] on the occasion of a visit from the Emperor of Russia documents to the last great examples of Turkish diwân literature. ʿAkîf Paşa (d. 1845) wrote a short moving marthiya on the death of his child. The lyrical poem Makbûr, written by ʿAbdulhâjj Hâmid Tarhan upon the death of his young wife in 1885, has been classed as the greatest marthiya after Bâlî’s elegy (S. E. Siyavûs Gil, in L4, i, 71). Not completely removed from the urban tradition, the unlettered and the peasants have marthiyas of their own. In Turkish folklore, lyrical compositions expressive of grief, ağhi, have survived; they commemorate the deceased, treat of general aspects of death or express sorrow over collective calamities (P. N. Boratav, in PhT, ii, cf. cahzon funèbre). Whereas the sufferings caused by the Russo-Turkish war of 1877-8 inspired Nâmîk Kemal [q.v.] to write his impassioned Waran marthiya, popular poets had already since 1683 turned to elegies upon the loss of Rumelian cities to the Christian enemy, such as Buda, Belgrade, Sarajevo, Banyaluka and Bugir- Rumelian cities to the Christian enemy, such as Buda, Belgrade, Sarajevo, Banyaluka and Bugir-

“4. In Urdu literature

Marthiya (pl. in Urdu, marthiyâ, marâdik) is one of the oldest forms of Urdu poetry. Two types exist, secular and religious, but the second is by far the more important; indeed, it is almost always assumed whenever Urdu writers mention marthiya. Moreover, it is usually about the Karbala martyrs, especially the Imâm al-Ḥusayn b. ʿAlî b. Abi Ṭâlib. Shorter poems on this theme may be termed naaâba or salâm, the latter normally containing a word such as salâm, salâmî, muârîd or muâryâ (see the first few verses). Urdu critics often begin their accounts with the pre-Islamic Arabic marthiya, and also postulate some slight debt to Persian elegists such as Muṭâshâm (Shibli, Mushâdama, 1-9). Yet they regard the form it took in 19th century Lucknow as peculiarly Indian—perhaps the only truly indigenous major Urdu poetical genre. Its early development goes back to the Dakhkani, that form of Urdu used in southern India, which is related to the literary language which emerged in northern India somewhat as Chaucer’s English is to that of Shakespeare. The ‘Adî Shâh [q.v.] sultans of Bîlgâpur (895-1047/1489-1686) and the Kûb Shâhs [q.v.] of Golkônda (901-1098/1496-1687) were Shîfl, patrons of poetry, and sometimes poets themselves. They encouraged the recitation of marthiya in Muhâr- ram, and even had ʿAṣhâr al-Ḥâdîn built specially for the purpose. Thus though, like other Urdu poetical forms, it was at first court poetry, because of its religious nature it was taken by princes to the people, to form a corporate religio-literary and social activity. It probably played an important part in the development of the muârîd (public poetical recital or competition) which became—and still remains—a phenomenon of Indo-Pakistani literary and social life. In the Deccan, from the 10th/16th century onwards, numerous poets composed marthiyas; some specialised in it. The researches of Nasîr al-Dîn Hâshîmî and Muhîy al-Dîn Kâdirîzor (see Bibl.) have brought hundreds of examples to light from manuscripts in the Subcontinent and Europe, including an important two-volume collection in Edinburgh University Library. Thus the Dakhkani marthiya can now be seen as the ancestor of the north-Indian marthiya which reached its apogee in the works of Anîs and Dabîr in the mid-19th century. Its spread northward was a by-product of the subjugation of the Deccan sultanes by the armies of the Emperor Awrangzîb (1657/8-1667).

Nevertheless, the 19th century Lucknow marthiya, varied in content but invariably in musaddas form, and frequently extending to between 100 and 200 stanzas (300-600 vv.), is a far cry from the modest elegies of early Dakhkani poets. To begin with, musaddas was rarely used in the Deccan. An isolated exception being Yâtim Ahmad (Hâshîmî, 379, gives two stanzas) dates from the Mughal period. It would appear that in Bîlgâpur and Golkônda, the great majority of marthiyas were in “ghazal form”—that is, monosyllabic, the rhyme also coming at the end of the first hemistich of the first verse. Among other forms occasionally used were muârîd and quatrains. To take an early poet, Sultan Muhammad Kuli Kûb Shâh (976-
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1020/1568-1611) wrote 5 marathi (Kulltyydt, ^r - *£-,
57-60), one in mathnawi, the rest mghazal form. Of ... the suitability of
musaddas for long poems, Hall's famous musaddas,
Madd-o-jazr-i-Isldm, being a prime example.

Certainly, both Sawda and Mir tried out musaddas of various kinds in about 10% of their elegies; but it was in Lucknow, where both poets gravitated late in life, that marthiya became inextricably associated with musaddas, with the rhyme scheme aaba bba, ccccd, reef, etc. The credit is usually given to Mir Damir, of the generation before AnTs. It may be that AnTs' father, Mir Khallik, also had a hand in it, if only we could date poems attributed to him and could be sure they were not composed by his celebrated son (see Shibli, op. cit., 15).

The disturbed situation in Dilli, due to Afghan and Maradhincursions, attracted many of its poets to Lucknow, whose Nawwabs were poets and patrons of poetry; and as they were also Suhis, they encouraged elegiac poetry. In its progress from the Deccan via Dilli to Lucknow, the marthiya changed in length, scope and content, as well as in prosody. In the Deccan, it began as a short lament, ranging from 5 verses (10 hemistiches) to 20—rarely 30, even allowing for the possibility that some examples which have survived may have been mere fragments. Nor did its length increase significantly in the early Mughal era. In fact, it resembled the nasbat or salam of northern India. The poet's task was naan avr tulma (lit. "to weep and cause weeping"). Thus the rhyme often included repeated interjections of sorrow, such as sa'i, sa'y, wayha, dh, ha'ë and hayf; other evocative words such as Husayn, Husayna, Karbah and mushtaba were also used in rhyme. The effect was heightened by the chanting (sz khâdan) in which elegies were recited. There were also realistic, if brief, descriptions of the blood-stained body or shroud or the martyr. Heaven and earth were said to be thunderstruck by his death. Yet despite its small compass, the Dakkan marthiya foreshadows, spasmatically, almost all the elements in the content of that of the 19th century. The various characters, their words, their feelings, and their exploits, are to be found. For example, the unhistorical marriage of al-Husayn's daughter Sakhta to his nephew Kasmir is accepted into A'Tl's al-Musannaf (d. after 1169/1756) and his contemporary Ghulami (Kadiri, 293, 297).

Brevity inhibited the development of these themes. But some long mathnawis on the Karbala martyrdoms were written in the Deccan, predating the 19th century Lucknow "epic" marthiya. Whether they had any direct influence on it is hard to say. Both Shah Muhammad's Dang-nama and Wali Wullin's Rawdat al-shuhada' date from around 1730. However, the later Rawdat al-shuhada' which begins with the Prophet's death and ends with Karbalâ, might better be described as a sequence of separate elegies. Another Rawdat al-shuhada', by a certain Muhkam, dates from 1806.

Sawda was a major elegist, and composed 91 marthiya. Though their average length is only about fifty verses, he was able to extend the battle-scenes, characterisation and dramatic content. He seems an obvious halfway house between the marthiya of the Deccan and that of Lucknow. He was often criticised for his lack of sincerity in lamentation.

The Lucknow "epic" marthiya may be said to have begun with Mir Damir and reached its climax with Mir Babar 'Ali Anis (1802-74) and Mirza Salamat 'Ali Sabir (1803-75), who composed more than a thousand marthiya each. Sz-khân often gave way to declamation (taht al-lafz], thus enhancing the dramatic impact. Despite the great length of many elegies, which has already been mentioned, so varied and extended was the content that no one marthiya told the whole Karbala' story in full. This was doubtless necessitated by the circumstances and the popularity of the form which led the poets to go on writing marthiya. Variety was achieved by the selection of incidents as well as variation in treatment. Yet some readers may regret that no full-fledged Karbala epic resulted. Characterisation, dialogue, description of scenes and nature, battle preparation and the battle itself, all played their part, without neglecting the original aim of lamentation. From the literary point of view, no devices of sz-shuhada' or bâghat were neglected, with rich vocabulary and telling similes and metaphors. Critics have analysed the content-sequence as follows (Ridwi, Rih-i-Anis. Introd., 14-15: Afdal Husayn, Haydât-i-Sabir, i, 137-40):

1. ebu (matla'mamhid) - introductory verses setting the tone, with no restriction to at details.
2. râkiyat - the martyr-hero's farewell to his nearest and dearest.
3. sz-pa' - a description of the hero from head to foot.
4. amal - the army's preparation for battle, perhaps including a detailed description of the hero's horse.
5. raja'z - the hero's battle oration.
6. dzam (ariz') - the actual battle, stressing the hero's valour, often including a description of his sword.
7. sz-hâdât - the death of the martyr, either al-Husayn or some member of his family.
8. bâyn - the lamentation of the martyr's family and friends, of the poet himself, and of all believers.

But the above scheme was not mandatory: there were really only two thematic essentials to qualify a poem as a marthiya—it must be a lament, and must involve the martyr's Karbala.

There was both mutual influence and intense rivalry between Anis and Sabir. Lucknow split into two camps, and a considerable literature of comparison was generated. Both were outstanding poets, and some consider Anis the greatest of all Urdu poets. If he is preferred to Sabir, it may be because on the whole he exhibits less pedantry and straining after effect. Two such giants were hard to equal; and before their deaths, the Lucknow principalcy ended with the exile of Nawwab Wadjid 'Ali to Calcutta after the Indian Mutiny (1857-8). Though marthiya continued into the present century, with encouragement at other courts such as Rampur and Hyderabad, its great days were over. Those interested in the contemporaries and successors of Anis may consult 'Ishdiki, 713-39, and Saksena, 137-9. To the present writer, the marthiya of Anis's brother Mu'nis seems to merit reassessment.

The importance of marthiya in Urdu literary history has been widely recognised. Hâlî (Mukaddima-yi-dîr- e-ash'iri, 182-91) describes Anis's marthiya as "the creation of a new form which greatly extended the range of Urdu poetry, increasing its vocabulary, ending its stagnation and breathing new life into it." It is also said to have demonstrated the suitability of musaddas for long poems, Hâlî's famous musaddas, Madd-e-jazr-i-Islâm, being a prime example.
Secular marthiya has existed alongside the religious type throughout its history, but it has received scant attention in comparison. Zafar Bari (130-31, 258) gives an elegy on Awarangiz in 5 verses of mixed Dakhani-Persian maznawi. The poet, Mir Qa'far `Ali (1068-1125/1658-1713), was born in north India, but accompanied the Emperor's son to the Deccan.

In the 19th century, the ʿAliqafḥ Movement revived interest in secular marthiya. Ḥālī himself composed five of them plus two shorter elegiac pieces (Kulliyāt-i-nazm-i-Ḥālī, Lahore 1968, i, 327-62), in various verse-forms. His elegy of the poet Ghālīb in ten stanzas of ten verses each is an often-quoted masterpiece. Among others often praised are that of Shibli Nu'mani (1857-1914) on his brother and that of Munshī Nawbāt Rāe Nazar on his son. Nationalism and independence in the Subcontinent have led to a proliferation of the form in newspapers and magazines.


J. A. Haywood

5. In Swahili literature.

The word marthiya is not used in Swahili literature; the word for an elegy is islamiko "lament". It is very much a living tradition among Swahili men of letters to compose praising poetry for great men who have died. The custom is well-known in Bantu Africa outside the sphere of Islamic influence, so that it may well have been in use among the Swahili before the advent of Islam in the late Umayyad period. Among the Bantu peoples, songs of lament have been recorded by De Rop, Rycroft, Van Wing and others.

Few songs of lament in Swahili have come down to us from any earlier period than the present century, except the Inshũa, which lamens in eighty stanzas the fall of the ancient city of Pate (the ruins of which have not yet been excavated) written probably before 1232/1820, by Sayid Abdallah bin Ali bin Nassir, a Swahili of Arabic origin. His contemporary Muyaka bin Haji al-Ghassani (whose family name also betrays his Arabic ancestry) (d. ca. 1250/1837) wrote secular verse on personal as well as political subjects, and quatrains on love and philosophy. One of his poems may be called an elegy. It begins thus:

"Do not remind me of that time when both my parents were alive when friends and kinsmen filled the house... Today I have remained alone with none to help or console me..."

In Tanga, Hemeti al-Buburi, who also wrote in the second quarter of the 19th century, composed the Uluzii wa Kutanuufu Nabhi, the Epic on the Death of the Prophet, in which he inserts a few lines of what may have been an elegy on Muhammad, see J. W. Allen's edition, p. 39. In Lamu, Muhammad bin Abu Bakari Kijumwa wrote an elegy on the death of Professor Alice Werner, of the School of Oriental Studies in London, whom he had served as an informant in 1913. The poem is dated 1354/1935-6. It begins:

"The hearts are full of grief and their sadness cannot be measured..."

Mohamed Bin Nasor Shaksi wrote an elegy on the death of the Governor of the Kenya Coast, Sir Mbaraka Ali Hnawy, in 1939. It begins: "We pray to Thee, O Majesty, O Lord without a peer..." Some of the best elegies were written in the last twenty years, first at the death of the author Shaaban Robert (1962), then at the death of the poet and Minister of Justice in Tanzania. Sh. Amri K. Abedi, in 1964.

The latter had himself composed a now famous lament at the death of his friend Shaaban Robert, which begins thus: Hae misba mizo! "Woe! A grave misfortune...". The complete text was published, together with many other elegies that were composed by Swahili poets in both Kenya and Tanzania for the same sad occasion, by the present writer in Swahili, Journal of the East African Swahili Committee, xxxii (1963), in Dar es Salaam. The same journal published the elegies written at the death of Amri Abedi (Swahili, xxxi/1 [1965], 4-18).

It is evident that the majority of Swahili elegies which have been published belong to the secular tradition of mourning the death of great men. Some of the finest pieces of Swahili lyric are among them, which is all the more remarkable since very little real lyric verse in the Western sense has been written in...
Swahili; there is for instance hardly any nature-
lyricism. The probable reason for the excellence of
elegiac poetry in Swahili is the popular predilection
also among other Bantu-speaking peoples, notably the
Zulu. The mood of feeling that in the past everything
was better, when good men and great leaders were
still alive, is a natural one for people who are so deeply
attached to their parents, their grandparents, their
aunts and uncles, that they will always go to their
elders for advice and guidance. The demise of such
senior friends creates a mood of loneliness and
aimlessness which explains the refrains of several of
the elegies, e.g. Amri Abbé’s on Shaaban Robert (tr.
in the original metre): “Our language is still
tender/who will be its foster father? Now that Shaaban
has departed/he that nursed it like an infant!”

In the purely Islamic elegies, these feelings of
nostalgia and solitude are projected on the demise of
the Prophet Muhammad, as in the elegiac hymn
probably composed by Sharifu Badruddini in Lamu,
which begins: “Longing fills the hearts of people...”
The people need guidance in all matters of daily life
and so, in Swahili literature, the time when the Holy
Prophet walked on earth is described as one of
happiness, since all men knew then what to do.

In the elegies of the great Muslim literary
Bantu language, see especially A. de Rop, Gesprkos
Woordenboek der Nkundo, Tervuren 1956, 62-85. On
the Inkisihi, see Knappert, Four centuries of Swahili
verse, London 1979, 127-37; on Muyakina bin Haji,
see op. cit., 146, where the full text and translation
of this elegy are given; for text and full translation
of Amri Abbé’s elegy on Shaaban Robert, see op. cit.,
285-7. The same work gives a bibliography of
Swahili poetry including the treatise of W. T.
Allen, on 314-16. For Ahmad Basheikh Husayn’s
elegy on Sir Mbasar Ali Haynani, written in 1959
a few years before his own death, see Knappert,
op. cit., 258-60. (J. Knappert)

MARTOLOS, a salaried member of the
Ottoman internal security forces, recruited
predominantly in the Balkans from among chosen
land-owning Orthodox Christians who, retaining
their religion, became members of the Ottoman ‘askeri
 caste [q.v.]. The word almost certainly originated
from the Greek, either armatolos (armed), “corrupt”, “gone astray”, or armatolos (armed), “armed”, “weapon-carrying”. It was shortened to
martolos (sometimes martolue, with the occasional
plural martoloioun, [q.v.]) in Ottoman Turkish, whence it entered Bulgarian and then Serbian. By the end of
the 9th/10th century it had entered Hungarian and
was often used by Europeans to describe Christian
sailors on the Danube River who served the Ottomans as rowers on light wooden barques called nassad. Its
euse by the Ottomans, however, was much broader.

In the mid-9th/mid-10th century, the conquering
Turks assigned martolos in the Balkans as armed
police, mounted and foot, who occasionally
participated in war, but usually acted in their locales
as peace-time border patrols, castle guards, security
forces for important mines, guards for strategic passes
(derbend) and, occasionally, tax collectors. Because of
their military positions, martolos were able to keep
their lands within the inadari system [q.v.]. Martolos were
not limited to the Balkans, however, as some were used
as spies and messengers as early as the 9th/10th
century among the Macedonians (see Anagnostopoulos,
in IA, vii, 342). Martolos in the Balkans were almost
always led by Muslims (martolos bashi, martolos aghasi,
martolos bashbugha). They remained loyal to the Sultan

for more than two centuries because the Ottomans
rewarded them with daily-wage ‘askeri status, though
they remained Christian; their positions were hereditary; and they were exempt from the djizya [q.v.]
and various local taxes.

When in the 11th/17th century local Balkan
antagonisms against Ottoman rule increased, Christian
martolos serving against rebellious haikus caused
hostility, some martolos joining with the anti-Ottoman
revolutionaries. By 1104/1692 Istanbul no longer
allowed Christians to serve as martolos in the Balkans,
and by 1135/1722 the Rumeli governor, ‘Othmán
Pasha, merged the institution of martolos with the
Muslim pandor (local security police) (Orthonlu, 89).

By the 13th/19th century, a few martolos persisted
in northern Macedonia, but these were effectively
replaced by new institutions brought about by the
Turkish reforms.

Bibliography: The term is briefly explained in
Pakahn, s.v. Martolos, ii, 409-10, and Midhat
Sertoğlu, Rezimli Osmanliler tarhi asıllıklapedi, Istanbul 1958, 197. It exists in numerous western language
studies, e.g. S. Kakuk, Recherches sur l’histoire
ottomanies des XVII et XVIII siecles, s’elements ottomans
de la langue hongroise, Budapest 1973, 268.

References to the institution in standard sources for
Ottoman history may be found in E. Rossi’s
article and in his addition in EP Suppl. The
most extensive bibliography on the formation of the
institution is in R. Anhgger, Martolos, in IA, vii,
341-4, and in C. Orhonlu, Osmanlar imperatorlugunda
derbend tezkirli, Istanbul 1967, 79-90. For the
Balkans, see M. Vasic, Die Martoloss im
Osmancischen Reich, in Zeitschr. fur Bal.-skologie,
Jahrgang ii (1964), 172-89, or the Turkish translation
mentions, M. Vasic, Osmanlar imperatorlugunda
martoloslar, in TD xxxi (1977), 47-64; and M. Vasic,
The Martolos in Macedonia, in Macedonian
Review, vii/1 (1977), 30-41. (E. Rossi: [W. J. Griswold])

MARTYR, MARTYRDOM [see SHAID; SHA-
HADA]

MÄRÜF AL-KARKHÎ. Abu MA’HÜZ b. FIRUZ or
FIRUZAN, d. 200/815-16, one of the most celebrated of
the early ascetics and mystics of the Baghdad
school.

While it is possible that the nisba al-Karkhi may be
connected with the eastern ‘Irāq town of Karkh
Baghadjād, it is more likely that it derives from his
association with the Karkh area of Bagdad. It is
generally thought that his parents were Christians,
although Ibn Taghribirdī (ed. Juynboll and Matthes,
i, 575) maintains that they were Sābiān of the district of Wāṣiṭ. Among his teachers in the tenets of Sūfīsm
were Bakr b. Khūnays al-Kūfī and Farkad al-Sabkāhī (al-Makki, Kūt al-kuhib, Cairo 1310, i, 9). He himself
was an important influence on another famous Sūfī of
the earlier period, Sārī al-Sākātī [q.v.], who was in
turn the teacher and master of one of the most famous
exponents of Sūfīsm, al-Djinayd [q.v.]. The story of
his conversion to Islam at the hands of the Shift’ Imām
“Ali b. Musa al-Ridā and his attempt to persuade his
parents to the same course is now generally regarded
as untrue. Among the sayings attributed to him are:
“Love cannot be learned from men; it is in God’s gift
and derives from His Grace”; “Saints may be known
as untrue. Among the sayings attributed to him are:
“Love cannot be learned from men; it is in God’s gift
and derives from His Grace”; “Saints may be known
as untrue. Among the sayings attributed to him are:
“Love cannot be learned from men; it is in God’s gift
and derives from His Grace”; “Saints may be known
as untrue. Among the sayings attributed to him are:
“Love cannot be learned from men; it is in God’s gift
and derives from His Grace}; “Saints may be known
as untrue. Among the sayings attributed to him are:
“Love cannot be learned from men; it is in God’s gift
and derives from His Grace”; “Saints may be known
as untrue. Among the sayings attributed to him are:
“Love cannot be learned from men; it is in God’s gift
and derives from His Grace}; “Saints may be known
as untrue. Among the sayings attributed to him are:
“Love cannot be learned from men; it is in God’s gift
and derives from His Grace}; “Saints may be known
as untrue. Among the sayings attributed to him are:
“Love cannot be learned from men; it is in God’s gift
and derives from His Grace}; “Saints may be known
as untrue. Among the sayings attributed to him are:
“Love cannot be learned from men; it is in God’s gift
and derives from His Grace}. In the earlier period, San al-Sakātī (ed. Juynboll and Matthes,
Kut al-kuhib, Cairo 1310, i, 9). He himself
was an important influence on another famous Sūfī of
the earlier period, Sārī al-Sākātī [q.v.], who was in
turn the teacher and master of one of the most famous
exponents of Sūfīsm, al-Djinayd [q.v.]. The story of
his conversion to Islam at the hands of the Shift’ Imām
“Ali b. Musa al-Ridā and his attempt to persuade his
parents to the same course is now generally regarded
as untrue. Among the sayings attributed to him are:
“Love cannot be learned from men; it is in God’s gift
and derives from His Grace”; “Saints may be known
as untrue. Among the sayings attributed to him are:
“Love cannot be learned from men; it is in God’s gift
and derives from His Grace}; “Saints may be known
as untrue. Among the sayings attributed to him are:
“Love cannot be learned from men; it is in God’s gift
and derives from His Grace}; “Saints may be known
as untrue. Among the sayings attributed to him are:
“Love cannot be learned from men; it is in God’s gift
and derives from His Grace}; “Saints may be known
as untrue. Among the sayings attributed to him are:
“Love cannot be learned from men; it is in God’s gift
and derives from His Grace}; “Saints may be known
as untrue. Among the sayings attributed to him are:
“Love cannot be learned from men; it is in God’s gift
and derives from His Grace}; “Saints may be known
as untrue. Among the sayings attributed to him are:
“Love cannot be learned from men; it is in God’s gift
and derives from His Grace}.
Tigris, is still an object of pious resort and pilgrimage. Al-Kushayri relates that prayer at his tomb was generally regarded as propitious in obtaining rain. Ma‘rūf’s name appears in many of the silās of the Sufi orders.


(R. A. Nicholson - [R. W. J. Austin])

Mā‘rūf al-Rūsāffi (1875-1943), leading poet of modern ‘Irāq and one extremely audacious and outspoken in expressing his political views. He was born in Baghdad in 1875 to his father ʿAbd al-Ḥanīn Maḥmūd, of Kurdish descent and from the Diabāriya tribe (between Kirkūk and Sulaymānīya in N. ‘Irāq), who was a pious man and worked as a gendarmerie outside Baghdad; for this reason, Ma‘rūf was brought up and educated by his devoted mother Fātima bint Djasim at her father’s house (she was of the Karaghul Arabic tribe, a branch of Shammar, who inhabited the Karaghul quarter in Baghdad).

Ma‘rūf was sent to a kutāb in Baghdad where he learnt reading and reciting the Qur‘ān by heart. After three years of primary school, he joined al-Ruḥiyya al-‘Askariyya school. In his fourth year there, he failed his examinations and was unable to continue his secular studies which would have paved the way for high military or government service. Hence he switched to religious studies under the supervision of the celebrated scholar Maḥmūd Shukrī al-ʿAlāṣī (1857-1924 [q.v.]), and others such as Shaykh ʿAbbās al-Ḵāṣṣib and Kāsim al-Kaysī, for twelve years. He was a distinguished student and became a devoted Şūţī. In appreciation of this, his master al-ʿAlāṣī gave him the name of Ma‘rūf al-Rūsāfī, in contrast to the name of the celebrated šūţī scholar Ma‘rūf al-Karkhī (which derived from the name of the western bank of the river Tigris), and thus Ma‘rūf’s family name became attributed to the eastern bank of the river.

There is no indication in the various biographical sources as to how he sustained himself during these years of his religious and literary studies and how he became a completely secular poet. What is known is that he was compelled to work as a teacher in two primary schools in Baghdad until he left for a third school in Mandali in Diyāwā because of a higher salary. Later, he attempted to return to Baghdad and passed there an examination in Arabic language and literature with distinction, so that he was appointed a teacher at a secondary school until 1908. During these years, he published poems in well-known Egyptian periodicals such as al-Mu‘aṣṣat and al-Muḥṣafat, as did others. He was poems of ‘Irāq, e.g. al-Ẓahīrī (i.a. Rūsāfī) there being no periodical of distinction in ‘Irāq at that time. He became well-known in other Arab countries as well as among the Arab emigrants in America.

However, by this stage of his life, his poetry was already devoid of religious tendencies and completely secular, with a longing for freedom of thought, against tyranny urging his people into scientific and cultural revival following the European model, describing and praising modern inventions, defending the victims of social injustice and lamenting the deteriorating conditions to which the Ottoman Empire, and especially ʿIrāq, was reduced. He also supported the slogan of the French Revolution, adopted by the Committee of Union and Progress (C.U.P.) as Ḥarīyāt, “Adālā, Ma‘ṣūdāt ("Liberty, Justice and Human Rights")." As it appears in his poem published in Dīva‘ī al-Rūsāfī, Beirut 1910.

After the Young Turk Revolution of 10 July 1908, he translated into Arabic the rallying-song of his poet Tewfik Fikret, which became a school song in many Arab countries. It seems that his sympathy with the ideology of the C.U.P. induced the Baghdad branch of the C.U.P. headed by Murād Bey Sulaymān (the brother of Maḥmūd Shekwat [q.v.]), to invite him to edit the Arabic part of the bilingual political and cultural journal (Baghdād (6 August 1908) which was the party’s bulletin.

Al-Rūsāfī celebrated the declaration of the Dūṣūr (or Constitution of 10 July 1908) with both poetry and action. According to Kāsim al-Ḵhāṣṣī (Ma‘rūf al-Rūsāfī, pp. 21-5), Ma‘rūf al-Rūsāfī arrived in Istanbul via Beirut in order to produce an Arabic version of his periodical, which it was hoped would create a new understanding between the two main groups of the Ottoman Empire, the Turks and the Arabs, and would serve as the voice of the C.U.P. Al-Rūsāfī was disappointed to learn that the editor had not been able to get the financial support needed to publish the Arabic part. So he left for Salonika, and there Maḥmūd Shekwat, the commander of the 3rd Army Corps of Macedonia, marched with his army on Istanbul, deposed the Sultan ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd II [q.v.] on 13 April 1909, and removed his supporters, the reactionaries headed by Darwīsh Wahdatī, who had been raised to power on 31 March 1909. In his poem Ruḥyat al-sarī ("An incantation for the fallen victim") (Dīva‘ī, 6th ed., Beirut (?) 1928, 162-4), al-Rūsāfī rebuked the Ottoman government for its tyranny, as being against Islamic tradition, and he called for a republican government (ṣumārīya, in order to achieve progress and freedom as in Europe. In his poem Fi Si‘lāt (ibid., 382-8), he described the revolution and his journey with the army to Istanbul against the Sultan. In his poem Tamnūs al-ḥarīyāt ("July, the month of freedom") (ibid., 388-9) he greeted the Young Turk Revolution, and expressed his joy at the deposition of ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd.

On his return to ʿIrāq via Beirut, where he received with courtesy by men of letters headed by there Amin al-Mahtab, he became short of money, but fortunately the owner of al-Maktaba al-Aḥliyya helped him by buying his Dīva‘ān. The poems were edited and rearranged by Muhāyī al-Dīn Khāyāyī and...
provided with a preface (Beirut 1910). This edition as well as the following ones were full of errors, but the new edition annotated by Mustafá ʿAlí, al-Ruṣafī’s close friend and disciple, published in 4 vols, by the ʿIrākī government, Bagdād 1974, is the only authorised and complete edition. The pornographic poems of al-Ruṣafī, except his poem ʿAfdāʾa la ḥalāʾa (Diwan, 6th edn., 283-3), are excluded from all editions, and the ʿIrākī authorities never allowed their publication. In the fourth edition, many verses and poems which were against King Faysal I, his officials, and against the Rēgīm ʿAbd al-Lāh, Nūrī al-Saʿīd and others, were not included.

Back home he resumed his work at the newspaper Bagdādī, but soon, in 1909, he reviewed a new invitation, this time from “The Arab Friends’ Association” headed by al-Zāhāwī and Fāhrī al-Mudarrīs in Istanbul, to edit their daily newspaper ʿAfdāʾ al-nāḥādī (“The Path of Reason”). In Istanbul he also gave lectures in two high schools on Arabic language and literature (collected in Naḥf al-tīf fī ʿl-khāṣṣa wa ʿl-khāṭib, Istanbul 1331/1917), and taught Taḥāf Pāḡa, a leading member of C.U.P., the Arabic language. It may be that his connection with Taḥāf helped him to be elected as a deputy in the Ottoman Chamber of Deputies, formed by the Mustafa ʿArab government being established in Damascus and headed by Prince Faysal b. al-Ḥusayn (17-23 June 1913) and commanded its members in his satiric poem Mā hākādhā (“Not in this way”) (Diwan, 402-5, cf. also 405-7), accusing them of jeopardising the unity of the Empire, besides encouraging French ambitions in Syria and causing enmity between Christians and Muslims. In fact, al-Ruṣafī was a great defender of the Arab spiritual and cultural revival within the framework of the Ottoman Empire, and a vehement critic of the European powers who were aiming at its destruction. When World War I broke out, he composed a poem al-Wāṣf wa ʿl-dījāḥū (“The homeland and the holy war”) (Diwan, 489-91) calling all the Muslims to defend Islam and criticising the Egyptians for backing the British, and he expressed his hope that ʿIrāk would defeat the approaching enemy. This solidarity with the Ottoman Empire explains also why al-Ruṣafī, in his poetry, did not lament those Arab nationalists who were hanged by Djamāl Pāḡa (1916). On the other hand, he attacked the ʿSharīf Ḥusayn of Mecca for his revolt against the Ottomans (10 June 1916); he neither celebrated an Arab government being established in Damascus and headed by Prince Faysal b. al-Ḥusayn (1918-21) where he became the focus of social and literary activities, together with the Palestinian writers, nor attended a new initiative headed by ʿIsāf Nāḥījī, ʿKhālid Sākākīnī and ʿAdīr Djabīr (Diwan, 141, 428, 515). In 1921 the Director of the College, ʿKhāṣf Tūṭāb, published al-Ruṣafī’s collection of 17 school songs with their musical settings under the title Madīʿaʿat al-nāḥāḥī ʿal-madarisayyī (Ith., Jerusalem 1921, with an introduction by ʿIsāf al-Nāḥījīn).

Safa Khulūsi in his article Maʿrūf al-Ruṣafī in Jerusalem (in Arabic and Islamic garden ... Studies presented to Abdal-Latif Tihawi ... London 1977, 147-52) has discussed this period in the life of al-Ruṣafī. Khulūsi thinks that the poem which al-Ruṣafī composed after attending a lecture which Prof. A. Sh. Yehuda gave on Arab civilisation at the invitation of ʿRāḥīb Nāḥījī, the Mayor of Jerusalem, and which was attended a new Hāfez in support of the British High Commissioner for Palestine, succeeded in diverting the attention from the resolutions of the Palestinian Arab Congress held at Haifa in December 1920 and deflated the opposition to Samuel’s policy. In this poem, al-Ruṣafī praised the lecturer and the speech of Sir Herbert Samuel, as well as the Arab-Jewish blood ties, denying the accusation of their mutual enmity, and finally expressing the Arab’s fear of being expelled from their homeland Ilā Ḥurūb Sāḥib, 1922, 149-57). The poem evoked strong protests from Arab nationalists, and the Lebanese Maronite poet Wādīl al-Bustānī, who lived in Haifa, composed a poem rebuking al-Ruṣafī. This strong campaign against him persuaded al-Ruṣafī to accept an invitation to return to Bagdād in order to become the editor of a new newspaper in support of Tālīb Pāḡa al-Nakīb, who claimed the throne of ʿIrāk.

One of the main questions asked by some Arab writers, and especially by the ʿIrākī writer ʿHilāl Nāḏījī in his al-Kawmīyya wa ʿl-tīfštīrīyya fī ʿl-ḥir al-Ruṣafī, Beirut 1939, 108-9, is why al-Ruṣafī did not deal with the Palestinian question and why he did not attack in his poetry the Zionist Movement in Palestine. The answer may be that al-Ruṣafī was a great supporter of science, progress, socialism, woman’s liberation, equality, freedom of thought and self-determination, as ʿHilāl Nāḏījī himself observed in his work and as is clear from several poems in al-Ruṣafī’s Diwan (see e.g. Yaʿūm Sīngalīfīn, 473). It seems that he found all these qualities among the Jewish settlers in Palestine, hence admired them and did not criticise their projects.

Al-Ruṣafī left for ʿIrāk, but the expulsion of al-Nakīb to India by the British in order to pave the way for Prince Faysal to become King of ʿIrāk put an end to the publication of the newspaper. Instead, al-Ruṣafī was appointed a deputy director of the office of translations, which he considered below his capability and his glorious previous career. He felt that he was being neglected and humiliated, at the time when what he called ‘flatters and those devoid of talents’ were attaining high and influential positions (Diwan, 426-8). At the end of 1922 he left for Beirut and decided not to return to ʿIrāk, but when he heard of the elections to the first ʿIrākī Parliament he returned
to Baghdad. There he published his daily newspaper al-Amal (1 October-20 December 1923) whose editors were later on being imperialized by the British in Iraq. He also tried to make peace with King Faysal I, but to his great disappointment was not elected as an M. P. At the end of 1923 he was appointed Inspector of Arabic language in the Ministry of Education and gave lectures at the Teachers' College in Baghdad on Arabic Literature, lectures that were partly published in Durus fi ta'rikh al-lugha al-'Arabiyya, Baghdad 1924.

During this period he was in bad financial circumstances, and wrote the most vicious poems against King Faysal I, his government (especially against officials of the Ministry of Education) and the British (Dīwān, 448-50, 460-71); some of these poems remained unpublished and circulated orally or in handwriting. In his poem Ḥukūmat al-mintīdū ("The Mandatory Government") (Dīwān, 461), he satirised the Iraqi government as "False flag, constitution and parliament", and affirmed that the government was enslaved by the British. In a poem, not included in his Dīwān (see Khaṭṭāt, Rūsafī, 139, and Hilal Nādīf, Ṣafātī min bāyāt al-Rūṣafī, Cairo 1962, 80), he accused King Faysal I of doing nothing but "counting days and receiving his salary" and cursed him and his palace, imploring its destruction. In order to escape from poverty, he wrote panegyric poems to Abd al-Muḥsin al-Ṣādūn and others, asking for financial support.

By the help of Sa'ūdīn, he succeeded in being elected as a member of the 'Irākī Chamber of Deputies (19 May 1928), but Sa'ūdīn's suicide on 13 November 1929 was a great loss to him, and he succeeded in several poems (Dīwān, 310-26). Later on, however, al-Rūṣafī succeeded several times in being elected for a period of eight years in all between 11 November 1930 and 22 February 1939.

Between 1933-4 al-Rūṣafī lived in Fallūdja in Diyalā; there he wrote his work al-Shabbāriyya al-Muḥarramiyya, 4u hāl al-lūṭqū al-mukaddas ("Muḥarram's personality, or the solving of the holy mystery"). S. A. Khulusi called it a magnum opus, adding that "after his self-made classical period, he advised that it should not be published before the year A.D. 2000," and stated that the book was described as "heretical and ... that it abounds in many objectionable views" (Mā'rūf al-Rūṣafī, in BSOAS, xiii/3 [1950], 619). A microfilm of the ms. is kept in the 'Irākī Academy of Sciences.

From the middle of 1941, after the coup d'état of Rashīd al-'Ālī al-Kallānī, he returned to Baghdad, where he lived in poverty. He supported the coup with his poetry, satirising the British and the Regent 'Abd al-Ilāh, as well as Nūr al-Ṣādī and other officials whom he accused of corruption. With the failure of the coup, followed by a massacre of the Jews known as the Farhād, the British occupied Baghdad (2 June 1941). Later on, al-Kallānī's four lieutenant-colonels ("The Golden Square") were caught and hanged. Al-Rūṣafī composed a long elegy on the failure of the coup and the hanging of some of its leaders, and threatened that a day would come and that the royal family would be destroyed by the army (Khaṭṭāt, 159-60; Nādīf, al-Ightirākiyya, 44-5). However, he was not arrested, and was left without support until he was forced to sell cigarettes in a small shop.

In 1944 he published his Rasūl al-lālūsī (Baghdād 1944), which contained three refutations of two of Zakī Mubārak's works al-Tasawwuf al-İslāmî (1938) and al-Nafr al-fannī (1934), and a third one of Caetani's work on the life of Muḥammad in his Annali de l'Islam (Milan 1905). Al-Rūṣafī's views on monism expressed in his refutation of al-Tasawwuf al-İslāmî caused tremendous criticism and anger and he was accused of apostasy. Fatwās were given against him and for the banning of his book. It seems that these attacks induced him to write his will, in which he affirmed that he was a Muslim who believed in God and in Muhammad, and that he believed in the essence of the religion but not in its trivialities (Muṣṭafā al-Ṣālih, al-Rūṣafī, ṣilāt bihi, wasta'yutahā, mu'allafītuh, Cairo 1946, 43, and Khaṭṭāt, 108-9).

By the end of 1944, he was allotted 40 'Irākī dinars a month by a rich and influential political personality, Muḥṣir al-Shāwī (d. 1958), to the end of his life, which came on 16 March 1945.

The great fame of al-Rūṣafī is based upon his political and social poetry. The 6th edn. of Dīwān al-Rūṣafī (Beirut 1958) is divided into 11 sections of different length: (1) On the universe (8 poems); (2) Social topics (63 poems); (3) Philosophy (9 poems); (4) Descriptions (59 poems); (5) Conflagrations (3 poems); (6) Elegies (24 poems); (7) On women (8 poems); (8) History (11 poems); (9) Politics (42 poems); (10) War (8 poems); (11) Short Poems (111 poems, the shortest being of 2 verses, some of them improvised at receptions and parties and the longest being of 29 verses). These sections contain altogether 454 poems of various types: 174 verses are monorhymed, 137 verses are arbitrary. Most poems are of monorhymes, in which each verse is divided into two hemistichs, and in the opening ones, both hemistichs are rhymed. A few poems are of stanzaic form, such as one poem in couplets; one poem is of three stanzas each stanza; two in quartets; four in quintets, and three ma'fuzahhaam in the classical ten hemistichs form. Of the four quintets, one is a versification according to the modern theory of the formation of the universe entitled al-Arfl ("The globe") (Dīwān, 27-32), and the second is a narrative poem on the consequence of the competition of the angel Jibril with the archangel 'Isā, rude composed poems in difficult rhymes which are avoided by other poets such as z,s,z,d,t and n, and at least eight poems, in the last hemistichs of which the numerical value of letters gives the date of their composition (ālā hisāb al-djamāl), a method which was used in the post-classical period. However, most of his poems are undated. Others were composed on the metre and rhyme of well-known classical examples, especially those of al-Mutanabbi and al-Ma'sārī [q. v.], and some have even quotations from pre-Islamic poets and others.

At the end of his life, he became free of this classical influence on style and metaphors and was able to use in his political poetry a spontaneous and more flexible style. The influence of al-Mutanabbi is clear also in his personal behaviour, his pride, his honesty and his daring way in expressing his ideas. Like al-Mutanabbi, he used proverbial sayings, and boasted of his character and poetry in his panegyrics in which he asked for alms, while the influence of al-Ma'ar'ī on him was clear in his philosophical outlook and his ideas on religion and God, including his scepticism and monism. Unlike Ibn Sinā [q. v.], al-Rūṣafī was sceptical about the eternity of the soul and its ascent to heaven (Dīwān, 182, 116, 189) and about religion as a divine revelation: for him, religion was, rather, an invention of wise thinkers for the benefit of mankind (ibid., 187, 189). But like William Blake, he
believed in the harmony and unity of body and soul (ibid., 192-3), and even if the soul was supposed to be eternal, he would be inclined to think that it had no awareness of life. On the other hand, he urged on the Arabs the need for a scientific and cultural revival, for unity and liberty, and he defended the freedom of women, especially of Muslim ones, in his poems on women’s affairs and in others. He also defended freedom of thought, behaviour and the press, and held that it was up to a free man to violate customs and traditions if he felt it necessary. He backed the oppressed, the persecuted and the victims of society, poverty and illness, and called for social security and equality. He rebuked the Arabs for their stagnation and apathy and for boasting of their old and glorious history. A unique poem which shows his attitude towards the oppressed and against religious fanaticism is his poem “The orphan’s mother” (Dīdān, 39-42).

In this, he relates the story of an Armenian widow and her orphaned son, both victims of religious fanaticism and racial hatred, her husband having been killed in the massacre of the Armenians in Turkey in 1915, and he declares that Islam is innocent of such cruelty. He also described new technical inventions such as the telegraph, the railway, the car, the watch, etc., and admired the inventions of the steam engine and of electricity.

He favoured long metres which suited his declamatory and rhetorical tone, such as tawil, wafir, kamil, bašt and khašt. Thought, not the emotions, dominated his poetry. He expressed his ideas in a direct and denotative style, not metaphorically or symbolically, and was fond of a classical vocabulary.

In his scientific works, he witnessed to his wide and profound knowledge of Arabic language and literature as well as of Islam and its history; yet he depended more on his talent and what he had studied during his youth. His published works, according to the chronological order of appearance are as follows:

1. al-Rusafī [a novel] by Namık Kemal, tr. from Turkish into Arabic by al-Rusafī, Baghdad 1909.
4. Dafʿ al-haḏaḏa fi tīrāḏāḏ al-lukṣa, Istanbul 1331/1912 (Arabic vocabulary used in the Turkish language and vice versa).
6. Taḥrīm al-harbiyya wa l-ta’lim, Beirut 1924 (versified didactic and scientific subjects, for school children).
11. ʿAlā bābṣīng Aḥī al-ʿĀlā, Baghdad 1946 (a commentary on Tahā Husayn’s Maʿṣūma Aḥī al-ʿĀlā; fiṣīḥah).
12. Aʿlam al-ṣūḥāb, Baghdad 1945 (a commentary on Risālāt ʿalām al-ṣūḥāb by Dr. Fāṭimah bint Aḥī al-ʿĀlā).

There are 6 other unpublished works which are still in ms., the most important of which is al-Saḥḥaḥiyya al-Muḥammatīyya.


In his works, he praises the generosity of ʿAbd al-Majīd and Muḥṣir al-Ṣawād. Another important book by Ṣāḥib al-Badrī ʿAbd al-Majīd al-Rusafī, Ṣaḥib Shukr, Baghdad 1959.

Al-Rusafī was also one of the friends and acquaintances of al-Rusafī, who was a compiler of Arabic proverbs. He also described new technical inventions such as the telegraph, the railway, the car, the watch, etc., and admired the inventions of the steam engine and of electricity.

He was also known for his scientific works, which were published in Baghdad, and also in Beirut in 1959, with the collaboration of other scholars. He also wrote a book on the geography of the region, which was published in Baghdad in 1959. His last book, published in 1962, contains poems and letters by al-Rusafī praising the generosity of his friend ʿAbd al-Majīd and Muḥṣir al-Ṣawād. Another important book by Ṣāḥib al-Badrī ʿAbd al-Majīd al-Rusafī, ʿAbd al-Majīd al-Rusafī, Ṣaḥib Shukr, Baghdad 1959.

In this, he relates the story of an Armenian widow and her orphaned son, both victims of religious fanaticism and racial hatred, her husband having been killed in the massacre of the Armenians in Turkey in 1915, and he declares that Islam is innocent of such cruelty. He also described new technical inventions such as the telegraph, the railway, the car, the watch, etc., and admired the inventions of the steam engine and of electricity.

He was also known for his scientific works, which were published in Baghdad, and also in Beirut in 1959, with the collaboration of other scholars. He also wrote a book on the geography of the region, which was published in Baghdad in 1959. His last book, published in 1962, contains poems and letters by al-Rusafī praising the generosity of his friend ʿAbd al-Majīd and Muḥṣir al-Ṣawād. Another important book by Ṣāḥib al-Badrī ʿAbd al-Majīd al-Rusafī, ʿAbd al-Majīd al-Rusafī, Ṣaḥib Shukr, Baghdad 1959.

The geographers of the 4th/10th century describe it as being in a flourishing agricultural region, with dependent settlements such as Diza and Kazer (or Diz)-i Afnā and with its Friday mosque built on wooden columns in the middle of the covered market. al-Mukaddasi states that in his time (ca. 570/980) it depended administratively on the local rulers, the Shī'is of Gharāṣṭan and that the appearance and speech of the local people resembled that of the mountain peoples of Gharāṣṭan (314; see also al-Īṣṭakhrī, 269-70; Ibn Hawkal1, 441-2, tr. Kramers and Wiet, 427; Hudud al-sām, 105, comm. 328, spelling the name as Marūd). The district flourished under the Saljuqs. Malik-Shāh built defences at the nearby town of Pāng-dīh, and Sangjār built Marw al-Rudh's wall, 3,000 paces in circumference and still standing in Mumtahān's time (136-9, tr. 135). The area was much fought-over in the warfare of the Gūrūids and Khwārazm-Shāhs, and a sharp battle took place near Marw al-Rudh between the Gūrūids rivals for supremacy in Khurāsān Ghiyāḥ al-Dīn Muhammad and Sultān-Shāh (Dzhawayni-Boyle, i, 298). Marw al-Rudh must accordingly have escaped the devastations which the Mongols wrought at Marw al-Shāhīdjan, but appears to have become ruinous in Tiṃūrid times.

Bibliography (in additions to references given in the article): Le Strange, Lands, 404-5; Barthold, Mervez, in ZVOIRAO, xiv (1902), 028-032; idem, Istorioko-geografskiy obzor Iran, St. Petersburg 1903, 25, Eng. tr. S. Soucek, An historical geography of Iran, Princeton 1984, 35-6; Barthold, Turkestân, 76.

MARW AL-SHĀHĪDJĀN or simply Marw, the city which dominated the rich but notoriously unhealthy oasis region of classical and mediaeval Islamic times along the lower course of the Murghāb river on the northeastern fringes of Persia, also called "Great Marw". Formerly within the historic province of Khurāsān [q.v.], the seat of pre-Islamic wazirs of the marches and often of provincial governors in Islamic times, its site ("Old Merv") and the nearby modern settlement of Bairam Ali (see below) fall today within the Turkmenistan SSR. The name Marw al-Shāhīdīn "Royal Marw" clearly relates to Marw's role as the seat of representatives of royal authority, guarding this bastion of the Iranian world against barbarians from the Inner Asian steppes, and is contrasted with the name of the smaller town of Marw al-Rudh [q.v.] "Marw on the river", situated further up the river. Concerning the basic element of the name, Marw, we find in Avestan Maong, and in OP Marga, MP Marv, indicating the existence of both a tabellarian form like Marv and a spirantised one like Marg (see Markwart-Messina, A catalogue of the provincial capitals of Erdishvan, Rome 1931, 45-6). The Arabic nūzah is al-Marvāz, cf. al-Safarī, Dār al-Madhīf, ed. A. El-Mahādrugī, p. 126.

As a result of the work of V. A. Zhukovskiy (Rasvoltini starogo Merva) and W. Barthold (K istorii orogrenov Turkestana, reprinted in Sochinenia, iii, Moscow 1965, see 136-56), we are better informed on the history of Marv than on that of any other town in Persia or Central Asia. Literary sources alone are not sufficient to enable us to fix the date to which history goes back in the valley of the Murghāb. Archaeology alone could supply the information, but the archaeology of this region has not yet adequately been studied. We are therefore only able to give the following facts. In the Achaemenid period (6th-4th centuries B.C.), we find a highly developed agricultural community on the region of the Murghāb incorporated in the Persian state. Details on this point are given by Greek writers of antiquity, in particular, the geographers and historians of the campaigns of Alexander the Great (336-323 B.C.). The Greeks found in this region not only a settled population but also a rural society practising agriculture on a very high level. They grew the vine and made good wine.

Classical sources refer to the Murghāb as the Margus river and to the region of Marw as Margamata; authors like Pliny attribute the foundation of the city to Alexander, but it seems that we are on surer ground in attributing this, or conceivably its founding, to the slightly later Seleucid king Antiochus I (280-261 B.C.). To this same period belongs the building of the wall intended to protect the agricultural zone from the nomads of the steppe, then inhabited by the predecessors of the Turkish people. There is no reason, it seems, to doubt the date of the foundation of Marw, but only archaeology can settle the question definitely. To what date does the earliest building in the area of Marw, that is, the citadel, belong? The fact that already several centuries before our era we find agriculture highly developed shows that the valley of the Murghāb had a system of artificial irrigation. The rapid development of the oasis of Marw was due not only to this but also to the fact that in the Parthian period the great caravan route which linked Western Asia with China passed through Marw. The caravan from Western Asia went from Marw to Balh, thence via the Darwāz and the northern part of Badakhšān, then on to the Ālā, Kāshāvarz and finally to China. In the Sāsānian period, the trade-route was moved further north. Caravans went from Marw to Ārarg, Kāshāvarz and Semirechë or the land of the Seven Rivers. Marw was not only an emporium on the trade-route but a great industrial city. It is, however, only after the Arab conquest that history gives us ample details of the life of the city.

By utilizing the information supplied by the Arab historians and geographers, we can obtain a fair picture of what Marw was like in their period and in antiquity. To understand the part played by Marw in the economic life of Western Asia and Central Asia, we have to study all that the Arab geographers and administrative historians of the 4th/10th century tell us about the system of irrigation. These sources record a highly-organised system of supervision and upkeep of the irrigation canals, under a mutawalli or mutazim al-nār, corresponding to the general Persian term for a local irrigation official, mir-āb [see ma2, 6. Irrigation in Persia]. Ibn Hawkal and al-Mukaddasi report that this chief of irrigation had an extensive staff to keep the channels in repair, including a group of divers (ghawwūd). There was a dam across the Murghāb above the city, and the supply of water from this store was regulated and measured by a metering device called the famous Nilometer [see mishāx], comprising essentially a wooden plank with intervals marked at
The citadel of Marw, contemporary with the town built on the Gavur-Kala area, goes back to a date earlier than that of the town itself. The latter (Gavur-Kala) must be recognised as the earliest site (called shahrud), i.e. around the citadel itself. The shahrud can hardly be earlier than the beginnings of the town of Marw, but it will only be by excavation that the problem of the date of the earliest habitations in the citadel will be settled.

The Arabs on their arrival found the western quarter so much increased that it was by then the most important part of the town. It is to this part that the Arab geographers give the name of rabat. The market was at first on the edge of the oasis in the "Gate of the Town", not far from the western wall, and one part of it extended beyond this wall as the Razik canal. The great mosque was built by the Arabs in the middle of the shahrud (al-Muṣ̄ādh, 331). Little by little, with the moving of the life of the town towards the rabat and the raising of the houses in the oasis in the water. See, on all this, E. Wiedemann, Beitrag X. Zur Technik bei den Arabern, in SBPMS Ergl., xxxviii (1906), 307-13 = Aufsätze zur arabischen Wissenschaftgeschichte, i, Hildesheim 1970, 272-8; C. E. Bosworth, Abū ʿAbdālāh al-Khuwārizmi on the technical terms of the secretary's art, in JESHO, xii (1969), 131 ff.

It is to the 2nd/7th-8th-13th centuries that the great economic prosperity of the oasis of Marw belongs, with a highly developed system of exchanges. Numerous technical and agricultural methods of cultures were developed, except the cultivation of wheat, which was imported from the valleys of Kāḡkā-Daryā and Zaraftūn. The people cultivated the silkworm. Shortly before the coming of the Mongols, there was at Kāhārū to the south-west of Mārū a "house" called al-Diwakūgh where sericulture was studied. Al-ʿĪstakhri, 265, says that Marw exported the most raw silk; its silk factories were celebrated. The oasis was also famous for its fine cotton which, according to al-ʿĪstakhri, was exported, raw or manufactured, to different lands; see on the textiles of Marw, R.B. Serjeant, Islamic textiles, material for a history up to the Mongol conquest, Beirut 1972, 87-90. The district of Marw also contained a number of large estates which assured their owners considerable revenue. According to al-Tabārī (ii, 1952-3), in the 2nd/8th century whole villages belonged to one man. In the absence of legal documents, little is known of the life of the peasants. It is evident, however, that they were bound by feudal bonds to their lords (dīkānān), and paid them at the time of the Arab conquest, in kind and in the 2nd/8th-10th centuries in kind and money. No evidence of the amount of these payments has come down to us. The town, built in the centre of a highly cultivated area, was destined to have a brilliant future. If we also remember that it had become one of the great emporiums on the caravan routes between Western and Central Asia and Mongolia and China, we can easily realise how the city grew so rapidly with its manufactures, markets and agriculture. At the present day, within the area of the old region of Mārū, we can see three sites of ancient towns: 1. Gavur-Kala, corresponding to the town of Mārū of the Sāsānid and early Muslim period; 2. Sultan-Kala quite close to the preceding on the west side. This is the Mārū of the 2nd-7th/8th-13th centuries, which was destroyed by the Mongols in 1221; and lastly 3. ʿAbd Allāh-Khan-Kala south of Sultan-Kala, Marw, rebuilt by Šāh Rūkh in 812/1409. This is all that remains of the famous city, including its nearer environs.

The town was gradually occupying the site of the rabat, the town was moved thither also. On the bank of the Razikh Canal was built the second mosque which at the beginning of the 3rd/9th century was allotted by al-Maʿmūn to the Šāhīs. In the middle of the 2nd/8th century, in the time of the revolutionary leader Abū Muslim, the centre was moved still farther westward to the banks of the Māǧān Canal. At this date, the town was gradually occupying the site of the rabat. The town of Marw in the 2nd/7th-8th-13th centuries was therefore no longer Gavur-Kala, but the town of which ruins still exist to the west of the latter, now known as Sulṭān-Kala. But the shahrud did not lose its importance at once. The site of the old town on Sulṭān-Kala is in the form of a triangle, elongated from north to south with an area equal to that of Gavur-Kala. It is surrounded by a fine wall built of unbaked brick, with several towers and other buildings belonging to the fortress. The latter was rebuilt by order of Sultan Malik-Šāh [q.e.] in 462-72/1070-80. It is one of the most splendid buildings of the period.

In the time of the Arab geographers, the two towns with their suburbs were surrounded by a wall, remains of which still exist. As regards the wall built in the towns of Marw and Sultan-Kala, it is mentioned still visible in the 4th/10th century and arc mentioned by al-ʿĪstakhri, 260, under the name of al-Rāy.

The social structure of the town of Mārū in the period when it took the place of Sultan-Kala changed a great deal, like the social and economic life of Western and Central Asia generally. The growth of cities, the development of urban life, the exchange of products for those of the country and those of the nomads of the steppes, the expansion of caravan traffic, now no longer limited to the trade in luxuries, all these encouraged the growth of new classes of society. It was no longer the dīkānān who were the great lords of the town of Marw in the 2nd-7th/8th-13th centuries, although in Gavur-Kala, however, their khāleş existed down to the end of the 6th/12th century; it was the merchants, the officials who were masters. Although both were connected with the local aristocracy, it was no longer agriculture but trade and property in the town which were their sources of wealth. Similarly, a change was taking place in the position of the artisans who had long ceased to be the serfs of the dīkānān. Down to the 3rd/9th century, a number of men still paid feudal dues to the dīkānān. From then onwards, they seem to have been free. The appearance of the town also changed as regards both topography and buildings. While in the shahrud (Gavur-Kala) the bazaar was at the end of the town and in part outside of it, when the rabat attracted urban life to it, the markets and workshops became the centre of the town. Marw (Sultan-Kala) became in the 5th/11th century a commercial city of the regular oriental type. It was traversed by two main streets, one running north and south, and the other east and west; where they intersected was the īrās, the centre of the market, roofed by a dome; the shops had flat roofs. It was there also that were to be found the little shops of the artisans, and although the literary sources only mention the money-changers, the goldsmiths and the tanners' quarters, there also must have been the quarters of the shoemakers, of the tindermakers, etc. It was not only the administrative and religious centre, for it also contained the palaces, the mosques, madrasas and other buildings. For example, to the
north of the ārsīs was the great mosque, already built in the time of Abū Muslim, which survived till the Mongol invasion, if we may believe the Arab sources. It must, however, have been frequently rebuilt. Yākūt also says that beside the great mosque was a domed mausoleum, built on the tomb of Sultan Sānjār; its mosque was separated from it by a window with a grill. The great dome of the mausoleum of turquoise blue could be seen at a distance of a day's journey. Within the walls which surrounded the mosque was another mosque built at the end of the 6th/12th century which belongs to the Šaḥīfīs. In the period of Yākūt, it seems that the domed building erected by Abū Muslim in baked brick, 55 cubits in height, with several porticoes—which is said by al-ʻIstakhrī to have served as a dār al-μāra or "house of administration"—no longer existed. It used to stand close to the great mosque built by Abū Muslim. The town of Marw in this period—in addition to its great wall—had inner ramparts which separated the different quarters of the town. The city was famous for its libraries, and Yākūt spent nearly two years there just to visit the Mongol cataclysm working in these libraries (on the topography of mediaeval Marw, see Le Strange, Lands, 397-403).

Regarding the history of Marw, the city was under the Sānānid rulers the seat of the Marvdān of the north-eastern part of Persia, being the farthest outpost of the empire, beyond which lay the city-states of Soghdia, the kingdom of Khwārezm and steppe powers like the Western Turks. Marw may be the Homer (for Mo-ho) of the Chinese Buddhist traveller Huen-tsoang, and on a Chinese map of the early 14th century it appears as Ma-li-wu (Bretschneider, Medieval researches, ii, 103-4). Nestorian Christianity flourished there until the Mongol period, and its ecclesiastical leaders are often mentioned as present at synods; before 553 it was a bishopric, and thereafter a metropolitananate (see Marquist, Evéques de la Perse, 75-6).

It was the metropolitan code of law that bore the name of the town of Khwādezīr. The last Sānānid Yazīdīgīr III at Pāy-e Bābhān (al-Tabari, i, 2881, 2883), and there was a monastery of Masardjāsīn lying to the north of Sūltān-Kahlūn (ibid., ii, 1925; Yākūt, al-Madīnūn, 2, 210).

The last Sānānid Yazīdīgīr fled before the invading Arabs to Marw and was killed there in 31651 by the Masbān Māhū Sūrī, so that the city acquired in Persian lore the opprobrious name of khudūd-dushman ("imetical to kings") (al-Tabari, i, 2872). It was conquered in this year for the Arabs by the governor of Khūrāsān ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAmir b. Kurayz [q.v.], who made a treaty with Māhū on the basis of a large tribute of between one and two million dirhams plus 200,000 ḍarībūs of wheat and barley; the local dīḥkān of the oasis were to be responsible for the tribute's collection, and the soldiers of the Arab garrison were to be quartered on the houses of the people of Marw. There was thus from the start a basic difference in settlement pattern from that in the great amirāt of ʿIrāk and Persia, where the Arabs built distinct encampments as centres of their power. ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAmir left a garrison of 4,000 men in Marw, and then in 51671 Ziyād b. Abīhi [q.v.] sent out 50,000 families from Baṣra and Kūfā, who were then settled in the villages of the oasis by the governor al-Rabī b. Ziyād al-Ḥārīḥī. A process of assimilation with the local Iranian population now began, especially as some Arabs began to acquire taxable land in the countryside, and so both financially and ideologically to the dīḥkāns. These atypical social conditions of the Marw oasis may have contributed to Marw's role in the later Umayyad period as the focal point in the east for the

"Abbāsid āʿrawa, for the propaganda of the Ḥāǧimīyya duʿā'ī seems early to have made headway among the settled and assimilated Arab elements. Some ʿAbbāsid agents were discovered there and executed in 118736, and soon afterwards, a committee of twelve nukabāb, headed by Sulaymān b. Kāthir al-Khūzāʿī, was formed. Abū Salāma al-Khālīl [q.v.] was in Marw in 126746, and two years later Abū Muslim [q.v.] arrived as representative of the ʿAbbāsid imām ʿImām b. Muhammad b. ʿAlī b. ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAbdūs. Abū Muslim took advantage of the tribal strife of Khwārezm and Yamān against the assimilated population of Arabs, whose fiscal grievances had not been fully redressed by the tentative reforms of the Umayyad governor Nāṣr b. Sayyār [q.v.] in 121739, aided by Yamanīs against Nāṣr and his North Arab supporters, so that by early 130748, Abū Muslim was in control of Marw (thus the interpretation of M.A. Shaban, The ʿAbbasid revolution, Cambridge 1970, 129 ff.; 138 ff.; idem, Islamic history A.D. 600-750 (A.H. 132), a new interpretation, Cambridge 1971, 84-5, 175-3, 182-5).

Under the early ʿAbbāsids, Marw continued to be the capital of the east, despite a humid and unpleasant climate (it was notorious for the guinea worm, filaria medinensis), and was for instance the seat of al-Maʿmūn whilst he governed the eastern provinces and was in charge of the post of kālīm al-Mutanabbi when he left for Baghdad. The Tāhirīd governors of Khūrāsān, however, followed here by their suppliants the Safarīds, preferred to make their capital at Nisbar, although Marw remained the chief commercial centre of Khūrāsān, and continued to flourish under the Sānānid rulers. Nevertheless, the disorders in Khūrāsān during the last decades of Sānānid rule, when power was disputed by ambitious military commanders, seem adversely to have affected Marw's prosperity. Al-Mukaddasī, writing ca. 980, says that one-third of the ṭabāʿ and outer town was ruinous, and the citadel too had been destroyed; moreover, the city was racked by the sectarian strife and factionalism which seems to have been rampant in the towns of Khūrāsān at this time (311-12; on the chief economic towns of Khūrāsān, see Wiesbaden 1974, 129 ff., 138 ff.; idem, "Die Ausbreitung der sīāfīschen Rechtsschule von den Anfängen bis zum 8./14. Jahrhundert", Wiesbaden 1974, 83-90).}

But under the Saljūqs, the fortunes of Marw revived. It transferred its allegiance from the Ghzāznawīs to the Tūrkmen in 428/1037, and became the capital of Caghrū Beg Dəwūd [q.v.], ruler of the eastern half of the newly-established Saljūq empire, and from ca. 1110, that of Sandjâr [q.v.], viceroy of the east. The latter's father Malik ʿShāh had built a wall of 12,300 paces round the city, which in Sandjâr's time underwent attack from various of the Sālđūq's enemies, such as the Khwārezm-Šāh Atsīz [q.v.], who in 536/1141-2 raided Marw and carried off the state treasury. It was at Marw that Sandjâr built his celebrated mausoleum, 27 m. square in plan and called the Dār al-Āqīna "Abode of the hereafter" (see on this, G. A. Pugachenkova, Puti razvitiya arkhitekturi Yuzhnogo Turkmenskogo, Moscow 1958, 315 ff.). Under Sandjâr's rule, the Tūrkmen of the steppes around Marw were under the control of a Sālđūq shībīn or police official, but when in 548/1153 these Ghzūz or Ghzūz rebelled against this control and defeated Sandjâr, Marw fell under the nomads' control, and the latter fled on to Tūrkestan, together with Balkh and Sarakhs, until the Khwārezm-Šāhs imposed their rule in northern Khūrāsān. Marw suffered terribly in the time of the first Mongol inva-
sions, when Khārazmian rule was overthrown. It was savagely sacked by Toluy's... to the 8th/14th century, and with the sands of the Kāra Kūm encroaching on the arable lands of the oasis (Nazha, 153-4).

What then remains of the town of the 2nd-7th/8th-13th centuries—in addition to the wall already mentioned? The whole site of Sultān-Kal’a is covered with mounds and hillocks, formed on the sites of ancient buildings. Everywhere one sees great piles of bricks, whole and broken, and fragments of pottery, plain and glazed. In the centre, like a memorial of the great past, rises the domed mausoleum of Sultan Sandjar mentioned by Yākūt, one of the finest buildings of the 6th/12th century. The question arises whether it had any connection with the “house of administration” with a dome and several porticoes mentioned by al-Isḥākhī. The Marw of this period contains numerous buildings within the area of Sultān-Kal’a, as well as outside its walls, especially the tower in the centre. The 946 of archaeological investigations by M.E. Masson. In 808/1406 the Timūrid ruler Shahruldi endeavoured to restore prosperity to this region, which had at one time been a flourishing oasis. Hāfiz-i Ābru gives us details of his scheme. The dam was rebuilt on its old site and the water restored to its old channel; but only a portion of the oasis could be irrigated. The town was rebuilt, but not on the old site because water could not be brought in sufficient quantity to Sultān-Kal’a. The town of Marw of this period corresponds to the old town of ‘Abd Allāh-Khān-Kal’a (popular legend wrongly attributing its building to the Shaybānīd ‘Abd Allāh b. Iskandar (991-1006/1583-98) [q.v.], the area of which was much less than that of Marw of the Mongol period, covering about three hundred square miles, and the Marw of this period could not be compared with that of the pre-Mongol period. In time, Marw and its oasis declined more and more. In the period of the Safawī kingdom, it was the object of continual attacks on the part of the Úzbegs, which could not help affecting it.

An almost mortal blow was dealt it at the end of the 18th century. Mu‘āmūr Khān (later called Shāh Murād), son of the atālik [q.v. in Suppl.] Dānṣūrī Bīy of the newly-founded Mangūt [q.v.] dynasty of amīrs in Bukhārā, attacked the Kādār Türkmen local lord of Old Marw, Bayram ‘Alī Khān, killing him in 1785. Shāh Murād also destroyed the Sultān-Band, the dam across the Murghāb 30 miles/48 km. above Marw, and thereby reduced the economic prosperity of the region (F. H. Skrine and E. D. Ross, The Heart of Asia, a history of Russian Turkestan and the Central Asian khantates from the earliest times, London 1899, 206). Consequently, the traveller Alexander Burnes found Marw in ruins and the surrounding district in complete neglect (Travels into Bukhara, London 1834, ii, 23 ff., 37-8, 258-60).

In 1884 the Marw oasis was occupied by the Russian army, and secured in the following year from an Afghan threat by General Egorov's victory. From 1887 onwards, attempts were made, with considerable success, to revive the agricultural prosperity of the devastated region by the building of two dams on the Murghāb, that of Hindu-Kūsh and that of Sultān-Band. The Transcaspian railway line from Krasnovodsk to Buhārā, Samarkand and Tashkent passed through Aḵūzbābād and Marw, and from Marw a branch was built southwards to Kūshāg on the Afghan frontier. In Tsarist times within the oblast of Transcaspia, Marw has since 1924 come within the Turkmenskia S.S.R. In 1935 the modern settlement of Bairam Ali was founded in the Marw region, and this town is now the chef-lieu of the rayon of the same name. In 1969 it had a population of 31,000, with flourishing cotton textile and dairy products industries (see BSF, ii, 344).

of Harb, Mu‘awiyah’s grandfather; Marwan himself had, according to al-Baladhuri, Ansab, v, 164, ten sons and two daughters, and al-Tha‘alibi, La‘ith, 136, tr. 107-8, states that he further had ten brothers and was the paternal uncle of ten of his nephews. It may have been fears of the family of Abu l-‘Aṣ that impelled Mu‘awiyah to his adoption (istihlāk) of his putative half-brother Ziyād b. Sumayya [see ziyād b. ʿaḥṭ] and to the unusual step of naming his son Yazīd as heir to the caliphate during his own lifetime. There was certainly a lack (with the exception of al-Walid b. ʿUthba, Mu‘awiyah’s nephew) of mature, experienced Sufyānids to succeed Mu‘awiyah, whereas at the time of the expulsion of the Umayyads from the Hijāz [see below], Marwan was the most senior of the Umayyads and the only one whom the Prophet had known (ṣayyīḥ kabīr) in the sources, probably referring as much to his prestige and authority as to his age.

When the difficulties arose in 60/680 over Yazīd b. Mu‘awiyah’s succession, involving a refusal of allegiance by the cities of the Hijāz, Marwan advised the governor of Medina, al-Walid b. ʿUthba, to use force against the rebels. After the withdrawal of the expeditionary force of Muslam b. ʿUkba al-Murri and its return to Syria (beginning of 64/autumn 683), the Umayyads’ forces, on whom Marwan had previously expulsed but had returned with Yazīd’s troops, comprising principally members of the lines of al-ʿAṣ under ʿAmr b. Sa‘id al-Aḥdab [q.v.] and of Abu l-ʿAṣ under Marwan, were forced by the partisans of the anti-caliph ʿAbd Allāh b. al-Zubayr [q.v.] to abandon their properties in the Hijāz and flee to Syria for a second time. Marwan was back in Syria by the beginning of 65/684, and some accounts say that he went in the first place to Palmyra rather than to the court of the caliph. Marwan was back in Syria by the beginning of 64/autumn 683, the Umayyads having succeeded in recovering much of their natural advantages beyond his own personal qualities and statesman of great skill and decisiveness, amply endowed with the qualities of ḥisāb [q.v.] and dhābiya, shrewdness, which characterised other outstanding members of the Umayyad clan. His attainment of the caliphate, starting from a position without many natural advantages beyond his own personal qualities (for he had no power-base in Syria and had spent the greater part of his career in the Hijāz), enabled his successor ʿAbd al-Malik to place the Ummayyad caliphate on a firm footing so that it was able to endure for over 60 years more and declared for

Marwan was now able to consolidate his position in Syria and Palestine. His short reign was filled with military activity, beginning with the expulsion of the Zubayrid governor, ʿAbd al-Rahmān b. ʿUthba al-Fihri, called Ibn Ḍajḥam, from Egypt. Marwan seems to have secured that province by Raḍajab 65/Febuary-March 685, leaving there as governor his son ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz. Although the sources are confused here, it seems that Marwan’s forces also repelled a Zubayrid attack on Palestine led by Muṣ‘ab b. al-Zubayr [q.v.]. It is possible, but not certain, that a Marwānid army itself invaded the Hijāz under Hubayr b. Duldja, but was repelled at al-Rabādha [q.v.] to the east of Medina. Marwan certainly took steps to secure Ṭirāk, which had declared for the Zubayrid cause, sending an army under ʿAbdāy Allāh b. Ziyād which by-passed the hostile Kaši centre of Kirkisiya in al-Ḍajzira and had reached al-Orkha when the news of Marwan’s death arrived.

This last event took place in the spring of 65/685, possibly as a result of a plague which was affecting Syria at this time. The date of Marwan’s death is variously given in the sources: Elias of Nisibn has 7 May, and the Islamic historians such dates as 3 Ramadān/13 April (al-Masʿādi, Ṭambih) and 29 Ṣā‘īnān/10-11 April (Ibn Sa‘d, al-Khalifā b. Khayyat, al-Ṭabarī). The place of his death is given by several authoritatively as Damascus (Ibn Sa‘d, al-Ṭabarī, al-Masʿūdi, Ṭambih), but by al-Ya‘kūbi and al-Masʿūdi, Murūd, as al-Sinnabrah on the Lake of Tiberias, a place used, it seems, as a winter residence by the early Umayyads. The length of his reign is placed at between six and ten months. Even less certain is Marwan’s age when he died; the sources make him at least 63, but he may well have been over 70.

On the occasion of the successful outcome of the Egyptian expedition, Marwan had taken the opportunity to promote a succession of Muḥammad b. ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz [q.v.], and it was accordingly the former who succeeded to the caliphate in Damascus after Marwan’s death, apparently without opposition (at least, at this moment) from the two heirs designated at al-Ḍajbiya, ʿAmr b. Sa‘id and Khalīd b. Yazīd, but now set aside.

Marwan’s life had been crowded with action, above all in its “ten years”, filled with military activity, beginning with the expulsion of the Zubayrid governor, enabled his successor ʿAbd al-Malik to place the Ummayyad caliphate on a firm footing so that it was able to endure for over 60 years more and declared for

Bibliography: 1. Sources. The main historical sources for early Islam all contain relevant material. See al-Khalīfa b. Khayyat, Ta‘līf, index; Ya‘kūbi, Ta‘līf, ii, 304-6 and index; Ṭabarī; index; Kindī, Wuldt Misr, ed. Guest, 42-8; Masʿūdi, Murūd, iv, 271-4, 277-9, v, 197-209 = §§ 1596-7, 1601-2, 1961-72 and index; idem, Ṭambih, 292, 304, 307-12, tr. Carra de Vaux, 383, 395, 425, 469, 471, 473, 474, 475, 476, 477, 478, 479, 480; there were also biographies devoted to Marwan in Ibn Sa‘d, v, 24-50; Balādḥurī, Ansāb al-ṣaḥāf, v, ed. Goitein, 125-64; Ibn Kutayba, Ma‘ṣūrī, ed. ʿUkāsha, 353-5; Ibn al-
Athir, Usd al-ghdba, ii, 33-5 (al-Hakam), iv, 348-9
(Marwan). Adab works like Ibn cAbd Allah al-Hakami by
his father's side, a grandson of the caliph Marwan I
HAKAM, the last of the Umayyad caliphs of
Armenia and Caucasus region. Following the death of
his general Ibrahim b. al-Ashtar in 72/691. Some
reports say that the woman was already pregnant
when Walld II was overthrown and killed and Yazid
II became caliph in Djamada II 126/September 744, but
Marwan's adopting the military formation known as
the kurdas (pl. karadis) and abandoning that called the
saff (pl. suuff). A kurdas was a relative small and
compact detachment of soldiers (usually cavalry),
and the saff were the more traditional long lines
in which the Arabs organised themselves for battle. It
has sometimes been suggested that Marwan was the
first to introduce the kurdas formation into the Muslim
armies and that his experience in fighting on the
northern borders where Byzantine influence was
strong (xooqor) has been proposed as the source of the
Arabic word; S. Fraenkel, Aramäischen Fremdwörter,
239) led him to do so. However, whether Marwan was
the first to use this formation among the
Muslims is doubtful (R. Levy, The social structure of
Islam, Cambridge 1957, 430) and it is notable that
Marwan's reports do not, in any case, relate to the
period of Marwan's fighting on the northern frontier
but to the later fighting against Khardidites in
Mesopotamia after he had seized the caliphate.

It seems that Marwan had already contemplated
marching south into Syria and taking a hand in affairs
when Walld II was overthrown and killed and Yazid
III became caliph in Djamada II 126/April 744, but
had been foiled by the dissent of the Kalbis in his
army led by Thaabib b. Nu'aym. During the short
period of Marwan's fighting on the northern frontier
but to the later fighting against Khardidites in
Mesopotamia after he had seized the caliphate.

It seems that Marwan had already contemplated
marching south into Syria and taking a hand in affairs
when Walld II was overthrown and killed and Yazid
III became caliph in Djamada II 126/April 744, but
had been foiled by the dissent of the Kalbis in his
army led by Thaabib b. Nu'aym. During the short
period of Marwan's fighting on the northern frontier
but to the later fighting against Khardidites in
Mesopotamia after he had seized the caliphate.
battle the two sons of Walid II were murdered in Damascus, Ibrâhîm and Sulaymân b. Hîshâm fled to the Kalbî centre of Palmyra, and Marwan was able to enter Damascus. There, it is said on the initiative of Abu Natâma theal, the Sufyânî branch of the Umayyad family, who claimed that the two sons of Walid II had named Marwan as their successor, he was recognised as caliph and given the kâ'â'a in Sa'far 127/December 744. Subsequently, Ibrâhîm and Sulaymân b. Hîshâm accepted his authority and were granted amâs. Marwan did not, however, choose to remain in Syria but moved back to Harrân in Mesopotamia where, presumably, he felt more secure. For the first time an Umayyad caliph attempted to rule from outside Syria.

Faced, however, with a rebellion in Syria he soon had to return there. The rebellion started among the Kalb of Palestine led by Thâbit b. Nu'aym and quickly spread to the north where Hims came out in opposition to Marwan. In Shawwâl 127/July 745 Marwan in person obtained the submission of Hims and then sent a force south to relieve Damascus, under attack from Yazîd b. Khabîd al-Kâsîrî. Yazîd was defeated and killed, and Marwan's army went on to capture Thâbit b. Nu'aym who was attacking Tiberias. Thâbit was executed and the Kalb settlement of al-Mizzâ near Damascus put to fire. Finally, al-Abrâsh al-Kalbî in Palmyra agreed to surrender to Marwan, and it seemed that his rule over Syria was again secure. At this point he called the Umayyad family together and had the kâ'â'a given to his two sons as his successors. But the opposition to Marwan in Syria was not yet over. When he raised a Syrian contingent to join the Mesopotamian army under Yazîd Ibn Hubayra [see Ibn Hubayra], which was attempting to establish Marwan's authority in 'Irâk, it deserted and it passed over to 'Abd Allah b. Sulaymân b. Hîshâm lived, and the Syrians recognised Sulaymân in opposition to Marwan. Sulaymân took possession of Kinnâsrîn and attracted support from the rest of Syria. Withdrawing most of his Mesopotamian troops from Ibn Hubayra's force, Marwan attacked and defeated Sulaymân near Kinnâsrîn and the vanquished Umayyad fled with the remnants of his army to Hims where, being deserted, he was under the command of his brother, to Kufa via Palmyra. Marwan now besieged Hims for the second time, and when the town finally submitted after several months he had its walls razed together with those of several other major Syrian towns. By the summer of 128/746 Marwan had finally established his control over Syria.

The extension of his authority over 'Irâk and all of Mesopotamia took even longer. Initially, he had attempted to weaken the governor of 'Irâk appointed by Yazîd III, 'Abd Allâh b. 'Umar b. 'Abd al-'Azîz, and to replace him with the Kaysî al-Nâdîr b. Sa'id al-Harâshî. Both rival governors were then overwhelmed, in 127/745, by the Khârijîtî movement which had begun in Mesopotamia among the tribe of Shabîbân and which is associated with the leadership of al-Dalâhî b. Kayî al-Shaybânî. The latter established himself in Kufa but in the spring of 128/746 returned north and occupied Mawsîl, seeking to take advantage of Marwan's difficulties in Syria. Marwan's son 'Abd Allâh, however, was able to hold the Khârijîtîs in check until Marwan had completed his subjugation of Hims and could divert his forces to the east to deal with the threat. In the late summer Marwan defeated and killed al-Dalâhî, under whom Sulaymân b. Hîshâm now fought, and the Khârijîtîs had to abandon Mawsîl. In the following year they were finally driven out of Mesopotamia and their danger ended when Marwan was able to withdraw men from 'Irâk to deploy against them and their new leader Abu Dâlî. That Marwan was able to withdraw men from 'Irâk was in consequence of the victories there in late 129/spring 747 of his general Yazîd Ibn Hubayra, who had defeated both the Khârijîtîs governor of Kufa and the 'Alîd 'Abd Allâh b. Mu'amîwîa [q.v.], until then holding sway over large areas of western and south-western Iran.

The domination which Marwan had established by the end of 129/summer of 747 was to be ended two years later by the rising of the Hâshîmîyîn which had already begun in Khurâsân in Ramadan 129/June 747. By Rabî' II 132/November 749 the armies of the Hâshîmîyîn had destroyed Umayyad rule in Persia and 'Irâk and the 'Abbâsîd caliphate had been proclaimed in Kufa. In Dhu 'l-Qa'da 132/January 750 Marwan himself led his forces in a last attempt to defeat the insurgents at the battle of the Greater Zab, and the destruction of his army there signalled the end of Umayyad power. Marwan himself escaped with a small band of supporters and fled through Syria to Egypt pursued by an 'Abbâsîd force. They finally caught him in Dhu 'l-Ka'da 132/June 750 at Bûsîr in the province of Ushmunayn in Upper Egypt, and there the last Umayyad caliph fell after a short struggle.

Marwan's career illustrates some of the weaknesses affecting the later Umayyad caliphate. He had obtained power as a result of his close links with the predominantly Kaysî army of the north Mesopotamian frontier in opposition to the Kalbî-based régime of Yazîd III. This close identification of the caliph with a particular faction clearly diminished the religious and moral claims of the Umayyad caliphate. Furthermore, his attempt to move the centre of the caliphate to Mesopotamia reflects the way in which Syria, hitherto the base of Umayyad rule, had itself been engulfed by the factionalism among the Arabs. It may seem that Marwan was unfortunate in that, having finally consolidated his authority over the central provinces, he was so soon overthrown by a movement which originated outside his control. In reality, however, the Umayyad state had been so weakened by its fundamental inability to satisfy the demands of Islam and by the factionalism among the Arab soldiers that it is doubtful whether even Marwan's forceful and energetic personality could have significantly prolonged it.
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MARWÂN AL-ASGHAR B. ABI HAFSA and MARWÂN AL-ASHGHAR B. ABI 'L-DIJANUB, the most famous members of a family which included several poets; al-Tha'lîbi characterises it as the most poetic families in Islam, with six poets amongst its members.

The origins of the family’s ancestor Abû Hafsa Yazîd are obscure. He was a maulûd of the Umayyad Marwân b. al-Hakam, whom he aided on various historical occasions during the caliphate of 'Ummân and under 'Abd al-Malik. It is impossible to decide exactly whether he was of Persian or Jewish origin. Freed by Marwân, he was entrusted with certain posts, including the collecting of the taxation from Medina. He married a girl from B. 'Amir of the Yamama, and his descendants were always to have close relations with that region of Arabia. One of them, Marwân al-Asghar b. Abû Hafsa, who was the grandson of Nâbigha al-Djâlî, which would explain the poetic talent of the family. The ancestor Yazîd wrote verses (the Fihrist however, describes him as mukâllâ). His son Yahyâ was held in esteem by 'Abd al-Malik b. Marwân and had relations with Djârir. The Fihrist attributes to him a diwan of 20 leaves, of which only a small part has come down to us. The eulogy which he wrote to 'Abd al-Malik the Caliph on the occasion of his accession to the caliphate is especially prosaic and conventional.

It is his grandson, Abî 'l-Sîmî Marwân b. Sulaymân, who can be considered as the first important poet of the family. He left the Yamama for Bagdad, thus confirming the fact that it was impossible to attain literary fame when living remote from the capital. With a personality which was moreover strange, sordidly avaricious, clumsy and unscrupulous, he would arrive at the palace clad in rags, despite the enormous sums which the caliph gave him for his poems. He seems to have steered his career forward with intelligence and prudence, and attached himself to the great personality of Abû 'l-Walld Ma'mân. He would have a daughter, and it is the name of his grandson Abu '1-Walld that which people declare as the last good poet of this family. It is correct that this particular person knew how to take up a central position on the scene. He was even more a professional eulogist than his grandfather, and was successively brought into the circles of al-Ma'mûn, al-Mu'ta'asim and then al-Walid. The latter reproached him for being excessively close to his brother al-Mutawakkil and exiled him. Al-Mutawakkil’s succession signalled his return to grace, and he went on to become one of the liveliest elements of the caliphal circles of literature. As well as the considerable sums which he got for his poems, he was awarded the governorship of the Yamama and Bahrayn. Al-Muntasir ordered him to return to the Yamama, where all trace of him is lost.

Marwân b. Abî 'l-Dijanûb kept up the anti-'Alid tradition characteristic of the whole family since the time of its founder. The most shining part of his fame came from his remarkable gift as a satirist. Recovering once more the verse of the swashbucklers of the 1st/7th century, he directed his shafts against several members of the court circle, in particular, 'Ali b. al-Dijam, his favourite target, and 'Abî b. Yahyâ b. al-Munadjdîm. He was savage and coarse, and quick to discover chinks in people’s armour; he used any weapon to hand, and did not scruple to use mendacity when he was short of arguments, all of which gave great joy to the caliph, who took a keen pleasure in following these kinds of clashes.

Marwân al-Asghar seems to be inferior as a poet to his grandfather. He was most at ease in attacking people, and his eulogies, even if they contain some fine verses, use above all the conventional material of this type of poetry. Caught between Abû Tamâm on one side, and al-Buhtûrî and Ibn al-Rûmî on the other, it was hard for him to aspire to the top positions. Moreover, he lacked the inspiration of Di'alî and the nobility of tone of 'Ali b. al-Dijâm. After him, talent left the family. His son Muhammad and his grandson Furîbî, to whom the Fihrist attributes 50 and 100 leaves respectively, were merely hack versifiers.
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MARWANIDS, the branch of the Umayyad dynasty of Arab caliphs in early Islam, who formed the second, and most long-lasting line of this dynasty, the first line being that of Sufyanids, that of Mu'awwiyah I b. Abu Sufyān b. Harb [q. v.], his son and his grandson (41-64/661-750), his son and successor Abū al-Malik [q. v.] being the progenitor of all the subsequent caliphs with the exceptions of 'Umar II [q. v.], son of Abū al-Malik's brother Abū al-'Azīz, and the last caliph Marwan b. Mu'awwiyah b. Mu'ammar b. Abū 'Imrān al-Hakam. For the general history of the dynasty, see Umayyads, and also the articles on individual rulers. (Ed.)

MARWANIDS, a dynasty of Kurdish origin who, having ousted the Hamdānids [q. v.], ruled Diyar Ba'kr from 380/990-1 to 478/1085. The founder of the dynasty, a Kurdish chief named Bādh, seized the city of Māyyāfārīk in 377/988 after the death of the Buyd ruler ʿAqūd al-Dawla (373/983), and then took Āmid, Naṣībīn and Akhitā (Ibn al-Āthīr, ix, 25; Ibn al-Azraq, 49-52). Bādh successfully fend off attacks both from a Buyd army sent against him and from the Hamdānids, but was killed by a coalition of Hamdānids and Umayyad forces after his unsuccessful attempt to take Mawṣil (380/990).

The dynasty itself, however, takes its name not from Bādh but from Marwan, a miller who had married Bādh's sister. It was their son Abū ʿAlī al-Ḥasan b. Marwan who, having withdrawn after Bādh's death in 380/990 to Ḥṣn Kaftayn, married his uncle's widow, routed the Hamdānids on two occasions and took possession of Māyyāfārīk and Āmid (Ibn al-Azraq, 39-60; Ibn al-Āthīr, ix, 50). After his murder at Āmid in 307/917, his brother Muhammād al-Dawla Sa'id ruled until 401/1011. These two precipitous reigns paved the way for the accession of a third brother, Naṣr al-Dawla Ahmad [q. v.], whose rule marks the apogee of Marwanid power.

Naṣr al-Dawla was recognised as ruler of Diyar Ba'kr by the Buyd amir Sulṭān al-Dawla, by the Fāṭimid al-Hākim, and by the Byzantine emperor, all of whom soon sent envoys and congratulatory messages to him (Ibn al-Azraq, 307). Indeed, Naṣr al-Dawla in his long reign (401-83/1011-61) was to practise a skilful policy of accommodation and self-preservation with all three powers. He also had to contend with Bedouin Arab dynasties such as the ʿUkhaylids and the Madāsidās [q. v.], who wielded power in Northern Syria and al-Dārāzāra, and to whom he was forced to cede Naṣībin and Edessa respectively.

The 6th/12th century chronicler of al-Dārāzāra, Ibn al-Azraq al-Fārikī, gives in his chronicle a very full account of Marwanid rule. Naṣr al-Dawla was fortunate to have the services of two capable viziers, Abū l-ʿĀsim al-Husayn al-Maghribī, who died in office (420/1032), and whose biography is given by Ibn Khālidīn [see AL-MAGHRIBI, BANU] and the even more famous Fakhr al-Dawla Ibn Dājir [see DABIR, BANU]. Under Naṣr al-Dawla, Diyar Ba'kr enjoyed a high level of stability and commercial and cultural prosperity. The Marwanid court at Māyyāfārīk was frequented by prominent ʿulāmāʾ and poets, such as the ʿAllāh al-Kāzarūnī (d. 455/1063) (Ibn al-Athīr, ix, 52) and the poet al-Ṭūḥāmī (d. 416/1026-7) (Ibn al-Azraq, 82). Nāṣir-i Khusraw visited Māyyāfārīk in 438/1046 and was much impressed by it (Safar-nda, ed. Muhammad Dābir-Siyāk, Tehran 1335/1956, 8-11).

Naṣr al-Dawla emerges as a flamboyant ruler with political acumen and extravagant tastes. His religious stance appears to have been a pragmatic one, suitable for the ruler of a vulnerable buffer state surrounded by greater powers of the most divergent confessional loyalties. It seems likely that he ruled a predominantly Christian population in the towns of Diyar Ba'kr and that he enjoyed a good relationship with Byzantium. Indeed, the emperor Constantine X asked him for help in procuring the release of the Georgian prince Liparit from the Saldjuk sultan Toghrūl (Ibn al-Āthīr, ix, 372-3). It is probable that Naṣr al-Dawla was persuaded for a short while from 430/1040-9 to give the Khutba in favour of the Fāṭimid al-Mustansir (Ibn Khālidīn, ʿIbar, ix, 318), but it is also noteworthy that in that same reign, ʿAbd Allāh al-Kāzarūnī went to Māyyāfārīk and spread the ʿAllāhī madhhab throughout Diyar Ba'kr (Ibn al-Āthīr, ix, 52).

In traditional fashion, Naṣr al-Dawla is praised for strengthening the frontiers and for building bridges and cities, and in these laudatory statements of Ibn al-Azraq are confirmed by the evidence of Marwanid inscriptions found on the walls of Āmid. Indeed, according to the evidence of an inscription dated 445/1053-4 on a marble slab in the Bāb Ḥīťa in Jerusalem, Naṣr al-Dawla was also responsible for establishing two houses for the use of pilgrims there (Burgoine, 118-21). The sources comment on the immense wealth accumulated by Naṣr al-Dawla. He is also said to have possessed 360 concubines who did not, however, prevent him from meticulous observance of the morning prayer. He was interested in gastronomical pleasures, too, and sent his cooks to Egypt to learn to culinary arts of that country (Ibn al-Āthīr, x, 11).

When the Saldjuk sultan Toghrūl advanced into Diyar Ba'kr (448/1056-7), he did not aim at abolishing the Marwanid state, so Naṣr al-Dawla recognised his suzerainty and kept his lands. Toghrūl wrote to him confirming his role as a frontier lord fighting the infidels and exhorting him to continue in this task (Ibn al-Āthīr, ix, 275).

On the death of Naṣr al-Dawla (453/1061), the power and prestige of the dynasty declined markedly. His son ʿNīẓām al-Dīn Naṣr succeeded him, at first only in al-Dārāzāra and Māyyāfārīk and then two years later (having overcome his brother Sa'id) in Āmid too. On the death of ʿNīẓām al-Dīn (472/1079) his son Naṣir al-
Dawla Mansūr, the last Marwānid ruler, came to power. The vizier Ibn Dāhir, who had left Diyar Bakr for Baghdad, used his influence with Malik-Shāh and Nizām al-Mulk to persuade them to bring the Marwānid dynasty to an end and to seize their treasures. In 478/1085 Diyar Bakr fell to Ibn Dāhir and direct Seljuq control was imposed (Ibn al-Athir, x, 93-4). Ibn Dāhir took his treasury for himself and the last Marwānid ruler Mansūr was given Dżaffar Ibn Umar, where he lived on until 489/1096.


**MARWĀNIYYA**, a branch of the Khalwātī Sufi order [q.v.] in Egypt, named after Marwān b. ʿAbī al-Mutāʿal (d. 1329/1911). His father, ʿAbī al-Mutāʿal b. ʿAbī al-Mutāʿal (d. 1299/1881-2), had been initiated into the Khalwātīya order by Husayn al-Muṣayṭihi (cf. Muḥārak, *Kitāb* [q.v.] of Muḥammad al-Ḥifnī’s disciple Muḥammad b. ʿAbī Allāḥ al-Ḥusaynī, *ʿAbī al-Mutāʿal* later obtained al-ʿāqīqa and acted as a šaykh of his own Khalwātīya order, which had not yet differentiated itself, either in name or in practice, from Muṣṭafā Kamāl al-Dīn al-Bakrī’s version of the Khalwātīya, as transmitted by al-Bakrī’s ʿalīfī al-Ḥifnī. From early 1912 onwards, under ʿAbī al-Muṣṭaʿal’s son, Marwān, the order was presented under a name of its own, al-Marwānīyya. The original šāhāda was replaced by another šīlāha which was identical with ʿAbīd’s genealogy (cf. *Abū al-Mutūal* al-Ḥamzāwi al-Marwānī, *Ṭabākhī al-ʾiṣāfī al-rabbānīyya bi lʾ-ʿawār al-Marwānīyya*, Cairo 1330/1912, 61-4). In addition, the order’s link with the Khalwātīyya tradition, which had been cultivated and propagated by Muṣṭafā Kamāl al-Dīn al-Bakrī, was cut when the reading of Yāḥyā al-Shirwānī al-Bākūlī’s ʿīlīd al-gaʿīyat—which according to al-Bakrī, is the pivot of Khalwātīyya ritual—was abandoned and when, at the same time, private and communal reading in the hadīsa [q.v.] of al-Bakrī’s ʿāṣībb [see *Hizī*] was replaced by the reading of saʿādīl and other liturgical texts attributed to ʿAbīd’s ancestor Marwān al-Khalīlī (d. 799/1329-30).

A discussion of the various factors which account for the introduction of these alterations and for the concomitant rise of the Marwānīyya, in conjunction with additional details and references, is to be found in F. de Jong, *The Šūfi orders in post-Ottoman Egypt*, 111-1-1951 (in preparation), ch. 3. The Marwānīyya is one of the officially recognized Šūfi orders in Egypt (cf. *Mashūqī* Ṣūfī al-Turūk al-Ṣūfiyya, Kānān raʾīṣ 118 li-zana 1176 m. bi-buat Nīzām al-Turūk al-Ṣūfiyya*, Cairo 3 d, 29).

**Bibliography:** Given in the article. (F. DE JONG)
which was dedicated to Fakhr al-Dīn ʿĪsā b. Ibrahim al-Ma‘wāl (see the edition of the Fakhrīya by H. Derenbourg, Paris 1895, 14, no. 2, 16). The information available on Abū Tālib al-Marwazi (see for example al-Suyūṭī, Buḥṣyā, 194; F. Bustanī, Dīrist al-ma‘ārif, iv, 401-2) is derived exclusively from the article which Yākūṭ (d. 625/1229) devoted to him (in ʿUddāb, vi, 142-50) during his lifetime; this explains the fact that the date of his death is nowhere mentioned.

Bibliography: Given in the article.

(Ch. Pellat)

AL-MARWAZĪ, ʿSHAʿRĀF AL-ZAMĀN TĀHĪR, presumably a native of Marw [see marw al-ghāṣqānī] or a descendant of such a native, physician and writer on geography, anthropology and the natural sciences, died after 514/1120. He acted as physician to the Sāḥibīsīsīn Sultan Malik Shāh [q.v.] and possibly to his successors down to the time of ʿṢaḥīh al-Mawsīl (see the edition of the Fakhriya by H. Derenbourg, Paris 1895, 14, no. 2, 16); little else is known of his life. His main fame comes from the book the Tābābīsī al-hayawān, which is essentially zoological in subject, but also with valuable sections on human geography, i.e. the various races of the world, extant in an India Office ms., Delhi, Arab 1949. Sections of this, in which the author reveals borrowings from inter alia the lost Kitāb al-Masālik wa ‘l-mā买卖āl of Abī ‘Abd Allāh Muḥammad b. Ahmad al-Ḥanāfī and his family [see al-Bayānīnî in Suppl.], have been edited and translated by Minorsky as ʿShaʿrāf al-Zamān Tāhir Marwāzī on China, the Turks and India, London 1942.

Bibliography: Minorsky, op. cit.; Brockelmann, S.I, 903. (C. E. Bosworth)

MARY [see Maryam].

MßAYA or MAREA, a Tigre-speaking tribe strongly in the upland region of the left bank of the river Ṭigre, north-west of Keren in western Eritrea [q.v.]. They claim descent from a Saho warrior of the same name, who is said to have settled in the region with seventeen soldiers during the 14th century. This data seems to be confirmed by the Gadda Ewostēwaṭīsī (Turayev, Acta S. Eustathii, 37-8), where the Ethiopian saint Ewostēwaṭīsī is said to have visited “the two Mārāyā” on his way to Jerusalem in ca. 1337 (cf. C. Conti Rossini, in RSO, iv, 452-3; Bermudez, Breve relāciones, 117). Until today, the tribe is indeed split into two sections of nobles, the Mārāyā Kayīr or “Red Mārāyā” and the Mārāyā Sallīm or “Black Mārāyā”, who are by far the most numerous. The distinction must represent two migrations, for the “Black” are traditionally regarded as “the first born” and in a higher position than the “Red”, which is contrary to the meaning of kayīr (kayr) in Amharic. On several occasions, such as the death of the chief of the “Black”, the “Red” had to give presents to the other group. The tribe consists further of families who are vassals to the nobles. The descendants of the warrior Mārāyā became very numerous and subjugated the local tribes. Called tigre because of their origin—the term means “serf caste” in this context—these vassal tribes were in fact Ethiopians and Bedja [q.v.], whose language was taken over by the ruling class. The latter’s Saho language has been long since forgotten. Differences in the penal code between punishments for crimes committed by nobles or by vassals have been disappearing. Under Italian rule, the more onerous duties of the vassals were considerably lightened. The rigid noble-serf relationship was, however, still very strong until recently.


MARYAM, Mary, the mother of Jesus. The Arabic form of the name is identical with Hebrew מְרֵיָּם and Maryam, which are used in the Syriac and the Greek Bible, in the New as well as in the Old Testament. In the latter it corresponds to the Hebrew מְרֵיָּם. Al-Baydawī considers the name to be Hebrew; but the noun would seem to indicate a Christian source, according to A. Jeffery, Foreign vocabulary of the Qur’ān, Baroda 1938, s.v. The name Maryam, like others with the suffix, such as ʿArām, Bil’ām, points to the region between Palestine and Northwestern Arabia as its home. According to Muslim interpretation, the name means “the pious” (al-ṣāhid; cf. the commentators on sūra III,31). It occurs frequently in the Kur’ān in the combination [fās] ʿīsā Ibn Maryam “[Jesus] the son of Mary” (sūra II,8,254; III,31-2; IV, 156, 169; V, 19, 50, 76, 82, 109, 112, 114, 116; IX, 31; XIX, 35; XXIII, 52; XXXIII,7; XLI, 37; LVIII, 27, LXI, 6, 14), no further being mentioned, because, according to Muslim tradition also, “Isā had no earthly father. In the region between Palestine and Arabia, “Isā is clearly regarded as the higher of the two. Yet Maryam’s place is important [see [fās] and the Bibli. there listed].”
Maryam is mentioned in the Kurʾān, from the earliest to the later Medinan suras.

(a) Maryam's special privileges; the announcement.

To the first Meccan period belongs sura XXIII, 52: "And we made the son of Maryam and his mother a sign; and we made them abide in an elevated place, full of quiet and watered with springs". Here some have seen the first allusion in the Kurʾān to the virgin birth. This idea is accentuated in sura XIX, 20, where Maryam says to the spirit (i.e. the angel) who announces to her the birth of a male child: "How should I have a male child, no human man having touched me?" In sura LXVI, 12, the conception is ascribed to this divine spirit (cf. Luke, i, 34-5: "And Mary said to the angel, How can this be, since I have no husband? And the angel said to her, The Holy Spirit will come upon you, and the power of the Most High will overshadow you").

The virgin birth is also mentioned in sura LXVI, 12 (Medinan): "And Maryam bint ʿImrān who kept her body pure. Then we breathed into it from our spirit. She acknowledged the truth of the words of her Lord and of his book and she belonged to the obedient".

A third mention of the announcement and the virgin birth is in sura III, 37-8: "When the angels said, O Mary, surely God has chosen thee and elected thee above the women of all created beings. O Maryam, be obedient unto thy Lord and prostrate thyself and bow down with those who bow down" (cf. Luke, i, 28). The commentators remark on these verbs: īṣāfā (chosen: twice) and ḥabara: Maryam was miraculously preserved from all bodily impurity and from spiritual failings. There is discussion too as to whether Maryam is the best of all women without exception, bearing in mind the veneration accorded to Fātima. Al-Rāzī, followed by al-Kurtubi, takes it in an absolute sense, while most say "of that time" (R. Arnaldez, Jésus fils de Marie prophète de l'Islam, Paris 1980, 77). Maryam is generally held, in Muslim tradition, to be one of the four best women that ever existed, together with Asiya b. Fātimah, Fātimah b. al-Kuršān b. Fātimah (Abūtdāl B. Hanbal, Musnad, iii, 135), and the chief of the women of Paradise (Ibn Hanbal, iii, 64, 80). For a comparison of Mary with Fātima, based on Sunnī and Shiʿī interpretations of verses in sura III and XIX, see J.D. McAliffe, Chosen of all women: Mary and Fatimah in Qurʾānic exegesis, in Islamochristiana, vii (1981), 19-28.

According to tradition, the announcement took place in the following way: Djbīrī appeared to Maryam in the shape of a beardless youth with a shining face and curling hair, announcing to her the birth of a male child. She expressed her amazement, but, on the angel's reassuring answer, she complied with the will of God.

Thereupon the angel blew his breath into the fold of her shirt, which she had put off. When the angel had withdrawn, she put on the shirt and became pregnant. The announcement took place in the cavern of the well of Silwān, whither Maryam had gone, as usual, to fill her pitcher; she was then 10 or 13 years of age; and it was the longest day of the year. In Christian tradition also, the voice of the angel was heard by Mary for the first time when she had gone to fill her pitcher. According to a different tradition, Ḥisāʾ's spirit entered Maryam through her mouth (al-Tabarī, Taʾsīr, vi, 22).

(b) Maryam's religious importance.

It has been pointed out that the Kurʾān seems to refer to a belief that Maryam was considered as a third deity, or a divine person; and that she and her son were venerated together as gods. Such may be reflected in sura V, 79: "Al-Masīḥ, the son of Maryam, is an Apostle only, who was preceded by other Apostles, and his mother was an upright woman; and both were wont to take food". This verse would appear to refute any veneration of Ḥisāʾ and his mother as divine persons, elevated above human needs. With it may be compared sura IV, 169: "O people of the book, beware of exaggeration in your religion and say of Allah nothing but the truth. ... Maryam is only the Apostle of Allah and his word, which he conveyed unto Maryam and a spirit that came forth from him. Believe, therefore on Allah and his Apostles and say not 'three'. Beware of this, this will be better for you. Allah is but one God", etc. Clearer is sura V, 116: "And when Allah said, O Ḥisāʾ b. Maryam, hast thou said to the people, Take me and my mother as two Gods besides Allah? He answered: Far be it, that I should say to what I am not entitled. If I should have said it, thou wouldst know it", etc.

The commentators also describe the Trinity as consisting of Allāh, Ḥisāʾ and Maryam. Al-Bayḍāwī, however, admits that in sura IV, 169, there could be an allusion to the Christian doctrine of one God in three Persons. Father, Son, Ḥisāʾ.
(a) The birth of Maryam. This story is found in a Christian tradition corresponding closely with that which is contained in the _Protoevangelium Jacobi_ and _De nativitate Mariae_. Mary’s father is called ‘Imrân in the Qur’ân, Joachim in Christian tradition; Ibn Khaldûn’s _Ibar_, ii, 144) is also acquainted with the name Joachim. Maryam is called a sister of Hûrûn (sura XIX, 32), and the use of these three names ‘Imrân, Hûrûn and Maryam, has led to the supposition that the Kur’ân does not clearly distinguish between the two Maryams, of the Old and New Testament. The Kur’ân names two families as being especially chosen: those of Ibrâhîm and of ‘Imrân (sura III, 32). It is the family of ‘Imrân, important because of Moses and Aaron, to which Maryam belongs. It is not necessary to assume that these kinship links are to be interpreted in modern terms. The words “sister” and “daughter”, like their male counterparts, in Arabic usage can indicate extended kinship, descent or spiritual affinity. This second ‘Imrân, together with Hûrûn, can be taken as purely Kur’ânic. M. Hamidullah’s literal rendering of _sûra_ 32 (cf. _Schedl, op. cit._, in _Bibl._, 189-99, 402-10).

Sûra XIX opens with the story of Zakariyyâ and Yahyâ (1-15); then follows the story of Maryam and ‘Isâ (16-34). Sûra III, 31-42, contains: (a) the birth of Maryam; (b) the announcement of Yahyâ (33-6); and (c) the announcement of ‘Isâ (37-41). The comparison of sûra XIX with sûra III makes it probable that Muhammad became acquainted with the story of the birth of Maryam later than with those of Yahyâ and ‘Isâ.

For further discussion, cf. A. M. Charfi, _Christianity in the Qur’ân commentary of Tabari_ (English translation), in _Islamochristiana_, vi (1980, 110) and A. Ferre, _La vie de Jésus dans Tabart_ (English translation), in _Islamochristiana_, v (1979, 11).

‘Imrân and Hanna were old and childless. One day the sight of a bird in a tree, which was feeding her young, aroused Hanna’s desire for a child. She prays God to fulfil her desire, and vows, if her prayer should be heard, to dedicate the child to the temple. She had, however, forgotten that, according to Jewish law, this would be impossible if she should give birth to a female child (cf. _Proto. Jacobi_, chs. iii, iv; Syriac text, 4). Compare with this sûra III, 31: “How the wife of ‘Imran said, O my Lord, I have vowed to thee what is in my womb. Now accept [this vow] from me, thou art the hearing, the knowing. And when she had given birth to the child, she said, O my Lord, I have given birth to a female child... and I have called her Maryam.”

Then the Kur’ân relates how she invoked on behalf of Maryam and her posterity Allah’s protection from Satan. On this verse is based the well-known _hadith_ “Every child that is born, is touched (or stung) by Satan and this touch makes it cry, except Maryam and her son” (al-Bukhârî, _Akhbâr_; _The Prophet_, x, 359, 368).

Maryam’s protection is less certain of her safety until the time of Joseph._ (cf. _Protev. Jacobi_, vi, 233, 254, 288, 292, 319, 368, 523). It has also been suggested that this idea of unique privilege could come from a Christian source (Arnaldes, 46-7).

The Kur’ân further relates (vs. 32) that the child grows up in a chamber in the temple ( _mibrâh_; cf. the _xêlêm_ in _Protev. Jacobi_, vi; Syriac text 5-6) under the divine grace and under Zakariyyâ’s care. According to Muslim tradition, ‘Imrân had died before the birth of Maryam, and Zakariyya claimed authority over her on account of his being her uncle; the rabbis did not recognise his claim; his right was proved by an ordeal, consisting in the parties throwing their pens or arrows (_ahlum_ in a river; the only one that floated was that of Zakariyyâ. (cf. _sûra_ III, 39). Christian tradition knows of an ordeal only in the case of Joseph, who, because a dove comes forth from his staff, is recognised as Maryam’s guardian.

As often as Zakariyya enters Maryam’s _mibrâh_, he finds her provided with food in a miraculous way (vs. 32). This feature also belongs to Christian tradition (_Protoev. Jacobi_, ch. viii; Syriac text, 7). The person of Joseph is not mentioned in the Kur’ân. In Muslim tradition, he takes care of Maryam, his cousin, because Zakariyya is no longer able to do so, on account of old age.

Muslim tradition speaks of one Qurayyûdî a carpenter who is betrothed to Maryam; he is the first to notice her pregnancy and to be convinced by her of its miraculous nature, as brought about directly by the power of God. (A. Charfi, 115-16; Abd al-Jalîl; L. Cheikh, _Mawlid Maryam al-’adhra fi taklid al-Islam_, in _Machriq_, xxvi [1926], 682-6).

The undoubted parallels between the Kur’ânic account and the material found in the apocryphal gospels do not, however, indicate direct dependence, but are more indicative of the folklore aspect of religion, much fuller than would be implied by the canonical text of the Gospels, itself the product of careful selec-

(b) The annunciation of Yâhŷyâ. See this art. and also Zâkâriyâa.

(c) The annunciation and birth of Isâ. The more detailed narrative is that of sûra XIX, 16-17. Maryam retires to "a place situated eastward", where she hides herself behind a curtain. The commentaries do not know whether a place to the east of Jerusalem is meant, or the eastern part of her house, to which she retired every month. It is said that this is the origin of the *kibla* of the Christians.

In 17-21 the story of the annunciation is given (cf. above), followed by that of Isâ's birth, which, according to some Muslim traditions, followed the conception either immediately or very soon. The pains of childbirth came upon Maryam when she was near the trunk of a palm. "She said, would to God I had died before this, and had become a thing forgotten, and lost in oblivion. And he who was beneath her [i.e. the child, or Djbîrîl, or the palm] called to her, saying, Be not grieved; God has provided a rivulet under thee; and shake the trunk of the palm and it shall let fall ripe dates upon thee, ready gathered. And eat and drink and be of good cheer." This story may, perhaps, be considered as a parallel to the Christian tradition in which it is related that, during the flight to Egypt, the babe Jesus ordered a palm in the desert to bow down in order to refresh Mary by its dates; whereupon the palm obeyed and stayed with its head at Mary's feet, until the child ordered it to stand upright again and to open a vein between its roots in order to quench the thirst of the holy family (Apocryphal Gospel of Matthew, ch. xx). The Kur'ân goes on (v. 26): "And when thou seest any man, say, I have vowed a fast unto the Merciful; so I may not speak to any man to-day". The commentaries say this was meant to avoid importunate questions. This feature is not in Christian tradition; yet in the *Protoc. Jacobit* it is said (ch. xii; Syriac text, 11) that Mary, who was then 16 years of age, ordered herself to the Israelites. According to Muslim tradition, she stayed in a cavern during forty days. The Kur'ân continues (XIX, 28): "Then she brought him to her people, carrying him. They said, O Maryam, thy father was not a bad man, neither was thy mother a harlot. Then she pointed to the child". Then the child begins to speak, one of the well-known miracles ascribed to Isâ. The "very shameful calumny" which the Israelites brought forth against Maryam is also mentioned in sûra IV, 155. As to the words "O sister of Hârûn" (cf. above), it may be added that, according to the commentators, this Hârûn was not Moses' brother, but one of Maryam's contemporaries, who was either a wicked man, with whom she is compared in this respect, or her pious brother.

A legend about loaves of bread which Maryam gave to the Magi is mentioned by al-Mas'ûdî, iv, 79-80 = § 1405.

The flight to Egypt is not mentioned in the Kur'ân, unless the "elevated place" (sûra XXIII, 52; cf. above) should be an allusion to it. According to Muslim tradition, which is acquainted with it, the abode lasted 12 years. After the death of Herod the family returned to Nâṣîrâ.

After his alleged death (according to Muslim teaching: see Isâ), he consolèd his mother from heaven. According to others it was Mary Magdalene. The stories of the *Transitus Mariae* have not obtained a place in Muslim tradition. Instead of these, there is a narrative of how Maryam went to Rome in order to invoke the help of the Virgin before this, and had become a thing forgotten, and lost in oblivion. Possibly apocryphal gospels and the Kûhânic stories reveal a common folklore tradition. For such stories, cf. J. Robinson, *Muhammadan teaching about Jesus*, in *MW*, xxv (1939), 37-54, and idem, *Stories of Jesus and Mary*, in *MW*, xl (1950), 236-43.

Maryam in popular Muslim devotion.

Maryam is much venerated in Muslim folk tradition, often along with Fâtimâ (see above). Muslim women have taken her as an example and as a recourse in time of trouble, often visiting Christian shrines. Christian and Muslim traditions both honour her memory at Mâitiyâ near Cairo, and in Jerusalem. In Jerusalem is Hâmmâm Sitt Maryam (the bath of Maryam), near St. Stephen's Gate, where it was believed Maryam once bathed; the place would be visited by women seeking a cure for barrenness (R. Kris and H. Kriss-Henrich, *Volksgläube im Bereich des Islam*, i, Walfahrten und Heiligengewöhnung, Wiesbaden 1960, 169; T. Canaan, *Mohammedan saints and sanctuaries in Palestine*, in *Jabl. of the Palestinian Oriental Soc.*, iv/1-2 [1924], 1-84).

Some plants have been named after Maryam; (a) *Maryamiyya* or *Miriamyeh*, *Salvia triloba*, Labiatae, said to have acquired its sweet scent when Mary wiped her forehead with its leaves (T. Canaan, *Plant-lore in Palestinian superstition*, in *JPOS*, viii/3 [1928], 129-68). G.M. Crowfoot and L. Baldensperger, *From cedar to hyssop. A study of the folklore of plants in Palestine*, London 1932, describe the *Miriamiyya* or "Sage of Vertue", and mention references to it by earlier travelers in Palestine (79-81). (b) Kaff al-Âdhrâ, *Anastatica hierochuntia*, *Crucecere*, the dried seed-heads of which can last for years and are blown around the desert, the seeds germinating when water is available. The seed-head is thought to resemble a fist, hence the name; the kaff or "hand" is well-known as a protection against the evil eye [see KHAMSA]; it can be seen painted or carved, or worn as an amulet; generally known in Muslim circles as kaff Fâtima. This plant, however, has in time past been used not to avert the evil eye—though this concept may also have been present—but as a birth charm, soaked in water when a woman was in labour, and the water sometimes given to her to drink. Known as kaff Fâtima bint al-Nâsir or kaff Maryam, it was sold in Egypt (Crowfoot and Baldensperger, op. cit., 196; idem, *The Rose of Jericho*, in *JPOS*, xii/1 [1931], 7-14); Violet Dickson, *Wild flowers of Kuwait and Bahrain*, London 1955, 16, remarks on its frequency in Central Arabia. C. Delman, *Arbeit und Sitte in Palästina*, Gütersloh 1935, i, 54, for its location in Palestine. The plant can still be found, but its folk usage seems to have died out.


(A. J. WENSINCK - PENELLO JOHNSTONE)

MARZBAN-NAMA (also known in the Arabicised form Marzban-nāma), a work in Persian prose containing a variety of short stories used as moral examples and bound together by one major and several minor framework stories. It is essentially a work in Persian prose (or Malatī) and was dedicated to the Sālджuk sultan of many verses and phrases in Arabic. They were made several minor framework stories. It is essentially containing "wise counsels and useful directions for

...and the king and the vizier concerning his intentions, Warawīnī mentions in his official correspondence. Warawīnī mentions in his own work. Among these are the Makāmāt of Hamidi, lines of poetry have survived. Ibn Isfandiyar ascribes to Marzban a divān in Tabari verse called the Nikī-nāma.

The Marzban-nāma is mainly a collection of moralistic fables like the book of Kalīla wa-Dīmna, to which it is often compared. It also contains, however, tales in which animals play no part and anecdotes about ancient kings and philosophers. The major framework is provoking stories of a prince who, after the succession of his brother to the throne, wants to withdraw to a life of seclusion. At the request of the grandees of the state he agrees to compose a book containing "wise counsels and useful directions for the conduct of life in this world". Through this book the new king should be made aware of the wicked character of his vizier. In the course of a disputation with the king and the vizier concerning his intentions, the prince starts to tell a long series of stories.

The versions in classical Persian were both made by members of the caste of secretaries serving in the chancelleries of mediaeval Islamic states. Their principal aim was to transform a comparatively simple text into a model of the style which was current in official correspondence. Warawīnī mentions in his preface that works which are as close to his own work. Among these are the Makāmāt of Hamidi, historical texts, Ḇigha collections as well as other collections of tales.

The differences between the two versions are considerable. Warawīnī states that the original Marzban-nāma had nine chapters. In the Rauḍat al-'usūl, an additional chapter contains moral teachings of an Islamic nature which contrast with the rest of the book. The latter version has also many stories which are not present in the work of Warawīnī, who declares that he made a selection from the contents of the original. Houtsma suggested that the two adapters may have had access to different versions of the ancient text. The principal story is only in Warawīnī's case a true framework story, as Gabrieli noted, but it is impossible to make out whether this is conformable to the original design or not.

The Marzban-nāma of Warawīnī was rendered into Turkish by Sadr al-Dīn Sheykhoğlu in the second half of the 8th/14th century. The latter work was translated again into Arabic by Ibn 'Arabshāh [q. v.] in 852/1448 under the title Fikhaṭ al-kalīlāt wa-mufakhat al-zarāfīt. Another Turkish translation, also based on Warawīnī, is the Liiwer al-hik̲m of Urfali based on Warawīnī's work. Another Turkish translation, also based on Warawīnī, is the Liiwer al-hik̲m of Urfali Nūzhet 'Umar Efendi (d. 1291/1778).
by the Muslims in the Sāwād, along with that of the royal family. The great nobleman al-Hurmūzān is sometimes called a marzubān. However, in the early 7th century marzān was still used for the military governor of the frontier districts of al-Hira, Hadjar and the Djarīza, as well as for the governors of Bābil and Khūtarna andiyā and of Balad.

Arabic accounts of the Muslim conquest of Sasanian territories use marzāban for local leaders who organised the defence or concluded treaties at Anbar, al-Madhār/Maysan, Dast-i Maysan, Sūs, Iṣfāhān, Pakāy, Ardashīr/Ardušrāvāyī, Fās, Kirmān, Zarang/Sīdijīstān, Nishapūr, Tūs, Sarakhs and Marw. This may be due to the military nature of their activity or because some of them, such as al-Hurmūzān, were great nobles, and it need not be taken as a title in every case. Marzāban appears to have been used in a generic sense for the shahrdār of Fārs (just as Pāpak is called the marzān and shahrdār of Fārs in the Kār-nāmā), for the padghābān of Iṣfāhān, for the ispāhān of Sīdijīstān and for the kanārang of Khūrāsān. The Hepthātilh ruler of Ḥarāt, Bāḥdāq and Fūshāng is also called a marzāban. At Marw and Marw al-Rūd, marzāban survived as the title of local Iranian officials under Muslim rule, and in 1057/23 Muslim b. Sa’dī al-Kilābī appointed Bahrām Sīs as marzāban at Marw to collect taxes from the Zangīs who lived in its vicinity. Marzāban was also used for the local notables and the ispāhān of Tabaristān from the 1st/7th until the 3rd/9th century.

Meanwhile, Marzāban or Marzābān came to be used as a proper name, at first for powerful officials such as the second Persian governor of al-Yaman, al-Madhār b. Wahrīz. It is also said to have been the name of Dhu ’l-Karnayn, of a sword belonging to the Banū ‘Abī Ṭālib of Makkām and of a district north of Samarkand. Marzābānī was used as a woman’s name, and al-Marzābānī was used as a nisba for someone who had an ancestor named al-Marzāban. Marzāban was also used metaphorically in poetry for a ruler or master, or for a leader of the Magdūs; marzābān were compared to lions, and a lion was called “the marzāban of roaring” and marzābānī.


For Bēh Aramāyā, see G. Hoffmann, Auszüge aus syrischen Akten persischer Mätter, Leipzig 1880, 38, 485, 496; O. Braun, Ausgewählte Akten persischer Mätter, Wiesbaden 1913, 490-1; J. B. Baillot, Histoire orientale, Paris 1902, 532-3; A. Scher, Histoire nestorianne, ii, in PO, vii, 1905, 129, 154. For Fūshāng
Shāpur and the Euphrates, see Dinawari, al-Akhbār al-futūḥ, 51; Tabari, i, 839; Ibn ‘Abbālī, Ghurar, ed. Zonkerg, 529; Yākūt, Bdūn, i, 367–8, iii, 299. For Naṣīrīn and Āmid, see Chabot, 526–9, 523–7; W. Wright, The Chronicle of Joshua the Stylist, Cambridge 1882, 61–2; Scher, ii/1, 176, ii/2, in PO, xiii, 1919. For the marzubān as a late Sāsānīd military official, see Ya‘qūbī, Ta‘rīkh, i, 203; Tabari, i, 2037; Mafṣūdī, Mafṣūdī, ed. Dāghīr, i, 269, 287, 319 = §§ 545, 581, 647 and index; Ya‘qūbī, Ghurar, 643, 701; R. N. Frye, The golden age of Persia, London und New York 1972, 191 ff.

For the great marzubān, see Abū Yūsuf, Khwāsī, Paris 1921, 57; al-Mubarrad, al-Kāmil, Paris 1921, 57; al-Mubarrad, 118; Ibn al-Djawaliki, 364, 367; LA, xii, 406; Ibn Khallīkān, Mafṣūf, Beirut 1968, iii, 281.

For the marzubān as the governor of a local or frontier district in the early 7th century, see Markwart, Catalogue of the provincial capitals of Early Islam, Rome 1931, 14, 21; Baladhūrī, 78, 85, 242–43; Dinawari, 115; Tabari, i, 2019, 3037–9, 2184, 2191, 2202; Hamza al-Isfahānī, Ta‘rīkh al-muluk al-adw wa-l-tawḥīda, Beirut 1961, 96; Agapius of Manbijī, Kitāb al-‘Unwān al-‘Ummī, vii, 142, 459; Scher, ii/2, 546, 547, 548, 549.

For the use of marzubān in Arabic accounts of the conquest, see Nyberg, i, 1; Ibn Sa‘d, viii/3, 3; Baladhūrī, 310, 312, 313, 315, 325–6, 342, 386, 393, 404, 405–6, 409–8; Ya‘kūbī, Bdūn, tr. Les pays, Cairo 1937, 166; Dinawari, 121–4, 140; Tabari, i, 2385, 2386, 2638–9, 2887–90, ii, 1462, 1688; Ibn Isfandiyār, Tabaristan, Tehran 1912, i, 158; E.G. Browne, History of Tabaristan, abridged ed. Leiden und London 1905, 86, 101, 108, 113, 149; Yākūt, iv, 468; C. E. Bosworth, Sīnān under the Arabs, Rome 1968, 13, 15, 16–17; Frye, op. cit., 97.

For Marzubān as a proper name, see Ibn Hīshām, ed. Wüstenfeld, Göttingen 1858, 46, 197; Baladhūrī, 457; Baladhūrī, 105–6; Ibn Kutayba, ʿUyun al-akhbār, Cairo 1964, i, 179; Dinawari, 402; Iskākhī, 292, 323; Ibn Hawkal, ed. Leiden 1938–9, 468, 497, 499–500; Masdūq, ed. Mirdadī, 279; Ibn Miskawī, Taʿrikh al-umam, ed. Margoliouth and Amedroz, London 1921, i, 113; Ibn al-ʿAṯārī, v, 291; Ibn Khallīkān, iii, 281, iv, 354–6; F. Justi, Iranisches Namenbuch, Marburg 1895, 197–8. For its use in poetry, see Dāwjālī, 366–7; Ibn Khalaf, iv, 1987; Saʿdī, Buštāl, Vienna 1883, 73; ʿーシr, 143; Shūshīrī, 631–2. (J.H. Kramer - [M. Morony])

MARZUBĀN B. RUSTAM [see MARZBAN-NAMA]

AL-MARZUBĀNĪ ABū ʿUbayd Allāh Muḥam-
mad b. ʿImrān b. Muṣā b. Saʿīd b. ʿUbayd Allāh al-
Khurāsānī al-Baghdādī al-Kātib, was one of the
most versatile and prolific of Arab scholars in the
vast field of hadith and most of all in the well-known traditionists such as Abu Bakr Abd Allah b. Abl Dawud al-Sidjasti and hadith himself to the study of akhbār in Khurasan, and his father was deputy to the official, see Ya‘qūbī, Ta‘rīkh, x, 385), a narrow-
mined traditionalist. The latter accused the unorthodox and active scholar of being a drunkard, a Muʿtazili, an untrustworthy relater and—according to others—a liar. The last accusation is corrected by al-Khatīb with the remark that he was not a liar, but that it was the madhhab and riwaḍā which he followed. Both seemed ambiguous to the average intellect. Someone who published the akhbār of Abu Ḥanīfah alongside the akhbār of the Muʿtazila, or who collected the Shīʿī aṯār along the Shīʿī way of Yazīd b. Muʿawiyah, or who mingled the principle of iṣlaha with that of sama, could not possibly pass the rigid criteria of al-Khatīb. By the way it was the same tendency, that of form accepted by the guardians of tradition. Once these accusations, against a man who frequently moved in Shīʿī circles, had been taken up by the eloquent and influential Ibn al-Djawzī (d. 597/1200 [q.v.] ) (Muntazam, vii, 177) in Baghdad—at that time under the influence of Hanbalism—then a like judgment, more or less founded on prejudice, was decisive and emphatic. The reputation of the saḥīh akhbār wa-
rwaḍā li ʿl-ādāb, as al-Khatīb spoke of him, was thereby marred. The fact that the Al-Marzubānī’s contemporaries valued his works more than those of al-Djahīz [q.v.] or that his colleague in Baghdad, the well-known philologist Abu ’Alī al-Farisi (d. 377/987 [q.v.]) counted him, the younger of the two, amongst the maṣāḥif al-dunyad, could not improve his impaired reputation. His admirable—and admired—monu-
mental work was soon neglected and, later on, became almost completely obscured. This must have happened because it was not in agreement with the criteria of the customary forms of tradition and because people were prejudiced about the author.

Al-Marzubānī’s contemporary and admirer, the renowned bookseller in Baghdad, Ibn al-Nadim (d. 380/990 [q.v.]), has listed more than fifty titles, along with the number of folios and often with a short summary of the materials in his Kitāb al-Wafā‘ (London, 1888, 298–301, transl. Dodge, 289–95) of the year 377/987. The later bio-
bibliographers like Yākūt, Udbā‘, vii, 50 ff., Ibn al-
Kīfī, Inbāh, iii, 182 ff., and al-Saʿādi, Waḥf, iv,
2. Works. We know concerning al-Marzubāni’s 18-volume collection of biographies of scholars, the al-Mukhtabar fī ʾakhbār al-nuḥud wa ʾl-ʿudābāt wa ʾl-ʿasārāt wa ʾl-ʿulāmāt, that the autograph, consisting of over 3,000 folios, was kept in the library of the Nizâmiyya Madrasa, situated on the east bank of the Tigris. During the opening years of the 7th/13th century, two excerpts were made of this single manuscript, namely a mantakāb in four volumes and a mu$:khr in at least two volumes. In the middle of the same century, the Mantakāb was extracted into one volume, which has been preserved and bears the title Nūr al-kabas al-mukhabar min al-Mukhabar ( diarr. Die Gelehrtenbiographien des Abū ʿUbdallāh al-Marzubāni in der Rezension des Ḥafiz al-Yaγmūrī, ed. R. Selliheim, Teil I. Text. Wiesbaden-Beirut 1964 [Bibliotheca Islamica, 23a]). It contains 125—of about 150 in all—biographies, hence approximately only one-fifth of the original version. The compiler, the Mu$:khr, in which the first only the part has survived, has not as yet been published. The traditions in this volume which, as a rule, begin with an ʾinsād, only partially correspond to those in the Nūr al-kabas. The compiler diverges considerably, in the sequence of the 33 biographies as well as in the transmission within the individual biography. He has access to or uses the Nūr al-kabas, but extracts, which only the first part has survived, has not as yet been published. The traditions in this volume which, as a rule, begin with an ʾinsād, only partially correspond to those in the Nūr al-kabas. The compiler diverges considerably, in the sequence of the 33 biographies as well as in the transmission within the individual biography. He has access to or uses the Nūr al-kabas, but extracts, which only the first part has survived, has not as yet been published. The traditions in this volume which, as a rule, begin with an ʾinsād, only partially correspond to those in the Nūr al-kabas. The compiler diverges considerably, in the sequence of the 33 biographies as well as in the transmission within the individual biography. He has access to or uses the Nūr al-kabas, but extracts, which only the first part has survived, has not as yet been published.

(2) His K. al-Muwashshah fimaʾdkhidh al-ʿulāmāt ʾalāʾ ʾl-ʿasārāt consisted of 300 folios according to the bibliography of Ibn al-Nadim. It exists in its complete form and in two editions: Cairo 1343/1924 and ed. ʿAlī Muhammad al-Bidjawi, Cairo 1965. In this delightful piece of ṣaḥīḥ writing, an anthology compiled under the aspect of critical standard-biography based on those of the Nūr al-kabas, is quoted from the Autograph, completed, comprises three sheets, hence approximately 10,000 folios; cf. ʿShīrīyat al-Marzubānī b. Sūfyan, collected and edited by ʿAlī Muhammad al-Bidjawi, Beirut 1982. Bibliography (in addition to the works mentioned in the article): Brockelmann, S I, 190 f. S III, 1217; F. Krenkow, in Islamica, iv (1930), 272-82; O. Rescher, Abriss der arabischen Literaturgeschichte, ii, 264; Zakaria, Tām, viii, 210; Kahlbā, xi, 97 f. (R. Selliheim)

(3) His K. Mu$:muʾāṣ fī asmāʾ al-ʾazṣaʾ originally consisted of 1,000 folios with the infamous verses of about 5,000 poets, arranged in alphabetical order. Only the second half has been preserved, and that moreover with numerous omissions and lacunae. It exists in two editions: ed. F. Krenkow, Cairo 1354/1935, repr. Beirut 1402/1982 and ed. Ṭab,āʾ al-Ṣattār Ṣāḥib Farādī, Cairo 1379/1960; cf. Ibrahim al-Ṣamarrī, Min al-ḥādīt min Mu$:muʾāṣ al-ʾazṣaʾ li ʾl-Marzubānī, Beirut 1404/1984.

(4) His K. Ṭab ʿal-nisāʾ is supposed to have included 500 or 600 folios. Ṭab al-Ṣattār al-Baghdādī (d. 1303/1682) still quoted from it in his Khāṣṣāt al-ṣaḥāb, i, 10, and iv, 565. In an old manuscript, 59 folios of the third part are preserved and contain ʾakhbār and verses by almost 60 women, members of sixteen different ancient Arabian tribes. The fragment was published by Sāmī Makī al-ʿAnī and Khīlāl Nādirī, Baghdād 1396/1976.

(5) The ʾAghfār al-naṣīṣ is still quoted from it in his Khāṣṣāt al-ṣaḥāb, i, 10, and iv, 565. In an old manuscript, 59 folios of the third part are preserved and contain ʾakhbār and verses by almost 60 women, members of sixteen different ancient Arabian tribes. The fragment was published by Sāmī Makī al-ʿAnī and Khīlāl Nādirī, Baghdād 1396/1976.
and is characterised by the fact that the author adds to the traditional ideas gathered by the rauât in the Arabic peninsula and put in order by philologists of the Ibn Kurayba type, more general concepts and ideas in which outside pieces of information, which are used to make instructive comparisons, are also taken into account.

Bibliography: Given in the article.

(Ch. Pellat)

**MAŠA’il WA-ADJWIBA**

(a.), "questions and answers", a technique of argumentation in mediaeval Islam. The pattern of question (su‘îl, pl. su‘îlat, as‘îla) and answer (jawâb, pl. jawâbi, ājwiba) has strongly influenced, both in form and content, numerous Arabic writings in virtually all fields of knowledge. Unsolved problems, or questions and objections propounded by a third person, are followed by answers or explanations and refutations. Sometimes the author, at the request of a third person, composed a monograph on a group of themes, and even dedicated it to him. Besides, the pattern of questions and answers often became a literary topos: as a justification for his work, the author, in his introduction, advances the plea that he composed it because of solicitations and requests of another person (Freimark, 36 ff.). Finally, the pattern also turned into a kind of research or presentation, without any dialogue between teacher and pupil or between two opponents. Ancient and Patristic-Byzantine literature shows parallels with these structures: cf. έρωτήσεις, ἀποκρίσεις, ἡμιτονήσεις, λοιςες, προβλήματα and the Byzantine έρωτοποιήσεις, in evidence since the 12th century A.D. The mediaeval questions et responsiones also belong to this genre. Since the pattern may have sprung from motives which are inherent in the matter, external influence from similarly-structured works of Christian origin or from Aristotelian-Peripatetic methodology (cf. Aristotelis, *Metaphysics*, iii, 1; *Prior and posterior analytics*, *Topics*) can only be proved after study of each individual case.

The oldest Islamic questions-and-answer literature endeavours to solve philological and textual problems of the Kur'ān text. Mention may here be made of the answers given by 'Umar to questions about kiya ʿār, i‘rāb, tanzil and meanings (ma‘āni) of the Kur’ān (Abbott, 110), and of the Masâ’il (su‘ölät) of the Khâridji leader Nâfi' b. al-Azraq (d. 65/685) on 200 difficult words in the Kur’ān, to which ʿAbd Allâh b. ʿAbbâs answered with references to ancient Arabic poetry. This philological interest, especially present in the oldest Kur’ān exegesis, increasingly made way for textual interpretation as a source of Islamic law and as a starting-point of Islamic theology. Thus there have come down to us masâ’il collections of Mâlik b. Anas and Ahmad b. Hanbal [q.v.], containing answers to legal, dogmatic and ethical questions, transmitted and partly edited by their pupils. Probably the most important masâ’il collection of Ahmad b. Hanbal comes from al-Khâlidî (d. 311/923) and is called Kitâb al-Qâmî ʿl-ladâl al-Masâ’il or (al-Musâdil min masâ’il ʿl-Abd b. Hanbal). Its aim is to give answers on legal questions culminates in the development of the Islamic institution of the fitây, the act of giving a fatwâ [q.v.]. This institution can be compared with Roman jus respondendi; as Goldzihler has shown, it has influenced Jewish circles.

On the basis of Kur’ānic texts, an apologetic literature was developed which tried to prove the superiority of Islam by means of the question-answer pattern. An example is the Kitâb al-Masâ’il attributed to ʿAbd Allâh b. Salâm (d. 43/663–4), a Jew from Medina, and probably composed by a Jewish renegade. It consists of a collection of questions put before the Prophet, at whose answers and explanations the theory is said to have been converted to Islam. The work is based on a scholastic principle which appears in an already developed stage in the disputation of Leontius of Byzantium (d. ca. 543) with the heretics. Reaching back to Aristotelian dialectics, this Aristotelian, influenced by Neo-Platonism, was familiar with the scholastic technique of question and refuting answer (cf. Grabmann, i, 104 ff., 107 f.). It is conceivable that Leontius' contest with the Nestorians, which was to be continued and which, more than 200 years later, reached a climax in John of Damascus and, after him, in Theodorus Abû Kurra (cf. Griffith, *Controversial theology*, 33 ff.), favoured in Syrian circles the development of a similar scholastic technique. Through disputations and polemics between Christians and converts to Islam, this technique may have become known to Islamic circles and have been accepted as a stimulating example in the practice of Islamic disputation (cf. Cook, *Origins*). The pattern of question (in the form of a conditional clause) and refuting answer or argument (hûdjâja) (often presented in the form of a main clause expressing an irredeem) is already found in al-Hasan b. al-Ḥanâfiyyâ (d. ca. 100/718), MS Leiden Or. 2523, f. 64v-65r (ed. Hayek; cf. Griffith, *Anmâr*, 149 ff.), a defence of Christian doctrine against the Muʿtazila by the Christian apologist ʿAmâr b. ʿAbd Allâh (first half of the 3rd/9th century). The principle of thesis and antithesis used here follows the tradition of the Christian Aristotelians, and marked the apologetic literature of Christian converts to Islam. One may compare al-Hasan b. Ayyûb (4th/10th century) in Ibn Taymiyya (*al-Daâbûq*, ii, 318, 319 in fine, etc.). Moreover, the question-answer pattern is also found in the exegesis of the Kûrânic literature of Islam, as well as in its learned literature in general.

At an early stage, debates with opponents from their own circles took the place of disputes with non-Islamic doctrines. One may quote the above-mentioned refutation of the Kadariyya by al-Hasan b. Muhammad b. al-Ḥanâfiyya; the debate on knowledge (maʿrîţa) inside the Muʿtazila as related by al-Dhâbiḥ (d. 255/868–9) in his Maṣâ’il wa l-ʿājwiba fi l-maʿrîţa; the discussion on the theodicy problem between al-Nazzâm, ʿAli al-Awsâwî, Abu ʿl-Hudhayl, Bighr b. al-Muʿtamîr, al-Mudîrî, al-ʿAṣbaḥî, al-ʾIsâkî and Dja ʿfar b. Har (see Daiber, *Muʿammâr*, 260 f.), noted down in a protocol by ʿAbd al-ʿAîr b. Tâhir al-Baghîdârî (d. 196/718), shorter version in al-Mîlîd, 136,11-138,3); and also the protocol of a discussion on the Kur'ān between the Hanâbî Ibn ʿAbd al-Muxaddis and an Arâfî opponent from Damascus (ms. Leiden Or. 2523), which took place between 589/1193 and 595/1199. This protocol, rewritten as an independent theological treatise (ms. Manisa 6584-5), clearly shows the traces of the tradi-
The Islamic technique of disputation is directly linked to the questions discussed (cf. Van Ess, Beginnings) and in particular cases, Christian peripatetic examples of perhaps Syriac origin may have been followed (cf. Cook, Origins). Like Judaco-Christian Hellenism (see Van Ess, Disputationspraxis, 54 ff.), Islam in the sphere of disputation developed a technique which became more and more the pattern of scientific treatises. In Ibn Sai’s works (see Ullmann in the Maghrib, there was even compiled a handbook of theological disputation, the Kitâb al-Dhâjâlîdâh, whose actual form (terminus ante quern 5th/11th century) certainly contains older material (Van Ess, Untersuchungen, 43 ff.). The question-answer pattern has become here a didactic principle, used to prepare future missionaries for their task. Later, this technique was elaborated in the so-called djalâl literature, developed under the influence of the Organon of Aristotle, and intended to teach Islamic theologians as well as jurists the art of dialectic discussion. One may compare the Hanbalis Ibn ‘Askil (see G. Makdisi, Scholastic method, 650 ff.; idem, Dialectic) or Ibn Surur al-Makdisi, whose Kitâb al-Djalâl (composed ca. 605/1209) has been preserved in manuscript (ms. Berlin 5319, fols. 7a-32). Makdisi has called attention to the resemblance between Ibn ‘Askil and the sic et non method used by Peter Abelard (Scholastic method, 648 f., 657 ff.; revised in Ruse, 253 ff.). It remains to be proved in detail whether the method of Abelard (see for this, Grabmann, ii, 200 ff.) and his predecessors offers more than “mere parallels”, and whether its origin is due to Arabic models (Makdisi). In medical literature, the question-answer pattern served an exclusively didactic purpose, namely the transmission of specific knowledge. The al-Masâ’il al-‘îthâbiyya, or al-Masâ’il ‘îthâbî, of Hunayn b. Ishâq [q.v.], preserved also in Syriac and Latin, which summarises in catechetical form the most important medical knowledge (see Ullmann, Medizin, 117 f.; idem, Natur- und Geheimwissenschaften, 450), became wide-spread. In medical education in Egypt and in the East, the orality of Hippocrates was summarised in the same way by Hunayn (see Ullmann, Medizin, 117, 206). For other medical handbooks in the question-answer pattern, see ibid., 110, 166, 209, etc. From the fields of philosophy, physics and logic, mention may be made of the Masâ’il al-mutâfarrîka of al-Fârâbî, and of the anonymous Syriac collection of definitions (ed. Furlani). From such didactical question-answer books it is only one step to the hadîd (definition) literature [q.v.] which could fall back on classical models (see Fuhrmann, part ii). Examples are al-Kindî’s Kitâb al-Hudud al-adâgh 3 wa- rustimikâh, and Ibn Sinâ’s Kitâb al-Hudud. Like in Syriac (cf. Baumstark, 131 ff.; Daiber, Bar Ze’bi), traditions of Greek-Hellenistic dhairesis literature may have been of influence here.

To the list of the above-mentioned works, which might be divided into question-answer literature of “diallectical” and “didactical” character, should certainly be added the Arabic-Greek tradition of the Problemata physica (al-Masâ’il al-‘îthâbiyya). The Problemata physica study the reasons and causes (fikâ 2î) of phenomena in nature, and often use the following paradox: “Why does phenomenon X have the effect Y, but does phenomenon Xa not have the effect Ya’?” The very treatment of the tradition of the Greek texts (see Flashar, 297 ff.) is reflected in the Arabic material (see, for the time being, Ullmann, Medizin, 92-6; idem, Natur- und Geheimwissenschaften, 458; Daiber, in Gnomon, xli [1970], 545 f.; Sezgin, iii, 50; v, vii, 216; on further mass., see Daiber, Graeco-Arabische und Philologische_ImageLibrarian archives. Numerous Arabic collections of the Problemata, ascribed to Aristotle, are closely related to the Problematia inedita, ascribed to Alexander of Aphrodisias, while others appear to be extracts from the Problemata physica, ascribed to Aristotle (cf. e.g. Book x in ms. 2234 of Tehran University, and see for this R. Kruk). The only, almost complete, manuscript of Hunayn b. Ishāq’s Arabic translation in 17 makâlîdâh (mentioned also by Ibn Abi Umayyâbî’s [q.v.] in his History of Physicians, is ms. Manisa 1790/3; an edition of the Arabic text, with its translation in Hebrew, is in preparation. The Arabic text goes back to a Greek original, which was definitely more complete than the Greek text known so far. Moreover, Syriac (Job of Edessa, 769-835 A.D.) and Arabic (Bâlinâs, at the turn of the 8th century A.D.) traditions seem to have utilised collections of the Problemata of Greek origin, which have not been preserved (cf. Weisser, 55 ff., 210, 215). For the Problemata, which have not been identified so far, and which, in the Arabic texts, are ascribed to Theophrastus, Proclus and Galen, see Ullmann, op. cit. The Problemata physica are often quoted and commented upon in Arabic: Rhazes, Kustâ b. Lûkâ, “Abd al-La’îf al-Baghdâdi [Makdisi]). An example is the change of ideas between Frederick II of Hohenstaufen and the Orient. In his 1178 A.D. youthful letters to his scholars from Damascus (ed. Daiber, Briefe), Ibn Ya’âshî (d. 643/1245) answers fourteen questions on logic, physics and metaphysics asked by Ibn Abî Shâ’d b. ‘Uglmân b. Sa’îd al-Mawâlî (see Endress, 97 f.); the Bûyîd vizier Abu 1- Fadîl Ibn al-Amîd (d. 360/970) informs A’dal al-Dawla [q.v.], at the latter’s request, on all sorts of questions on human physiology, i.e. Ri’sâl, has become known (Sezgin, iii, 203) and published (by al- ‘Azzâwî) under the title al-Muhâsîbârî fî ‘îthâbî baynahu wa-bayna Nâshirîn. The text is one of the numerous examples in which the question-answer pattern serves only to transmit knowledge, and thus has a didactic purpose. The master, the scholar, answers questions of a pupil, someone who tries to find information, but whose name is often not mentioned. This transmission of knowledge occasionally takes the form of learned correspondence. Thus the Christian Yahyâ b. 2îrî (d. 974 A.D.) answers fourteen questions on logic, physics and metaphysics asked by Ibn Abî Sa’îd b. ‘Uglmân b. Sa’îd al-Mawâlî (see Endress, 97 f.); the Bûyîd vizier Abu 1- Fadîl Ibn al-Amîd (d. 360/970) informs A’dal al-Dawla [q.v.], at the latter’s request, on all sorts of questions on natural science in letters, preserved in manuscript (‘Irâk Museum, Baghdad 594; a different text in ms. Leiden Or. 184) (see Daiber, Briefe), Ibn Ya’âshî (d. 643/1245) answers grammatical questions put before him by a group of scholars from Damascus (ed. R. Sellheim). A famous example is the change of ideas between Frederick II of Hohenstaufen and the Orient. In his Adâjîbâ ‘an al-‘âbîta al-‘alâbiyya (cf. Kattoura 42 f.; al-Tafâzzi, 308 ff. 283 al-‘adâjîbâ fi mutâtima tawhîdîyya, Kuwait 1972), Ibn al-Haylîmâ, Fâhkî al-Dîn al-Râzî û ‘îsâ b. Mâssa. To this can be added the adaptations of two different collections of Problemata by Abu 1- Farâdî b. al-Tayyib in ms. Nurusmâniye 3610 (new number 3095), written before 1076/1665: fol. 1b-21b (Alex- ander of Aphrodisias) and fols. 22a-33b (Aristotle). Moreover, there is the short extract (starting with Aristotle, Problemata physica, ii, 3) in ms. Princeton 2988 by Sulaymân b. Ahmad, not further known.

Not related to the Problemata physica is the Ri’sâl fî ‘î- ar’î ‘al-‘af a’ 2îyya (ms. Washington, Army Medical Library A 82), a question-answer discussion, possibly fictitious, between al-Hârîth b. Kalâda [q.v. in Suppl.] (an older contemporary of the Prophet) and the Sâsànî ruler Kûsrâ Anûnhîrân on practical questions of human physics, ii, 144. Ri’sâl has become known (Sezgin, iii, 203) and published (by al- ‘Azzâwî) under the title al-Muhâsîbârî fî ‘îthâbî baynahu wa-bayna Nâshirîn. The text is one of the numerous examples in which the question-answer pattern serves only to transmit knowledge, and thus has a didactic purpose. The master, the scholar, answers questions of a pupil, someone who tries to find information, but whose name is often not mentioned. This transmission of knowledge occasionally takes the form of learned correspondence. Thus the Christian Yahyâ b. 2îrî (d. 974 A.D.) answers fourteen questions on logic, physics and metaphysics asked by Ibn Abî Sa’îd b. ‘Uglmân b. Sa’îd al-Mawâlî (see Endress, 97 f.).
tr. M. Grignaschi), and the categories, the soul and the difference, in this subject, between Aristotle and his commentator Alexander of Aphrodisias. In his Kitāb al-Itibār fī-r-ci tadhkihu ʿl-abṣār, preserved in manuscript (Brockelmann, i, 385), the Egyptian scholar al-Kārīf reports on physico-astronomical and physiological-optical questions which Frederick II put before the Arab scientist Kamāl al-Dīn b. Yūnus (tr. Wiedemann). The texts mentioned show the extent of the scientific relations of Frederick II with the Orient (see also Suter).

As against the geographers who preceded them, they were for the most part travellers who, to the data already taken traditionally by their predecessors from

For the most part, the works of the Arab geographers have been published. The most recent and comprehensive is M. Ullman, Die Abhandlung des Abu Hâmîd al-Gazzâlî. Antworten al-Masâlik wa 'l-Mamâlik, present common characteristics. Nevertheless, not all those whom, in his eyes, constitute this genre were given the title which has been retained, and furthermore, the K. al-Masâlik wa 'l-mamâlik which is perhaps the oldest, that of Ibn Khurrodadbih (d. between 272 and 367/885 and 977), then as a group, the K. al-Sawar al-ard of al-Balqhi (d. 322/934), the K. al-Masâlik wa 'l-mamâlik of al-Idnîsî who (269, n. 1) "hardly do anything more than complete the data of the Masâlik wa 'l-mamâlik", does not seem to have come to light. A. Miquel, who often cites the Masâlik wa 'l-mamâlik (in La géographie humaine du monde musulman, i, Paris 1967, 2nd ed. 1973, index), devotes to this genre a fairly long chapter (267-330) which he entitles "l'advent of genuine human geography" and in which he studies separately the works of al-Istakhri and Ibn Hawkal, adds to Blâchère's list the K. al-Masâlik wa 'l-mamâlik of al-Muhallabî (d. 380/990) and simply mentions al-Bakri and al-Idnîsî who (269, n. 1) "hardly do anything more than complete the data of the masâlik works for Spain and the Maghrib".

Leaving aside the two latter ones cited, all the authors illustrative of the genre isolated by Blâchère are easterners living at the end of the 3rd/9th century or in the 4th/10th one, i.e. in a period when the Shî'a movement began to enjoy some remarkable successes. As against the geographers who preceded them, they were for the most part travellers who, to the data already taken traditionally by their predecessors from treatises of cosmography and geography based directly or indirectly on Greek science and particularly on Polýmê (see Baylamûs), and to the information relating to the routes, distant lands and peoples who inhabit them that they could derive from
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Regarding the form given to these works, these authors (with the exception of al-Idrīsī) do not follow the geographical literature that has established the division of the world into climates [see ʿiklīm], but distinguish large regions, roughly corresponding to the mazālik [see mamlakā], within which they describe the routes that they traverse, their localities and the men who live there.

"The authors of whom we are about to speak," writes Blācher [Extrait, 115], "are concerned purely with description. All their attention is directed to the recording of the general features of a country, assessing how the details relating to each place, in the past, bear on their present life. All this is no doubt written down in a generally monotonous style". However, this genre assumes a literary aspect which contrasts with the dryness of the administrative manuals, without giving as important a place to adāb as do a Dājjāz or an Ibīn al-Fakhī, just as it avoids the fables and marvellous accounts of certain other travellers who had the opportunity to go beyond the borders of the Islamic empire. Nevertheless, the eastern authors of the group do not know the Christian world and even have a poor acquaintance with the Muslim West, with the exception of Ibn Hawkal whose work constitutes, on certain points, a unique historical source, for his chapters on the Maghrib, Spain and Sicily can be regarded as original. Generally, history in these works occupies a place which is not negligible, but it is doubtless the sedentary al-Baḵrī who supplies in this regard the most information, while al-Idrīsī, who questioned, at the court of the Normans of Sicily, some travellers and Christian pilgrims, is quite well-informed on the routes, towns and states of Europe, not to mention the fact that he himself navigated the length of the coasts.

It was with a purely didactic purpose that Blācher marked out from the rest of the geographical literature the concept of mazālik wa ʿl-mamālik, or geographical works of various written or oral sources, now added first-hand documentation gathered in the regions that they describe. In this regard, a passage of the Kitāb al-arḍ of Ibn Hawkal is very revealing; for it presents a totally characteristic layout [see Blācher, Extrait, 110-1; Ar. text in the 2nd ed. of the Sūrat al-arḍ, 329, and Fr. tr. Kramers-Wiet, almost identical to that of Blācher, i, pp. IX-X and ii, 321-2).

The most famous member of the family, sought for ʿĀshīa at the battle of the Camel (allegedly already then at commander of the Bakr b. Wāʾil and threw in his lot with the Umayyads thereafter [al-Tabārī, i, 3179, 3220 f.; ii, 765 f.]), in the civil war which broke out at the death of Yazīd b. Muʿawīya, he negotiated the alliance (hilf [q.v.]) between the Bakr b. Wāʾil and Aṣīd in Basra and played a major role in the subsequent feud between these two tribes and the Ṭāmīn (668-675), emerging as the undisputed leader of the Bakr b. Wāʾil, whom he later conducted in battle against al-Mukhtar in 67/668-67 ([al-Tabārī, i, 448 ff., 720, 726; al-Baladhurī, Anāb, ibv, 105 ff.; v, 253, 259). Having joined the pro-Umayyad Dūfriyya, a group of Basrans who unsuccessfully tried to oust Muḥammad ibn Basra in 69/689 or 70/689-90 (not 71/690-1, as stated by C. A. Pellegrino, ii, s.v. Mīṣmāʾī), he fled to the Yamama, but returned on ʿAbd al-Malik b. Ṭārīq’s reconquest of Ṭārīq in 72/691. He died shortly thereafter (al-Tabārī, ii, 799 ff.; al-Baladhurī, Anāb, ibv, 156 ff.; 160 ff.; Pellegrino, Mīṣmāʾī, 270). His brothers Makṭūbī b. Mīṣmāʾī and ʿĀshībī b. Mīṣmāʾī were also men of some prominence (for references, see Crone, loc. cit.).

Under the Marwānids, the family retained its leadership of the Bakr. Ṣībīl and, on the whole, its Umayyad sympathies. Thus Nūḥ b. Ṣlaybān b. Mīṣmāʾī commanded the khums [q.v.] of Bakr b. Wāʾil against the Muḥallabīds in Basra in 101/720 (al-Tabārī, ii, 1580), while other members of the family were at various times governors of Fāṣā and Dārāb-gīrī, Sīstān and Sind (Crone, op. cit., 117 f.). But they played no role in the third civil war or the ʿAbbāsid revolution.

In the caliphate of al-Mahdī, ʿAbd al-Malik b. Ṣīlābān b. Mīṣmāʾī commanded a naval expedition to Sind and acted as deputy governor there for a short while (al-Tabārī, iii, 460 f.; 476 f., 491). Yet, unlike the Muḥallabīds or the Kūṭaybīds, also Basran families of major importance in the Umayyad period, the Māṣamīʿīs failed to effect a political comeback under the ʿAbbāsids.

Bibliography: Practically all chronicles dealing with the Umayyad period have something to say about the Māṣamīʿīs. The most important references are given in the article, to which however should be added Ibn Ḥazm, Qanāḥa, ed. Hārūn, 29 f. (P. Crone)
ians from the Umayyad period who are known by name, and probably the first to translate a work into Arabic. So far, endeavours to identify and date him have been unsuccessful. He is said to have been of Judeo-Persian origin and to have lived in Baṣra. Occasionally he is indicated as a Syrian (ṣūrānī), which is probably to be explained by the translation which he allegedly made from Syriac into Arabic of the Kannāš (kwānūṣ, kwān) of Aḥrun [q.v. in Suppl.], translated into Syriac by a certain Gosios. According to Ibn Djulduj [q.v.], this was done under the caliphs Marwān (64/978-85) or ʿUmar b. ʿAbd al-Ḥādī. This, according to Masāwr, was doubtless copied by Cosmas Indicopleustes who visited the area in 177 A.C., mentions on this coast the port of Saba, identified with the Biblical Seba of the Bible. The actual port, is mentioned in the famous inscription carved in the port of Adulis about 240 B.C. at the time of Ptolemy III Epiphanes (246-221 B.C.), whose name is derived from Ethiopic mesu-wa “cry, loud call”. A fisherman from Dahlak, driven by a storm to the then inhabited island, is said to have related that its size was such that a man, shouting in a high voice (sauw), could make himself heard from one end to the other (Conti Rossi, Il Gadda Filipso, 162). According to another version (Conti Rossi, Documenti, 16; cf. Esteves Pereira, História de Minas, 62), Ethiopian caravan leaders, arriving at Djärar, had to cry aloud for the barks of the island to come and fetch them. The island is in fact one km. long and ca. 250 m. wide.

The Masawa region, known as Samhar, may have been visited as early as the third millennium B.C. when Egyptian ships sailed down the Red Sea. It became better known in history when the Greek Ptolemies developed a series of stations along the African coast [see also, 1876]. Djärar, the region, is mentioned in the famous inscription carved in the port of Adulis about 240 B.C. at the time of Ptolemy III Euergetes (246-221 B.C.), and copied by Cosmas Indicopleustes who visited the area about 525 A.D. (M.Crindle, The Christian topography, 57). Armadores of Ephesus (ca. 100 B.C.), whose work is known through extracts by Strabo (ca. 20 B.C.), mentions on this coast the port of Sabah, identified with Djärar by Conti Rossi (Storia, 60, 103; Comenti e notezze, 17). In connection with Adulis, now Zula, the region is also mentioned in the well-known Periplus of the Erythraean Sea (tr. Schoff, 22-3, cf. 60). This Aksumite port in the gulf of the same name must have ceased to function somewhere about the middle of the first millennium A.D. (Kammerer, Essai, ch. 5), and its rôle may then have been taken over by another, presumably larger port, by Masawa, lying about 30 miles to the north. In early Islam, Masawa is mentioned as a place of exile and thus considered by Conti Rossi (Storia, 212), as being in Muslim hands. Because of his love of wine, the Arab poet Abū Bihjān [q.v.] was banished “from Umar to Bāṣīr” in 14/634 (Caetani, Annali, v, 224 ff.; Brockelmann, 1, 40, 21, 701; Conti Rossi, Documenti, 212). At the death of Marwān, the last Umayyad caliph, his son ʿAbd Allāh, on his flight to Djudda, arrived at Bāṣīr (al-Masaw, Tanbih, 330).
According to al-Mas'ūdī, who wrote in the 4th/10th century, the coastal plains, and consequently Masawwā', were tributary to Ethiopia, and Bāḏī lay on the littoral of al-ma'sūd, “the mind”, the territory of the Bedja [g.v.]. If by this term the hinterland of Masawwā' is meant (Bāḏī is not to be identified with Badi or Afīr island lying further north, see Crowfoot, *Some Red Sea ports*), al-Mas'ūdī indicates that the Bedja were working the Eritrean gold mines (Conti Rossini, *Storia*, 278) and that the port played a role in the gold traffic.

During the 6th-8th/12th-14th centuries, Masawwā' is under the sovereignty of the amir of Dahlab, who called himself sulṭān. The Ethiopians, however, as in the time when the amir depended on Aksum, continued to indicate him as sīyūna bāhīr “prefect of the sea”, in opposition to the bāh bāhīr “ruler of the sea [-province]”, who resided at Debārāwā (Debaroa).

Relations between Ethiopia and the naʿūb of the amir at Masawwā' must have been uneasy, at least occasionally, as may be concluded from the capture of the port by Isaak, son of Negus Dawit I (1381-1410). In the 10th/16th century still, the sovereignty of Masawwā' was linked to that of Dahlab (de Barros, *Decada*, ii, i. viii, ch. 1; Basset, *Inscriptions*; Esteves Pereira, *Os Portugueses*) The (Is) di ma's(u) on Fra Mauro’s map is perhaps identical with Masawwā' (Kammerer, *La Mer Rouge*, iii,5, 20). An impression of the commercial activity in this and other ports on both sides of the Red Sea in the early 16th century can be gained from Ludovico di Varthema (*Travels*, 31, 37-8). Andrea Corsali (*Historale description*, 32-3), Tomé Pires (*Sama oriental*, 43) and Duarte Barbosa (*The Book*, 16). According to the author of the *Cartas das novas* (Thomas, *Discovery of Abyssinia*, 67), there was a large number of boats at anchor at Masawwā', including two from Gudjarat, when he arrived there in 1521. Soon, however, foreign trade in the Horn of Africa was to suffer severely from the Portuguese interference with local commerce. The discovery and development of the trade route round Cape of Good Hope, Ahmad Grā'ī’s invasion of the highlands [see Ḥabash, Ḥabashu] and the emergence of Turkish influence in the Red Sea caused the decline of Masawwā', which remained however the main port of Ethiopia.

When a Portuguese exploratory mission landed in Masawwā' in 1520, the town was completely Muslim. According to Álvarez (Beckingham-Huntingford, *The Prester John*, i, 58), the Portuguese transformed the mosque into a church, but did not occupy the port, although the Ethiopian king Lebna Dengel strongly wished them to build a fortress there. However, the Ethiopian king Lebna Dengel strongly tried to prevent the Portuguese from building a fortress there, which remained however the main port of Ethiopia for Western missionaries until 1520, when it was completely Muslim. According to Álvarez (Beckingham-Huntingford, *The Prester John*, i, 58), the Portuguese transformed the mosque into a church, but did not occupy the port, although the Ethiopian king Lebna Dengel strongly wished them to build a fortress there. However, the Ethiopian king Lebna Dengel strongly tried to prevent the Portuguese from building a fortress there. The Portuguese, however, as in the time when the amir depended on Aksum, continued to indicate him as sīyūna bāhīr “prefect of the sea”, in opposition to the bāh bāhīr “ruler of the sea [-province]”, who resided at Debārāwā (Debaroa).

Relations between Ethiopia and the naʿūb of the amir at Masawwā' must have been uneasy, at least occasionally, as may be concluded from the capture of the port by Isaak, son of Negus Dawit I (1381-1410). In the 10th/16th century still, the sovereignty of Masawwā' was linked to that of Dahlab (de Barros, *Decada*, ii, i. viii, ch. 1; Basset, *Inscriptions*; Esteves Pereira, *Os Portugueses*) The (Is) di ma's(u) on Fra Mauro’s map is perhaps identical with Masawwā' (Kammerer, *La Mer Rouge*, iii,5, 20). An impression of the commercial activity in this and other ports on both sides of the Red Sea in the early 16th century can be gained from Ludovico di Varthema (*Travels*, 31, 37-8). Andrea Corsali (*Historale description*, 32-3), Tomé Pires (*Sama oriental*, 43) and Duarte Barbosa (*The Book*, 16). According to the author of the *Cartas das novas* (Thomas, *Discovery of Abyssinia*, 67), there was a large number of boats at anchor at Masawwā', including two from Gudjarat, when he arrived there in 1521. Soon, however, foreign trade in the Horn of Africa was to suffer severely from the Portuguese interference with local commerce. The discovery and development of the trade route round Cape of Good Hope, Ahmad Grā'ī’s invasion of the highlands [see Ḥabash, Ḥabashu] and the emergence of Turkish influence in the Red Sea caused the decline of Masawwā', which remained however the main port of Ethiopia.

When a Portuguese exploratory mission landed in Masawwā' in 1520, the town was completely Muslim. According to Álvarez (Beckingham-Huntingford, *The Prester John*, i, 58), the Portuguese transformed the mosque into a church, but did not occupy the port, although the Ethiopian king Lebna Dengel strongly wished them to build a fortress there (*ibid.*, i, 479 ff.). The information of the “*Zorz Itineraries*” (Crawford, *Ethiopian itineraries*, 90, 159), according to which king David (= Lebna Dengel) gave the port to the Portuguese, may refer to the mission of 1520, to some negotiations by the Portuguese, or to mere rumour. According to Álvarez (*op. cit.*, Appendix iv; Bruce, *Travels*, iii, 54; Beccari, *Rerum*, index s.v. *Maçuq*). In 1693 the naʿūb Mūsā b. ʿAmir b. Ḥunnī tried to use extortion against the Armenian merchant Khōdār Murād, who had returned from the Dutch East Indies with gifts for the Ethiopian king. When Ḥunnī refused to pay, his goods were confiscated. King Lyāsū I ordered the delivery of foodstuffs to Masawwā' to be suspended, and started preparations to attack the naʿūb, who then submitted (Van Donzel, *op. cit.*, 83). According to the French traveller Charles Jacques Poncet (ca. 1700, see Foster, *The Red Sea*, 154), the fortress in Masawwā' was not very strong, and the arrival of an English vessel “cast terror into the whole island”. On learning of the arrival of this ship at Masawwā', the Ethiopian monks made a disturbance before the palace in Gondar, probably fearing a punitive expedition from what they thought to be Portuguese. Poncet also relates that the Pāṣa received him with great civility, at the recommendation of the emperor of Ethiopia, who was greatly afraid because he could easily starve the port or refuse to furnish it with water. The inhabitants of the island, however, thought that it would not pay tribute either to him or to the Ethiopian king (Bruce, *Travels*, iii, 5-6).

The number of Banians or Indian merchants, in whose hands trade had formerly been (Van Donzel, *Foreign relations*, index s.v.), was reduced to six, who made but a poor livelihood (Bruce, *Travels*, iii, 55). In the first decades of the 19th century, the naʿūb still exercised some power. According to Salt (A voyages, *Cond. I*, 138, 147), the naʿūb ldrīs tried to prevent the English from opening a communication with Ethiopia, but came then under pressure from both the Sharīf of Mecca on the one side and from Ras Wolde Sellāsē of Tigre on the other. Salt was told by the Ras that the road by Bure, south of Amphiła Bay (see the map in Salt, A *voyage*, opp. p. 137), was preferable to the route by Masawwā', but Nathaniel Pearce wrote to him that the only road into Ethiopia was by
Masawwa' (ibid., 152). He added that the na^ib would not allow guns to pass through his country. In 1844, almost three centuries after their first attempt, the Turks tried again to get a foothold on the mainland by occupying Arkiko. But again they were forced back on to Masawwa', which in 1846 was leased to Muham- mad 'Ali [q.v.], and now became an important ele-
ment in Egyptian, British, Italian and Ethiopian politics. The lease, having expired at the death of Muhammad 'Ali in 1849, was renewed in 1865 in favour of Isma'il Pasha [q.v.]. Egyptian rule was welcomed by the local nomads who, during the an-
archy of the last years of King Tewodros of Ethiopia, had been suffering from the hill tribes. Soon some of the latter too began to seek Egyptian protection. In 1872 the Swiss Werner Münzinger, consul of France in Masawwa' since 1865, resigned from his post and entered the service of the Egyptians. Having allegedly paid £1,000,000 to the Porte, Isma'il Pasha created the so-called Eastern Sudan, i.e. Takti, Su'akkin and Masawwa', and appointed Münzinger as governor in 1873. Münzinger initiated a plan to link Masawwa' with the Egyptian possessions in the north-east, and constructed the causeways to the mainland. On each of them was a gate, watched by a guard who collected a toll from every passer-by (Rohlfs, Meine Mission, 31 ff.; Conti Rossini, Documenti, 16). He also fortified the port, made himself "protector" of the Bilen tribes and occupied the Kerri region. The Turkish practice of having a na^ib of Balaw origin was continued, and a member of his family was appointed sirdar [q.v.] of the troops in Masawwa'. When the European powers left Egypt with a free hand with regard to Ethiopia, Isma'il Pasha appointed the Dane Søren Adolph Arendrup as commander of the Egyptian troops in Masawwa', and three Egyptian expeditions set out against Ethiopia [see HABASH, i]. After the Egyptian dehâle near Gura in 1876, rumours spread in Masawwa' that the Ethiopian King Yohannes was going to attack the port. But the king wanted peace with Egypt, insisting however that Masawwa' should be restored to his kingdom. The peace treaty, arranged by C. G. Gordon, left Egypt still in control of the Kerri region and the port, where the anti-
Ethiopian policy of the British was maintained by the Egyptian governor of Masawwa'. He gave asylum to Fitawrari Debbeb, an Ethiopian rebel and cousin of King Yohannes, who sold his loot openly in the markets of Arkiko and Masawwa' and who had brought trade with the coast to a standstill. After Mukhtar Bey had been replaced by Mason Bey, an American who had been in the service of the Egyptian government, a treaty between Great Britain, Egypt and Ethiopia was signed at Adowa in 1884 by King Yohannes and Rear-Admiral Sir William Hewett. The actual control of Egypt, and consequently of the ports on the Red Sea coast which had been occupied by the Egyptians, lay indeed in the hands of Great Britain after the revolt of 'Urabi Pasha [q.v.]. Under British protection, free transit through Masawwa' was given for all goods, including arms and ammunition, to and from Ethiopia. A general reservation with respect to the lawful claims of the Porte, explicitly mentioned in Lord Granville's instruction to Admiral Hewett, was ignored in the Treaty. Nor did the Treaty contain any concrete agreement about the possession of Masawwa'. In a letter to Queen Victoria, King Yohannes, aware that the removal of the Egyptian garrison would leave the port open to him, expressed the wish that "the gates of heaven would open for her as she had opened Masawwa' for him". In her answer, the Queen regretted being unable to accede to the King's wish regarding the port (Zewde Gabre-Sellasie, Yohannes IV, 152). Indeed, by now another European power had appeared on the scene. Wary of the huge expenditure that the port would entail, the British purchased the port of Suakim, and in view of financial difficulties in Egypt, Great Britain had been seeking an alliance with Italy. Already in 1881, an Egyptian appeal to use force against Italy after the establishment of an Italian colony in Assab [q.v.], had been rejected by the British government. In 1882 Egypt had even been invited to participate in restoring order in Egypt. In the years 1881-3, the port of Masawwa' (Zewde Gabre-Sellasie, op. cit., 160), hence retaining possession of the port was not con-
considered to be "in the true interests of Egypt" (ibid., 161). Having thus been given a free hand in the Red Sea, Italy landed a military expedition in Masawwa', where on 5 February 1885, the Italian flag was flying side-by-side with the Egyptian one over the palace and the forts. King Yohannes was outraged, while Menelik, who was building up his own power in Shoa and had signed a secret treaty of friendship and trade with the Italians in 1883, acted as mediator between the Ethiopian king and Italy. The Italians quickly occupied Arafale and Arkiko, and when the Egyptian garrisons were gradually withdrawn, almost all major places between Assab and Masawwa' came into their power. Notwithstanding the Treaty of Adowa, the Italians did not allow free transit of ammunition and arms to King Yohannes, nor in the quantities which he desired. They also rejected any form of Egyptian authority, although this was recognised at first. Tension between the Ethiopians and the Italians led to an armed encounter at Dogali (1887), where the latter suffered defeat. Menelik offered mediation, which was accepted by Yohannes but refused by the Italians, who concluded another treaty with the future Negus. Yohannes, meanwhile convinced that Great Britain and Italy were acting in accord, and considering Sir Gerald Portal's mission to him as a feint, marched against Masawwa' in 1887. However, before reaching it he turned his attention again to the Mahdist forces. After his death in the battle of Kallabat (Metemma), the Italians signed the Treaty of Ucciali (Wuchali) in 1889. Italian possession of Masawwa' was confirmed, but Menelik permitted to import arms duty-free through the port (see the text of the famous Treaty in Zaghi, Grisi, 152; cf. Marcus, Menelik II, index s.v. Treaties). After their defeat at Adowa in 1896, the Italians were able to retain Eritrea and the port of Masawwa', which played an impor-
tant role during the Italo-Ethiopian war. Conquered by British forces in 1941, Masawwa' remained under British administration until the federation of Eritrea with Ethiopia in 1950. In 1931 the population was estimated at 9,300 and in 1970 at 18,490. Imports consist mainly of industrial goods, while exports comprise oilseeds, nuts, hides, coffee, salt, fish and pearl. Local industries include a salt works, fish and meat processing enterprises, a cement plant and an ice factory. A thermal power plant serves outlying areas where manganese is mined. The volcanic deposits of the Danakil Plains contain sulphur, sodium and potassium, gypsum, rock salt and potash. During their brief occupation of Eritrea, the coastal settlements on the Red Sea and the Harar region, the Egyptians introduced their Hanafi legal code, which was kept on by the Italians. Thus the Hanafi maqāṣid is predominant in the coastal towns of Masawwa'. During their brief occupation of Eritrea, the coastal settlements on the Red Sea and the Harar region, the Egyptians introduced their Hanafi legal code, which was kept on by the Italians. Thus the Hanafi maqāṣid is predominant in the coastal towns of Masawwa'. Its
founder, "Abd al-Kadir al-Djilami [q.v.], is said to have died at the place of the mosque dedicated in his name. His anniversary (ziyadrat al-Djildni) is celebrated by a pilgrimage and the accompanying ceremonies on 11 Rabl al-Awwal of each year.

nar, Gioskster 1935; C. Conti Rossini, Il Galla Filos e il Gadda Yohannes di Dabra Bizan, in Atti della R. Accademia dei Lincei, anno CCXVII (1900), Ser. VI, Classe di Sci. mor., vol. viii, Parta 1, Rome 1903; idem, Storia d'Africa, Bergamo 1928; idem, Comenti e notizie di geografi classici suora il Sudan Egi-


MASCARA [see AL-MA'SAKAR]

MASCULINE [see MUGHARKAR]

MASJID (A.), mosqej, the noun of place from sajdja "to prostrate oneself, hence 'place where one prostrates oneself [in worship]'". The modern Western European words (Eng. mosque, Fr. mosquée, Ger. Moschee, Ital. moschea) come ultimately from the Arabic via Spanish mezquita.
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I. IN THE CENTRAL ISLAMIC LANDS
A. The origins of the mosque up to the Prophet's death

The words masjid is found in Aramaic as early as the Jewish Elephantine Papyri (5th century B.C.), and appears likewise in Nabatean inscriptions with the meaning "place of worship", but possibly, originally "stele, sacred pillar". The Syriac form masjid and Amharic masqeg are late loans from Arabic, though Ge'ez masqegi "temple, church" may be a genuine formation from the verbal root m· s· g· d (itself certainly borrowed from Aramaic). The form m· s· gd is 'oratory, place of prayer' occurs also in Epigraphic South Arabian (A. F. L. Beeston et alii, Sabac dictionary, Louvain-Beirut 1982, 125). The Arabic masjid may thus have been taken over directly from Aramaic or formed from the borrowed verb (see A. Jeffery, The foreign vocabulary of the Quran, Baroda 1938, 263-4).

I. The Meccan period. The word is used in the Kur'an especially of the Meccan sanctuary (al- Masjid al-haram, sūra II, 139, 144, 145, 187, 192, 214; V, 3; VIII, 34; IX, 7, 19, 28; XVII, 1; XXII, 25; XLVIII, 25, 27). According to later sources, this was already the usage in the Meccan period (ca. al-Ya'kubi, Ta'rij, i, 285, 12). According to tradition, the term al-Masjid al-askār (sūra XVII, 1) means the Jerusalem sanctuary (according to B. Schrieke, in JST, vi [1915-16], 1, cf. Horovitz, in ibid., ix [1919], 159 ff., the reference is rather to a place of prayer in heaven); and in the legend of the Seven Sleepers,
masjid means a tomb-sanctuary, probably Christian, certainly pre-Islamic (sura XVIII, 20). The word is also applied to pre-Islamic sanctuaries, which belong to God and where God is invoked, although Muhammad was not always able to recognize the particular cult associated with them. It is undoubtedly with this general meaning that the word is used in this verse of the Kur`an: “If God had not taken men under his protection, then monasteries, churches and places of prayer (salaat) and masjids would have been destroyed” (sura XXII, 41). The word is also used in a hadith of an Abyssinian church (al-Bukhari, Salati, bdb, 48; 54; Muslim, Masajid, tr. 3) and in another of Jewish and Christian tomb-sanctuaries (al-Bukhari, Salati, bdb 55; Muslim, Masajid, tr. 3). Even Ibn Khaldun can still use the word in the general meaning of a temple or place of worship of any religion (Mukadima, jil, 6, at the end). There is therefore no question of a word of specifically Muslim creation. This is in entire agreement with Muhammad’s original attitude to earlier religions. Just as Abraham was a Muslim, so David had a masjid (al-Tabari, Ta’rikh, i, 2408, 7 ff.).

To the Prophet, the Meccan sanctuary always remained the principal mosque, known as Bayt Allah even before the time of the Prophet. It was a grave charge brought against the Kuraysh in the Meccan period that they drove the believers out of al-Masjid al-haram (sura II, 214; V, 3; VIII, 34; XXII, 25; XVIII, 25), which was considered all the more unjust as they worshipped the true lord of the sanctuary. To the true God belonged al-masjids (sura LXXII, 18, Meccan); it was therefore an absurdity for the godless to prevent the worship of God in “God’s own mosques” (sura II, 108). The result was that it was revealed in the year 9/630-1: “It is not right for polytheists to frequent the mosques of God” (sura LXXII, 18, Meccan); it was therefore an absurdity in entire agreement with Muhammad’s original attitude to earlier religions. Just as Abraham was a Muslim, so David had a masjid (al-Tabari, Ta’rikh, i, 2408, 7 ff.).

According to this tradition, the building of the mosque was not a fundamental necessity. Every place was the same to God, and humility in the presence of God, of which the ritual prayer was the expression, could be shown anywhere; hence the saying of the Prophet that he had been given the whole world as a masjid, while earlier prophets could only pray in churches and synagogues (al-Wakidi, tr. Wellhausen, 405; Corpus sertii di Sallb b. ‘Alli, ed. Haurmer, 50 and doc. Mecca, 60). Al-Bukhari, Salati, bdb 56; Tayammum, bdb 1; Muslim, Masajid, tr. 1), and also the saying: “Wherever the hour of prayer overtakes thee, thou shalt perform the salaat and that is a masjid” (Muslim, Masajid, tr. 1). That he nevertheless remained firmly attached to the traditional sanctuary of the Ka’ba, produced a confusion of thought which is very marked in sura 11, 136 ff. When in Medina he was able to do as he pleased, it must have been natural for him to create a place where he could be undisturbed with his followers and where they could perform the ritual salaat together.

2. The foundation of the Mosque in Medina. According to one tradition, the Prophet came riding into Medina on his camel with Abü Bakr as raf‘i’ surrounded by the Banu Nadir. The camel stopped on Abü Ayyub’s fina. Here (according to Anas) the Prophet performed the salaat, and immediately afterwards ordered the mosques to be built and purchased the piece of land from two orphans, Sahl and Suhayl, who were under the guardianship of Mu‘adhdh b. ‘Afra’, for 10 dinars, after declining to accept it as a gift; he lived with Abü Ayyub until the mosque and his houses were completed. During this period he performed the salaat in courtyards or other open spaces (al-Bukhari, Salati, bdb 48; Muslim, Masajid, tr. 1; Ahmad b. Hanbal, Musnad, iii, 212 above; Ibn Highām, 336; al-Tabari, i, 1258 f.; al-Mas‘ūdī, Munajjī, iv, 140-1 = § 1469). According to this tradition, the building of the mosque was intended by the Prophet from the first and the choice of the site was left to the whim of his mount. According to another tradition, the Prophet took up his abode with Abü Ayyub, but during the first period of his stay in Medina he conducted the salaat in the house of Abü Umama As‘ad, who had a private masjid, in which he used to conduct salaats with his neighbours. The Prophet later expressed the desire to purchase the adjoining piece of ground, and he bought it from the two orphans, who according to this tradition, were wards of As‘ad (al-Baladhuri, Futuh al-buldan, § 55, 7 and 52, etc., Cities of the Prophet). The site was covered with graves, ruins (khirbāb; also
harth, al-Tabari, i, 1259, 17; 1260, 1; cf. Ahmad b.
Hanbal, Munna, iii, 212, 7, perhaps due to an old
misreading) and palm-treed land was used as a place
for keeping camels (and smaller domestic animals,
al-Bukhārī, Waḍā', bāb 66). The site was cleared, the
palms cut down and the walls built. The building
material was bricks baked in the sun (labīn) (Ibn
Ḥīṣām, 337; al-Bukhārī, Salāt, bāb 62, 65; according
to one tradition they were baked at the well of Ṣafīm,
Wüstenfeld, Stadt Medina, 31); in plan it was a court-
yard surrounded by a brick wall on a stone foundation
with three entrances; the gateposts were of stone. On
the kibla side (i.e. the north wall), at first left open, the
stems of the palm trees which had been cut down were
soon set up as columns and a roof was put over them
of palm-leaves and clay. On the east side two huts of
similar materials were built for the Prophet's wives
Sawdā' and ʿAʾishah; their entrances opened on to the
court and were covered with carpets; they were later
increased so that there were nine little houses for the
Prophet's wives. When the kibla was moved to the south,
the archway at the north wall remained; under this
archway called sūfa or zula the homeless Companions
(Aḥūl al-Sūfa q.v.) found shelter (al-Bukhārī,
Salāt, bāhš 48, 62; Wüstenfeld, Medina, 60 f., 66; al-
Diāyārbakrī, Taʾrīkh al-Khamīṣ, Cairo 1302, i, 387 fl.;
on the sūfa, 387 in the middle; 391 after the middle;
cf. L. Caetani, Annali dell' Islam, i, 5 f.). In seven
months the work was completed (Wüstenfeld, Medina,
59), according to others in the month of Ṣafar
of the year 2 (Ibn Ḥīṣām, 339, 18 f.). The mosque
was very simple. It was only really a courtyard
with a wall round it; the sūfa already mentioned supplied
a shelter on the north side, while on the south side,
later the kibla side, an archway was probably built also,
for the Prophet used to preach leaning against a palm
trunk and this must have been on the kibla side. How
the archways were not be ascertained. The mosque was the
courtyard of the Prophet's houses and at the same time the
meeting-place for the believers and the place for common prayer.
According to the sources, it was the Prophet's
intention from the very first to build a mosque at once in Medina; according to a later tradition, Gabriel
commanded him in the name of God to build a house
for God (al-Diyāyārbakrī, i, 387 below); but this story is
coloured by later conditions. It has been made quite
clear, notably by L. Caetani (Annali dell' Islam, i, 432,
437 fl.) and later by H. Lammens (Moʿawia, 8, 5, 62;
ident, Ẓād, 30, 93 fl.; cf. that the earliest masjid had
nothing of the character of a sacred edifice. Much can
be quoted for this view from Ḥaddīth and Sīra (cf. Annali
dell' Islam, i, 440). The unconverted Thaqafīs were
received by the Prophet in the mosque to conduct
diplomacy and he even put up three tents for them in
the courtyard (Ibn Ḥīṣām, 916; al-Wākidī-
Wellhausen, 382); envoys from Ṭāʾimam also went
freely about in the mosque and called for the Prophet,
who dealt with them after he had finished prayers (Ibn
Ḥīṣām, 933 f.; al-Wākidī-Wellhausen, 386). Ibn
ʿUaysīs brothers came to masjid the head of the Ḥaḍīth
Sufyān, threw it down before the Prophet and gave his
report (Ibn Ḥīṣām, 981; al-Wākidī-Wellhausen,
225). After the battle of Ḫud, the Medina chiefs
spent the night in the mosque (al-Wākidī-Wellhausen,
149). The Awsīs tended their wounded here (ibid.,
215 f.; al-Ṭabari, i, 1491 f.); a prisoner of war was
tied to one of the pillars of the mosque (al-Bukhārī,
Salāt, bāb 76, 82; cf. 75). Many poor people used to
live in these huts (ibid., bāb 93); the government of the chiefs and
huts were put up in the mosque, one for example by
converted and liberated prisoners, another by the
Banū Ghīfār, in whose tent Saʿd b. Muʿādh died of his
wounds (ibid., bāb 77; Ibn al-ʿĀṣīr, Ud al-ghāba,
i, 297). People sat as they pleased in the mosque or
took their ease lying on their backs (al-Bukhārī, Ibn
bāb 6, Salāt, bāb 85; Ibn Saʿd, i, 124, 14); even so late as the reign of ʿUmar, it is recorded that he found
strangers sleeping in a corner of the mosque (al-
Mubahra, Kamīl, 118, 15 ff.); the Prophet received
gifts and distributed them among the Companions
(Bukhārī, Salāt, bāb 42); disputes took place over
business (ibid., bāb 71, 83) and in general, people
slept and conducted themselves as they pleased. Indeed, on
one occasion some Sudanese or Abyssinians with the
approval of the Prophet gave a display with shield and
lance on the occasion of a festival (ibid., Salāt, bāb 69;
Idayn, bāb 2, 25; Ḫidād, bāb 81); and on another
stranger seeking the Prophet, rode into the mosque on his
camel (ibid., bāb 6). So little "consecrated" was this,
the oldest mosque, that one of the Mudāfṣān or "Hypocrites",
executed for scoffing at the believers,
could call to Abū ʿAyyūb "Are you throwing me out of the
Mīratu Bani Ṭhāʾībān"? (Ibn Ḥīṣām, 362,
10 f.).
All this gives one the impression of the head-
quarters of an army, rather than of a sacred edifice.
On the other hand, the mosque was used from the
very first for the general divine worship and thus
became something more than the Prophet's private
courtyard. Wherever the Prophet's intentions had been from the first, the masjid, with the increasing
importance of Islam, was bound to become very soon
the political and religious centre of the new
community. The two points of view cannot be distin-
guished in Islam, especially in the earlier period. The
mosque was the place where believers assembled for
prayer around the Prophet, where he delivered his
addresses, which contained not only appeals for obe-
dience to God but regulations affecting the social life
of the community (cf. al-Bukhārī, Salāt, bāb 70, 71);
from here he controlled the religious and political
community of Islam. Even at the real old sanctuaries
of Arabia, there were no restrictions on what one
could do; what distinguished the mosque from the
Christian church or the Meccan temple was that in it
there was no specially dedicated ritual object. At the
Kaʾba also, people used to gather to discuss every day
affairs and also for important assemblies, if we may
believe the Sīra (Ibn Ḥīṣām, 183 f., 185, 1, 218, 9,
248, 257, 19). Here also the Prophet used to sit;
strangers came to visit him; he talked and they
disputed with him; people even came to blows and
fought there (Ibn Ḥīṣām, 183-4, 185-6, 187-8, 202,
19, 257, 259; Chron. d. Stadt Mekka, ed.
Wüstenfeld, i, 223, 11). Beside the Kaʾba was the Dār al-
Nadwa, where important matters were discussed and justice
administered (ibid., see index). From the Medina
mosque was developed the general type of the Muslim
mosque. It depended on circumstances whether the
aspect of the mosque as a social centre or as a place
of prayer was more or less emphasised.
3. Other mosques in the time of the
Prophet. The mosque of the Prophet in Medina was
not the only one founded by Muslims in his lifetime,
and according to tradition not even the first, which is
said to have been the mosque of Kubāb. In this
village, which belonged to the territory of Medina (see
Wüstenfeld, Geschichte der Stadt Medina, 126), the
Prophet on his ʿibrah stopped with the family of ʿAmr
b. ʿAwf, the length of his stay is variously given as 3,
4, 14, 22 and 50; ibid., bāb 71, 1; cf. that on this
found a mosque there on his arrival, which had been
built by the first emigrants and the Anṣār, and he per-
formed the salah there with them (see Wustenfeld, op. cit., 56; al-Baladhuri, Fadl al-salah Ji Masjid Makka
and the pillar is still shown beside which he conducted the service (al-Bukhan, Fadl al-salah Ji Masjid Makka
we 'l-Madina, bdb 2, 4; Muslim, Hodjâ, tr. 94; al-Diyârâbârî, 1, 382; al-Baladhuri, 5). We are occasionally
told that he performed his salah on the Sabbath in the mosque at Kuba' when he went to the Banû '1-
Nasser in Damascus of the year 4/625 (al-Wâkidî-Wellhausen, 161).

It is obvious that the customs and ideas of the later community have shaped the legend of this mosque.
The only question is whether the old tradition that the mosque was founded either by the Prophet himself or
even before his arrival by his followers is also a later invention. We thus come to the question whether the
Prophet founded or recognised any other mosques at all in Medina. A plethora of legends have been spread about this
fact that the first thought of the Muslim generals after the conquest was to found a mosque as a centre around which to gather.

Conditions differed somewhat according as it was a new foundation or an already existing town. Important
examples of the first kind are al- Başra, al-Kuľa and al-Fus'ét. The second was founded by 'Uthâ b. Ghâzwân as winter-quarters for the army in the year 14/635 (or 16/637 or 638). The mosque was placed in the centre with the Dar al-Imâra, the dwelling of the commander-in-chief with a prison and Diwân in front of it. Prayer was at first offered on the open space, which was fenced round; later, the whole was built of reeds and when the men went off to war the reeds were pulled up and laid away. Abî Mûsâ al-
Ashârî [q.v.], who later became 'Umar's vâli, built the edifice of clay and bricks baked in the sun (labûn) and used grass for the roof (al-Baladhuri, 346-7, 350; Ibn al-Fâkhî, 187-8; Yûkît, Bâdî‰, i, 642, 6-9; cf. al-
Tabari, i, 3277, 14 ff.). It was similar in Kûfa, which was founded in 17/638 by Sa'd b. Abî Wakkâs. In the centre was the mosque, and beside it the Dar al-
Imâra was laid out. The mosque at first was simply an open quadrangle, sabâ, marked off by a trench round it. The space was large enough for 40,000 persons. It seems that reeds were also used for building the walls here and later Sa'd used labûn. On the south side (and
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Medina, 131; al-Sira al-Halabiyya, ii, 60; al-Baladhuri, 1-2; Muslim, Hodjâ, bâb 93). If the connection with the Tabari tradition, the masjîd al-Imâra, is to be sought north of Medina, the 'the mosque founded on piety' would then be the mosque of Medina rather than that of Kuba' which lies to the south of it. There is in itself nothing impossible about the rejection in principle of any mosque other than that of Medina.

We should then have to discard the whole tradition, for, according to it, the Prophet was at first not unfavourably disposed to the new mosque, and his wrath, according to the tradition, arose from the fact that it had been founded by a refractory party. But as a matter of fact, there are indications that a number of mosques already existed in the time of the Prophet; for example, the verse in the Kur 'ân, 'in houses, which God hath permitted to be built that His name might be praised in them, in them men praise Him morning and evening, whom neither business nor trade restrain from praising God and performing the salah and the giving of alms', etc. (sûra XXIV, 36-7). If this revelation, like the rest of the sûra, is of the Medinan period, it is difficult to refer it to Jews and Christians, and this utterance is quite clear: 'Observe a complete fast until the night and touch thou them (i.e. women) not while ye are in the mosques' (sûra II, 183). The time about which there is no doubt is the time of the Prophet several Muslim mosques which had a markedly religious character and were recognised by the Prophet.

That there were really public places of prayer of the separate tribes at a very early date is evident from the
tradition that the Prophet in the year 2 offered his sacrifice on 10 Dhu 'l-Hijjah/3 June 624 on the masjîd of the Banû Salîma. In addition, there are constant references to private masjîd where a few believers, like Abî Bakr in Mecca, made a place for prayer in their houses and where others sometimes assembled (al-Bukhârî, Salah, bâb 46, 87; Tabâhidjûd, bâb 30; cf. also Adhân, bâb 50).

B. The origin of mosques after the time of the Prophet.

1. Chief mosques. What importance the Medina mosque attained as the centre of administration and worship of the Muslims is best seen from the fact that the first thought of the Muslim generals after their conquests was to found a mosque as a centre around which to gather.
only here) there was an arbour, zulla, built (cf. al-Baladhuri, 348, i: suffa). The Ddr al-lmdra beside the mosque was later by 'Umar's orders combined with the mosque (al-Tabari, i, 2489, 12 ff.; 2485, 16; 2487 ff.; 2494, 14; Yākūt, Maṣgām, iv, 323, 10 ff.; al-Baladhuri, 275 ff., cf. Annali dell' Islam, iii, 846 ff.). The plan was therefore an exact reproduction of that of the mosque in Medina (as is expressly emphasised in al-Tabari, i, 2489, 4 ff.); the importance of the mosque was also expressed in its position, and the commander lived close beside it. There was no difference in al-Furat, which, although there was already an older town here, was laid out as an entirely new camp. In the year 21/642, after the conquest of Alexandria, the mosque was laid out in a garden where 'Amr had planted his standard. It was 50 dhird's long and 30 broad. Eighty men fixed its kibla, which, however, was turned too far to the east, and was therefore altered later by Kurra b. Shārik [cf. Annali dell' Islam, iii, 846 ff.]...
But that there were tribal mosques at a very early date is nevertheless quite certain. The mosque at Kufa was the meeting place of the tribe (Ibn Sa'd, i/1, 6 and cf. above) and according to one tradition, the Banu Ghainn b. 'Affa were jealous of it and built an opposition mosque (al-Baladhi, 3; al-Tabari, Tafṣīr, 1, 21). A Companion who had taken part in the battle of Badr, 'Uttān b. Malik, complained to the Prophet that he could not reach the masjīd of his tribe in the rainy season and wanted to build a mosque for himself (al-Bukhārī, Ṣaḥīḥ, bāb 46; Muslim, Masājid, bāb 47). The Prophet himself is said to have visited the masjīd of the Banū Zurayk (al-Bukhārī, Dīghād, bāb 56-8) and in the masjīd of the Banū Salima during the prayer, there was revealed to him sura II, 139, which ordered the new masjīd to be turned into mosques in (ibid., 30). It is also recorded of mosques in Cairo that they were converted churches. According to al-Tabari, 21, a Companion who had taken part in the battle of Badr, 'Uttān b. Malik, complained to the Prophet that he could not reach the masjīd of his tribe in the rainy season and wanted to build a mosque for himself (al-Bukhārī, Ṣaḥīḥ, bāb 46; Muslim, Masājid, bāb 47). The Prophet himself is said to have visited the masjīd of the Banū Zurayk (al-Bukhārī, Dīghād, bāb 56-8) and in the masjīd of the Banū Salima during the prayer, there was revealed to him sura II, 139, which ordered the new masjīd to be turned into mosques in (ibid., 30). It is also recorded of mosques in Cairo that they were converted churches. According to al-Tabari, 21, a Companion who had taken part in the battle of Badr, 'Uttān b. Malik, complained to the Prophet that he could not reach the masjīd of his tribe in the rainy season and wanted to build a mosque for himself (al-Bukhārī, Ṣaḥīḥ, bāb 46; Muslim, Masājid, bāb 47). The Prophet himself is said to have visited the masjīd of the Banū Zurayk (al-Bukhārī, Dīghād, bāb 56-8) and in the masjīd of the Banū Salima during the prayer, there was revealed to him sura II, 139, which ordered the new masjīd to be turned into mosques in (ibid., 30). It is also recorded of mosques in Cairo that they were converted churches. According to al-Tabari, 21, a Companion who had taken part in the battle of Badr, 'Uttān b. Malik, complained to the Prophet that he could not reach the masjīd of his tribe in the rainy season and wanted to build a mosque for himself (al-Bukhārī, Ṣaḥīḥ, bāb 46; Muslim, Masājid, bāb 47). The Prophet himself is said to have visited the masjīd of the Banū Zurayk (al-Bukhārī, Dīghād, bāb 56-8) and in the masjīd of the Banū Salima during the prayer, there was revealed to him sura II, 139, which ordered the new masjīd to be turned into mosques in (ibid., 30). It is also recorded of mosques in Cairo that they were converted churches. According to al-Tabari, 21, a Companion who had taken part in the battle of Badr, 'Uttān b. Malik, complained to the Prophet that he could not reach the masjīd of his tribe in the rainy season and wanted to build a mosque for himself (al-Bukhārī, Ṣaḥīḥ, bāb 46; Muslim, Masājid, bāb 47). The Prophet himself is said to have visited the masjīd of the Banū Zurayk (al-Bukhārī, Dīghād, bāb 56-8) and in the masjīd of the Banū Salima during the prayer, there was revealed to him sura II, 139, which ordered the new masjīd to be turned into mosques in (ibid., 30). It is also recorded of mosques in Cairo that they were converted churches. According to al-Tabari, 21, a Companion who had taken part in the battle of Badr, 'Uttān b. Malik, complained to the Prophet that he could not reach the masjīd of his tribe in the rainy season and wanted to build a mosque for himself (al-Bukhārī, Ṣaḥīḥ, bāb 46; Muslim, Masājid, bāb 47). The Prophet himself is said to have visited the masjīd of the Banū Zurayk (al-Bukhārī, Dīghād, bāb 56-8) and in the masjīd of the Banū Salima during the prayer, there was revealed to him sura II, 139, which ordered the new masjīd to be turned into mosques in (ibid., 30). It is also recorded of mosques in Cairo that they were converted churches. According to al-Tabari, 21, a Companion who had taken part in the battle of Badr, 'Uttān b. Malik, complained to the Prophet that he could not reach the masjīd of his tribe in the rainy season and wanted to build a mosque for himself (al-Bukhārī, Ṣaḥīḥ, bāb 46; Muslim, Masājid, bāb 47). The Prophet himself is said to have visited the masjīd of the Banū Zurayk (al-Bukhārī, Dīghād, bāb 56-8) and in the masjīd of the Banū Salima during the prayer, there was revealed to him sura II, 139, which ordered the new masjīd to be turned into mosques in (ibid., 30). It is also recorded of mosques in Cairo that they were converted churches. Accord-
ing to one tradition, the Rashida mosque was an un-
finished Jacobite church, which was surrounded by
Jacobite and a Nestorian Church into mosques (ibid.,
65). When Dżawhar built a palace in al-Kahira, a day
or monastery was taken in and transformed into a
Mosque (ibid., 269); similar changes took place at later
dates (ibid., 240) and synagogues also were
transformed in this way (Masjid Ibn al-Bannā',
ibid., 265). The chief mosque in Palermo was previously
a church (Yākūt, Būṣrā, i, 719). After the Crusades
several churches were turned into mosques in
Palestine (Sauvage, Hist. de Jérusalem. et h'lon, 1876, 7;

Other sanctuaries than those of the “people of the
scripture” were turned into mosques. For example a
Masjid al-Shams between al-Hilla and Karbalā‘ was
the successor of an old temple of Shaddāq (see Goldziher, Masalad, 3); and in the immediate vicinity al-Hākim turned a
place, the Rashida mosque was an un-
finished Jacobite church, which was surrounded by
the successor of an old temple of Shamash (see
al-Baladhurī, Bab 10. Thus in
Islam also, the old rule holds that sacred places sur-
vive changes of religion. It was especially easy in cases
where Christian sanctuaries were associated with
Biblical personalities who were also recognised by
Islam: e.g. the Church of St. John in Damascus and
many holy places in Palestine. One example is the
mosque of Job in Shaykh Sa‘d, associated with sūra
XXI, 83, XXXVIII, 40; here in Silvia’s time (4th
century) there was a church of Job (al-Masā‘il, i, 91
= § 84; Baedeker, Palast. u. Syrien, 1910, 147).

But Islam itself had created historical associations
which were bound soon to lead to the building of new
mosques. Even in the lifetime of the Prophet, the
Bani Sālim are said to have asked him to perform the
salat in their masjid to give it his authority (see above,
in I. A. 3). At the request of ‘Ithāb b. Malik, the Prophet performed the salat along with Abū Bakr in
his house and thereby consecrated it as a musalla,
because he could not reach the tribal mosque in the
rainy season (al-Bukhārī, Salāt, bāb 47; Tāhāfudjud, bāb 36; Muslim, Masalad, tr. 46; a similar story in al-
Bukhārī, Adab, bāb 47, Tāhāfudjud, bāb 33, is perhaps
identical in origin). After the death of the Prophet, his
memory became so precious that the places where he
had prayed obtained a special importance and his
followers, who liked to imitate him in everything, pre-
ferrred to perform their salat in such places. But this
tendency was only an intensification of what had
existed in his lifetime; and so it is not easy to decide
how far the above stories reflect later conditions.

Mosques very quickly arose on the road between
Mecca and Medina at places where, according to the
testimony of his Companions, the Prophet had prayed
(al-Bukhārī, Salāt, bāb 89; al-Wāṣīkī-Wellhausen,
421 ff.); the same was the case with the road which the
Prophet had taken to Tabūk in the year 9/630-1 (Ibn
Higham, 907; al-Wāṣīkī-Wellhausen, 394; there were
154 places, which were listed in Annali dell’Islam, ii, 246-
7). Indeed, wherever he had taken the field, mosques
were built; for example, on the road to Badr, where
according to tradition Abū Bakr had built a mosque
(al-Wāṣīkī-Wellhausen, 39, also Wustenfeld, Medina, 135). The mosque of al-Fādil was built on the spot
where the Prophet had prayed in a leather tent during
the war with the Banū ‘Nadīr in the year 10/625-6 (al-
Wāṣīkī-Wellhausen, 163; Wustenfeld, Medina, 132).
He is said to have himself built a little mosque in
Khaybar during the campaign of the year 7/628-9 (al-
Outside Tā’if, a mosque was built on a hillock,
because the Prophet had performed the salat there
during the siege in the year 8/629-30, between the
tents of his two wives, Umm Salama and Zaynab (Ibn
Higham, 872-3; al-Wāṣīkī-Wellhausen, 369); in
Liyya, the Prophet is said to have himself built a mosque
while on the campaign against Tā’if (Ibn
Higham, 872; al-Wāṣīkī-Wellhausen, 368-9).

Mosques arose in and around Medina, “because
Muhammad prayed here” (Wustenfeld, Gesch. d. Stadt
Medina, 31, 38, 132 ff.). It is obvious that for most of
these cases, later conditions are put back to the time
of the Prophet; in connection with the “Campaign of
the Trench” we are told that “he prayed everywhere
where mosques now stand” (al-Wāṣīkī-Wellhausen,
208). Since, for example, the Masjid al-Fādil is also
called Masjid al-Shams (Wustenfeld, Medina, 132), we
have perhaps here actually an ancient
sanctuary.

Mosques became associated with the Prophet in
many ways. In Medina, for example, there was the
Masjid al-Baghlā where footprints of the Prophet’s
mule were shown in a stone, the Masjid al-Idjābā where the Prophet’s appeal was answered, the Masjid al-Fath which recalls the victory over the
Meccans, etc. (see Wustenfeld, Medina, 136 ff.). In
Mecca, there was naturally a large number of places
sacred through associations with the Prophet and
therefore used as places of prayer. The most
honoured site, next to the chief mosque, is said to
have been the house of Khādijā, also called Mawlid
al-Sayyida Fatima, because the daughter of the
Prophet was born there. This house, in which the
Prophet lived till the hujja, was taken over by ‘Akkāl,
‘Ali’s brother, and bought by him through Mu‘āwiyah
and turned into the chief mosque in the 2nd Muh. Stud., d. Stadt Mecca, ed. Wustenfeld, i, 423; iii, 438, 440).
Next comes the house in which the Prophet held his first secret
meetings. This was bought by al-Khayzuran [q.v.],
mother of Hārūn al-Rašīd, on her pilgrimage in
171/788 and turned into a mosque (Chron. Mekka, iii, 112, 440). She also purchased the Prophet’s birth-
place, Mawlid al-Nahr, and made it into a mosque.
(ibid., i, 422, 439). If Mu‘āwiyah really bought the
Prophet’s house from his cousin, it was probably the
right one; but the demand for places associated with
the Prophet became stronger and stronger, and we
therefore find more and more places referred not only
to the Prophet, but also to his Companions. Such
are the birthplaces of Hamza, Umar and ‘Ali (Chron.
Mekka, iii, 445), and the house of Māriya, the mother of
the Prophet’s son, İbrahīm (ibid., i, 447, 466), who
also had a mosque at Medina (Wustenfeld, Medina,
133). There were also a Masjid Khādiţa (ibid., i, 324) and a Masjid ‘Aţīga (ibid., iii, 454), a Masjid of the “granted appeal” in a narrow valley near
Mecca, where the Prophet performed the salat (ibid.,
453), a Masjid al-Dīn, where the Dīn overheard his
preaching (ibid., i, 424; iii, 453), a Masjid al-
Rā‘ya, where he planted his standard at the conquest
(ibid., i, 424; ii, 435), a Masjid al-Bay‘a where the first homage of the Medinans was received (ibid., i, 428; iii, 441). In the Masjid al-Khāfy in Minā is shown the mark of the
Prophet's head in a stone into which visitors also put their heads (ibid., iii, 438). Persons in the Bible ... a saint (cf. Ibn Djubayr, Rihla, 114, 115; cf. Dozy, Supplement, s.v.). Makdām also means a little chapel and in Arafa there is still a Masdjid is shown, and in ba, beside which the Makdām Tl with the Kaaba is connected with mosques, Adam, Abraham and their heads (ibid., i, 415, 425) and another in al-Zahirah. The mosque founded by the Prophet's night journey and the journey to Paradise. The mosque founded by the Prophet was, as mentioned in sura XVII, 1, and therefore connected with the Mosque of the Splitting of the Moon (by the Prophet), etc. (see Ibn Djubayr, Rihla, 114 ff.; al-Makrizi, iv, 269). One other mosque was the Mosque of the Temple in Jerusalem was, as already pointed out, identified as al-Masjid al-Aqsa mentioned in sūra XVII, 1, and therefore connected with the Prophet's night journey and the journey to Paradise. The mosque founded by the Prophet on this occasion, and marks in a stone covering a hole are explained as Muhammad's footprints (sometimes also as those of Idrīs; cf. Le Strange, Palestine, 136; al-Batanūnī, Rihla, 165; Baedeker, Palastina, 1910, 52-3; cf. al-Yā’kūbī, Tāvīqī, ii, 311). The name al-Masjid al-Aqsa was used throughout the early period for the whole Harām area in Jerusalem, later partly for it, and partly for the buildings on its southern part (Ibn al-Fākhi, 100; Sauvageau, Hist. Jerus. et Hébrons, 95, 121; cf. Le Strange, Palestine, 96-7). Then there were the mosques which had specifically Muslim associations, like the Masjid of Umar on the Mount of Olives where he encamped at the conquest (al-Mukaddasī, 172).

In Egypt not only was an old Christian sanctuary called Masjīd Qubā on the east bank of the Nile (Ibn al-Makrīzī, iv, 269), but we are also told, for example, that the Mosque of Ibn Taymiyya was built where Mūsā talked with his Lord (al-Makrīzī, iv, 36); according to al-Kurdatī, there were in Egypt four Masjīdīs of Mūsā (Ibn Dūkmād, ed. Vollers, 92); there was a Masjīdī Yā’kūb wa-Yūsuf (al-Mukaddasī, 200) and a Joseph's prison, certainly dating from the Christian period (al-Makrīzī, iv, 315). There was also a Mosque of Abraham in Munyat Ibn al-Khaṣbah (Ibn Djubayr, 58). The chief mosque of Sanʿā was built by Shem, son of Noah (Ibn Rusta, 110). The old temple near Iṣṭaḵr mentioned above was connected with Sulaymān (al-Masʿūdī, Murāqī, iv, 76-7 = § 1403; Yākūt, i, 299). In the mosque of Ūmar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb, not only Ibrāhīm but one thousand other prophets and one thousand saints, described as wāṣi, are said to have offered their prayers; here was the tree Yākūt (sūra XXXXII, 146); here died Yāghūṭā and Yāsūk, etc. (Yākūt, iv, 325; also Ibn Djubayr, 211-12), and in this mosque there was a chapel of Abraham, Noah and Idrīs (Ibn Djubayr, 212); a large number of mosques were associated with Companions of the Prophet. What emphasis was laid on such an association is seen, for example, from the story according to which Ūmar declined to perform the salāt in the Church of the Resurrection in Jerusalem, lest the Church should afterwards be claimed as a mosque.

4. Tomb-mosques. A special class of memorial mosques consisted of those which were associated with a tomb. The graves of ancestors and of saints had been sanctuaries from ancient times and they gradually adopted into Islam. In addition, there were the saints of Islam itself. The general tendency to distinguish places associated with the founders of Islam naturally concentrated itself round the graves in which they rested. In the Kurān, a tomb-masjid is mentioned in connection with the Seven Sleepers (sūra XVIII, 20) but it is not clear if it was recognized. As early as the year 602-3 the companions of Abū Bakr are said to have built a mosque at the place where he died and was buried (al-Wākidī-Wellhausen, 262). The Prophet is also said to have visited regularly at al-Bakr in Medina the tombs of martyrs who fell at Ḫub and paid reverence to them (ibid., 143). Whatever the exact amount of truth in the story, there is no doubt that the story of the tomb-mosque of Abū Bakr is anecdoted. The accounts of the death of the Prophet and of the period immediately following reveal no special interest in his tomb. But very soon the general trend of development stimulated an interest in graves, which led to the erection of sanctuaries at them. The progress of this tendency is more marked in al-Wākidī, who died in 207/823, than in Ibn Iṣbāk, who died in 151/768.

The collections of Ḩadīth made in the 3rd/9th century contain discussions on this fact which show that the problem was whether the tombs could be used as places of worship and in this connection whether mosques could be built over the tombs. The Ḩadīth answers both questions in the negative, which certainly was in the spirit of the Prophet. It is said that “Salat at the graves (fi l-makṣūr) is makshūr” (al-Bukhārī, Salāt, bāb 52); “sit not upon graves and perform not salāt towards them” (Muslim, Qānāt, tr. 33); “hold the salāt in your houses, but do not use them as tombs” (Muslim, Salāt al-musāfīrīn, tr. 28). On the other hand, it is acknowledged that Anas performed the salāt at the cemetery (al-Bukhārī, Salāt, bāb 48). We are also told that tombs cannot be used as masjīd (al-Bukhārī, Salāt, bāb 48; Qānāt, bāb 62). On his deathbed the Prophet is said to have cursed the Jews and the Christians because they used the tombs of their prophets as places of salāt. Ḩadīth explains this by saying that the Prophet was not at first accessible (al-Bukhārī, Salāt, bāb 48, 55; Qānāt, bāb 62; Anbīyāʾ, bāb 50; Muslim, Masjīdī, tr. 3); as a matter of fact, its precise location was not exactly known (Qānāt, bāb 96). The attacks in Ḩadīth insist that tomb-mosques are a reprehensible Jewish practice: “When a pious man dies, they built a masjīd on his tomb”, etc. (al-Bukhārī, Qānāt, bāb 48, 54; Muslim, Qānāt, bāb 71). Although this view of tomb-mosques is still held in certain limited circles (cf. Ibn Taymiyya and the Wahhābīs), the old pre-Islamic custom soon also became a Muslim one. The expositors of Ḩadīth like al-Nawawī (on Muslim, Masjīdī, tr. 2, lith. Dihlt, 1319, i, 201) and al-ʿAskālānī (Cairo 1329, i, 354) explain the above passages to mean that only an exaggerated tāʿiṣ of the dead is forbidden so that tombs should not be used as a kibla; otherwise, it is quite commendable to spend time in a mosque in proximity to a devout man.

The name given to a tomb-mosque is often kaḥba [q.v.] a word which is used of a tent (al-Bukhārī, Qānāt, bāb 62; Ḩadīth, bāb 64; Fard al-šumr, bāb 19; al-Dığıyā, bāb 15; Tārafa, Dīwān, vii, 1), but later came to mean the dome which usually covers tombs and therefore it came to mean the general name of a tomb of a saint (cf. Ibn Djubayr, Rihla, 114, 115; cf. Dozy, Supplement, s.v.). Makām also means a little chapel and
a saint’s tomb (van Berchem, CIA, i, no. 72, etc.; cf. index). The custom of making a kubba at the tomb of a saint was firmly rooted in Byzantine territory, where sepulkral churches always had a dome (Herzog-Hauch, Realencyclopaedie, x, 784). The usual name however for a tomb-santa was maghadh; this is applied to places where saints are worshipped, among Muslim tombs particularly to those of the friends and relations of the Prophet (van Berchem, CIA, i, nos. 32, 63, 417, 544; al-Makrizî, iv, 265, 309 ff.), but also to tombs of other recognised saints, e.g. Mashhad Bird al-Din (Ibn Djughar, Ribha, 236), etc.

The transformation of the tombs of the Prophet and his near relatives into sanctuaries seems to have been a gradual process. Muhammad, Abû Bakr and 'Umar are said to have been buried in the house of 'A'isha; Fatîma and 'Ali lived beside it. 'A'isha had a wall built between her room and the tombs to prevent visitors carrying off earth from the tomb of the Prophet. The houses of the Prophet's wives remained as they were until al-Walîd rebuilt them. He thought it scandalous that Hasân b. 'Ali should live in Fatîma's house and 'Umar's family close beside 'A'isha's house in the house of Hâfîsa. He acquired the houses, had all the houses of the Prophet's wives torn down and erected new buildings. The tombs were enclosed by a pentagonal wall; the whole area was hallowed; it was not until later that a dome was built over it (Wüstenfeld, Medina, 66 ff., 72-3, 78 ff., 89). In the cemetery of Medina, al-Bakî [see Bakî, ed. Dahiry, Zoubdat Kachf el-Mamdlik, 42, ed. P. Ravaisse, 42, Dahiry, Zoubdat Kachf el-Mamdlik, 42, ed. P. Ravaisse, 42, ed. P. Ravaisse, 42], a whole series of
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and partly sacred site (cf. Ibn Djubayr, Ribha, 114, 196); but this word does not seem to be used of ordinary tomb-mosques, although the distinction between these and mosques in honour of the departed disappeared. In these Kubbas, the regular recitation of the Qur'an was often arranged and the tomb was provided with a kiswa. The mausoleum might be built in connection with a great mosque and be separated from it by a grille (Yakut, iv, 509, 6 ff.).

3. Mosques deliberately founded. In the early period, the building of mosques was a social obligation of the ruler as representative of the community and the tribes. Very soon a number of mosques came into existence, provided by individuals. In addition to tribal mosques, as already mentioned, there were also sectarian mosques, and prominent leaders built mosques which were the centres of their activity, for example the Masjид Ali b. Hātim (al-Tabarî, ii, 130), the Masjid Simāk in Kūfa (ibid., i, 2653), the Masjid al-Asghar, etc. As old sanctuaries became Islamised the mosque received more of the character of a sanctuary and the building of a mosque became a pious work; there arose a badīth, according to which the Prophet said: "for him who builds a mosque, God will build a home in Paradise"; some add "if he desire to see the face of God" (Corpus tauri di Zaid b. 'Ali, ed. Griﬃnî, no. 239 on p. 239, 6 ff.; al-Makrlzî, i, 265; Masdjīd of Zuhd, al-Madrasa al-Shanﬁyya, ed. Bunz. 91, 17; Yakut, i, 245 ff.; al-Makrlzî, iv, 36). Like other sanctuaries, mosques were sometimes built as a result of a revelation in a dream. A story of this kind of the year 557/1162 is given by al-Samhūdī for Medina (Wüstenfeld, Medina, 91); and a similar one of a Masdjid, which seems a quite fantastic ﬁgure (there is probably an exaggeration), is added to the incomplete list of al-Makrlzî (d. 730/1330) according to al-Makrlzî counted 480, without a minbar and marked oﬀ, but quite in the open (cf. for Tiberias, Nasîr-i Khusraw, ed. Schefer, 36).

The word musalla may mean any place of prayer, therefore also mosque (cf. sūra II, 119; cf. al-Makrlzî KubI, iv, 25, 16; idem, Ittiâd, ed. Bunz. 91, 17; Yakût, Buldan, iv, 326, 3-5) or a particular place of prayer (al-Fitr, ii, 4, 3-7). In Cairo, the two festivals were celebrated on a musallâ opposite the hill Yāhmum (Al-Tadj al-Dīn built a mosque and a separate chamber in connection with a great mosque and be separated from it by a grille (Yakut, iv, 509, 6 ff.) and a madrasa might be called after its head or a teacher (ibid., iv, 235, 17; Yakût, Uldâbâ, vii, 82).

Lastly, a mosque might take its name from its situation or from some feature of the building.

6. Al-Muṣallā. In addition to the mosques proper, al-Makrlzî mentions for Cairo eight places for prayer (musallâ) mainly at the cemetery (iv, 334-5). The word musallâ may mean any place of prayer, therefore also mosque (cf. sūra II, 119; cf. al-Makrlzî KubI, iv, 25, 16; idem, Ittiâd, ed. Bunz. 91, 17; Yakût, Buldan, iv, 326, 3-5) or a particular place of prayer (al-Fitr, ii, 4, 3-7). In Cairo, the two festivals were celebrated on the Musalla Khawlan (a Yemeni tribe) was an open space, and the service was said (1659, 18); in Kufa, several are mentioned (ibid., ii, 628, 16; ii, 470, 8; iii, 367, 8-368) two in Marw (ibid., i, 2451). Shortly after 300/912-13 a musallâ outside of Hamadhân is mentioned (al-Masûdî, Murudjî, ix, 23 = § 3595). There was al-Musalla al-Atik in Baghdad; here a dakkâ was erected for the execution of the Karmatian prisoners (al-Tabarî, iii, 2244-5; cf. 1659, 18); in Kufa, several are mentioned (ibid., ii, 628, 16; 1704, 8; iii, 367; 8-368) two in Marw (ibid., i, 2451, 2; 1964, 19; cf. Nasîr-i Khusraw, Raw, tr. 274), one in Farghana (Ibn Hawūkli al-Asghar). It is also an exaggeration when Ibn al-Makrlzî mentions in Baghdad a mosque for the Anbā‘i officials of the tax-oﬃce (Buldan, 245), and several distinguished scholars practically had their own mosques. It occasionally happened that devout private individuals founded mosques. In 672/1273-4 Tâg al-Dîn built a mosque and a separate chamber in which he performed the salāt alone and meditated (al-Makrlzî, iv, 90). The mosque thus founded was very often called after their founders, and memorial and tomb-mosques after the person to be commemorated. Sometimes a mosque is called after some devout man who lived in it (al-Makrlzî, iv, 97, 265 ff.) and a madrasa might be called after its head or a teacher (ibid., iv, 235, 17; Yakût, Uldâbâ, vii, 82).

In Egypt, al-Hâkim in the year 403/1012-13 had a census taken of the mosques of Cairo, and these were found to amount to 800 (al-Makrlzî, iv, 264); al-Kudât mentions in Baghdad a mosque for the Banū Sâlih. A lance which the Negus of Ethiopia had presented to al-Zubayr was carried in front of him and planted before the Prophet as sura. Standing in front of it, he conducted the salât, and then preached a khutba without a minbar to the rows in front of him (al-Tabarî, i, 1281, 14 ff.; al-Bukhârî, Hadî, bâb 6; Salât, bâb 90; Ístdân, bâb 6). He also went out to the musallâ for the salāt al-istiksa by the place of prayer (al-masjīd, etc.) of the Banû Sâlih. A lance which the Negus of Ethiopia had presented to al-Zubayr was carried in front of him and planted before the Prophet as sura. In the year 16/637, it was expressly stated that it was sunna to go out to it; Sa’d b. Abi Waqâṣ built a mosque in Kûsa’s Ḫānân in al-Maḍâ‘; in, at the festival in the year 16/637, it was expressly stated that it was sunna to go out to it; Sa’d, however, thought it was a matter of indifference (al-Tabarî, i, 2451). Shortly after 300/912-13 a mussallâ outside of Hamadhân is mentioned (al-Masûdî, Murudjî, ix, 23 = § 3595). There was al-Musalla al-Atik in Baghdad: here a dakkâ was erected for the execution of the Karmatian prisoners (al-Tabarî, iii, 2244-5; cf. 1659, 18); in Kufa, several are mentioned (ibid., ii, 628, 16; 1704, 8; iii, 367; 8-368) two in Marw (ibid., i, 2451, 2; 1964, 19; cf. Nasîr-i Khusraw, Raw, tr. 274), one in Farghana (Ibn Hawūkli al-Asghar). It is also an exaggeration when Ibn al-Makrlzî mentions in Baghdad a mosque for the Anbā‘i officials of the tax-oﬃce (Buldan, 245), and several distinguished scholars practically had their own mosques. It occasionally happened that devout private individuals founded mosques. In 672/1273-4 Tâg al-Dîn built a mosque and a separate chamber in which he performed the salāt alone and meditated (al-Makrlzî, iv, 90). The mosque thus founded was very often called after their founders, and memorial and tomb-mosques after the person to be commemorated. Sometimes a mosque is called after some devout man who lived in it (al-Makrlzî, iv, 97, 265 ff.) and a madrasa might be called after its head or a teacher (ibid., iv, 235, 17; Yakût, Uldâbâ, vii, 82).

Lastly, a mosque might take its name from its situation or from some feature of the building.

6. Al-Muṣallâ. In addition to the mosques proper, al-Makrlzî mentions for Cairo eight places for prayer (musalla) mainly at the cemetery (iv, 334-5). The word musalla may mean any place of prayer, therefore also mosque (cf. sūra II, 119; cf. al-Makrlzî KubI, iv, 25, 16; idem, Ittiâd, ed. Bunz. 91, 17; Yakût, Buldan, iv, 326, 3-5) or a particular place of prayer (al-Fitr, ii, 4, 3-7). In Cairo, the two festivals were celebrated on the Musalla Khawlan (a Yemeni tribe) was an open space, and the service was said (1659, 18); in Kufa, several are mentioned (ibid., ii, 628, 16; ii, 470, 8; iii, 367; 8-368) two in Marw (ibid., i, 2451, 2; 1964, 19; cf. Nasîr-i Khusraw, Raw, tr. 274), one in Farghana (Ibn Hawūkli al-Asghar). It is also an exaggeration when Ibn al-Makrlzî mentions in Baghdad a mosque for the Anbā‘i officials of the tax-oﬃce (Buldan, 245), and several distinguished scholars practically had their own mosques. It occasionally happened that devout private individuals founded mosques. In 672/1273-4 Tâg al-Dîn built a mosque and a separate chamber in which he performed the salāt alone and meditated (al-Makrlzî, iv, 90). The mosque thus founded was very often called after their founders, and memorial and tomb-mosques after the person to be commemorated. Sometimes a mosque is called after some devout man who lived in it (al-Makrlzî, iv, 97, 265 ff.) and a madrasa might be called after its head or a teacher (ibid., iv, 235, 17; Yakût, Uldâbâ, vii, 82).

Lastly, a mosque might take its name from its situation or from some feature of the building.
then on al-Musalla al-Kadim where Ahmad b. Tulun erected a building in 256/870. The site was several times changed (al-Makrizi, iv, 306; al-Mukaddasi, 200, 14-20). In 302, 306 and 308 the salāt al-ṣalāt was performed for the first time in the Mosque of ʿAmr (al-Makrizi, iv, 20, 8 ff.; al-Suyūṭī, Ḥun al-muḥādara, ii, 137 below; Ibn Ṭabarī, iii, 194, 9 ff.). Ibn Bāṭṭaṭa notes the custom in Spain (i, 20) and Tunis (i, 22) and also in India (iii, 154). Ibn al-Ḥāḍid (d. 737/1336-7) says that in his time the ceremonies still took place on the musalla but conditions the bids associated with them (K. al-Makrāzī, Cairo 1320, ii, 82). It is also laid down in Muslim law, although not always definitely (see Juynboll, Handbuch d. Islam. Ges., 1910, 127; I. Guidi, II Muḥāṣar, i, 1919, 136). The custom seems in time to have become generally abandoned. In the 9th/10th century the Masjid Aṣḵunkur was expressly built for the ḵūba at the Friday services and at festivals (al-Makrizī, iv, 107, 17).

The mosque as the centre for divine worship.

I. Sanctity of the mosque. The history of the mosques in the early centuries of Islam shows an increase in its sanctity, which was intensified by the adoption of the traditions of the church and especially by the permeation of the cult of saints. The sanctity associated with tombs taken over by Islam was naturally very soon transferred to the larger and more imposing mosques. The expression Bayt Allāh “house of God”, which at first was only used of the Kaʿba came now be applied to any mosque (see Corpus iuris di Zaid b. Ἠλί, no. 48, cf. 156, 983; Chron. Mecca, ed. Wüstenfeld, iv, 164; van Berchem, CIA, i, 10, no. 1, 18; Ibn al-Ḥāḍid, K. al-Madkhal, i, 20, 29; ii, 64, 68; cf. Bayt Bankhārah, ibid., i, 23, 73; ii, 36). The alteration in the original conception is illustrated by the fact that the Mamlūk al-Malik al-Zahir Baybars declined to build a mosque on a place for tethering camels because it was unseemly, while the mosque of the Prophet had actually been built on such a place (al-Makrizī, iv, 91; Abū Dāwūd, Salāt, bāb 22).

In the house of God, the musḥbār and the minbar enjoyed particular sanctity, as did the tomb, especially in Medina (al-Bukhārī, Fadd al-salāt fi masjdī Makka wa ʿl-Madīna, bāb 5). The visitors sought baraka, partly by touching the tomb or the railing round it, partly by praying in its vicinity; at such places “prayer is heard” (Chron. Mecca, iii, 441, 442). In the Masjid al-Khayf in Mina, the visitor laid his head on the print of God”, which at first was only used of the Kaʿba and in the Azhar Mosque (al-Makrāzī, iii, 19, 52) or the Mosque in Jerusalem (al-Mukaddasi, 170), were especially visited. Pious visitors made ṭawaf [see ṭawaf] between such places in the mosque (al-Makrizī, iv, 20). Just as in other religions, we find parents dedicating their children to the service of a sanctuary, so we find a Muslim woman vowing her child or child yet unborn to the mosque (al-Bukhārī, Sahih, 74; al-Makrizī, iv, 20). The fact that mosques, like other sanctuaries, were sometimes founded after a revelation received in a dream has already been mentioned (see 1 B. 5). This increase in sanctity had as a natural result that one could no longer enter a mosque at random as had been the case in the time of the Prophet. In the early Umayyad period, Christians were still allowed to enter the mosque without molestation (cf. Lammens, Moʿawia, 13-14; Goldziher, in WZKM, vi, 1892, 100-1). Muʿawiyah used to sit with his Christian physician, Ibn Uṭṭil, in the mosque of Damascus (Ibn Abī ʿUṣaybiʿa, i, 117). According to Ahmad b. Hanbal, the Aḥī al-Kītāb (or Aḥī al-ʿAbd) and their servants, but not polytheists, were allowed to enter the mosque of Medina (Mardīd, iii, 339, 39). At a later date, entrance was forbidden to Christians and this regulation is credited to Umar (Lammens, op. cit., 13, n. 6). A strict teacher of morality like Ibn al-Ḥāḍid thought it unseemly that the monks who won the marks for the mosques should be allowed to lay them in the mosque (Makkāl, ii, 57). Conditions were not always the same. In Hebron, Jews and Christians were admitted on payment to the sanctuary of Abraham until in 664/1265 Baybars forbade it (Quaquemère, Hist. Sult. Maml., i/2, 27).

According to some traditions, a person in a state of ritual impurity could not enter the mosque (Abū Dāwūd, Tahāra, bāb 92; Ibn Mādira, Tahāra, bāb 123). In any case, only the pure could acquire merit by visiting the mosque (Muslim, Masājid, tr. 49; Corpus iuris di Zaid b. Ἠλί, no. 48). The custom was not always the same. In Hebron, Jews and Christians were admitted on payment to the sanctuary of Abraham until in 664/1265 Baybars forbade it (Quaquemère, Hist. Sult. Maml., i/2, 27).

According to some traditions, a person in a state of ritual impurity could not enter the mosque (Abū Dāwūd, Tahāra, bāb 92; Ibn Mādira, Tahāra, bāb 123). In any case, only the pure could acquire merit by visiting the mosque (Muslim, Masājid, tr. 49; Corpus iuris di Zaid b. Ἠλί, no. 48). The custom was not always the same. In Hebron, Jews and Christians were admitted on payment to the sanctuary of Abraham until in 664/1265 Baybars forbade it (Quaquemère, Hist. Sult. Maml., i/2, 27).

According to some traditions, a person in a state of ritual impurity could not enter the mosque (Abū Dāwūd, Tahāra, bāb 92; Ibn Mādira, Tahāra, bāb 123). In any case, only the pure could acquire merit by visiting the mosque (Muslim, Masājid, tr. 49; Corpus iuris di Zaid b. Ἠλί, no. 48). The custom was not always the same. In Hebron, Jews and Christians were admitted on payment to the sanctuary of Abraham until in 664/1265 Baybars forbade it (Quaquemère, Hist. Sult. Maml., i/2, 27).

According to some traditions, a person in a state of ritual impurity could not enter the mosque (Abū Dāwūd, Tahāra, bāb 92; Ibn Mādira, Tahāra, bāb 123). In any case, only the pure could acquire merit by visiting the mosque (Muslim, Masājid, tr. 49; Corpus iuris di Zaid b. Ἠλί, no. 48). The custom was not always the same. In Hebron, Jews and Christians were admitted on payment to the sanctuary of Abraham until in 664/1265 Baybars forbade it (Quaquemère, Hist. Sult. Maml., i/2, 27).
as there is no fitna connected with it, but they must not be perfumed (Muslim, Salât, bâb 29; al-Bukhârî, Djdîm’a, bâb 13; cf. Chron. Mekka, iv, 168). Other hadîths say they should leave the mosques before the men (al-Nâsî, Sahîb, bâb 77; cf. Abu Dâwîd, Salât, bâb 14, 48). Sometimes a special part of the mosque was railed off for them; for example, the governor of Mecca in 256/870 had ropes tied between the columns to make a separate place for women (Chron. Mekka, ii, 197 below). According to some, women must not enter the mosque during their menstruation (Abû Dâwîd, Tâhâra, bâb 92, 103; Ibn Mâdja, Tâhâra, bâb 117, 123). In Medina at the present day, a wooden grille shuts off a place for women (al-Batârînî, al-Rîhîl, tr. 58; al-Hîjâzî, y. 240). At one time, the women stood at the back of the mosque here (Yâkût, Udâbîb, vi, 400). In Jerusalem there were special maksûres for them (Ibn al-Fâhîm, 100). Ibn al-Hâdjî would prefer to exclude them altogether and gives Â’ûlîba as his authority for this.

Although the mosque became sacred, it could not quite cast off its old character as a place of public assembly, and in consequence, the mosque was visited for many other purposes than that of divine worship. Not only in the time of the Umayyads was considerable business done in the mosques (al-Tabârî, ii, 1118; cf. Lammens, Zind, 98) which is quite in keeping with the hadîth (Sâlît, bdb 71-90) which actually found it necessary to forbid the sale of wine in the mosque (ibid., bâb 73), but Ibn al-Hâdjî records with disapproval that business was done in the mosques: women sit in the mosques and sell thread, in Mecca hawkers even call their wares in the mosques. The list given by this author gives one the impression of a regular market-place (Makhkîl, ii, 54). Strangers could always sit down in a mosque and talk with one another (see al-Mukkaddasî, 205); they had the right to spend the night in the mosque; according to some, however, only if there was no other shelter available (Makhkîl, ii, 43 below, 49 above; see below f.D.1b). It naturally came about that people also ate in the mosque; this was quite common, and regular banquets were even given in them (e.g. al-Makrîzî, ii, 54, 57, 121-2; ibid., Salât, bdb 119; Ibn Masâdî, bdb 24, 29; Ahmad b. Hanîlî, ibid, 106, below 10). Ibn al-Hâdjî laments that in the Masjîd al-Âkṣa people even threw the remains of their repast down in the mosque; animals were brought in, and beggars and water-carriers called aloud in them, etc. (Makhkîl, ii, 53 ff.). It is even mentioned as a sign of the special piety of al-Shirazi (d. 476/1083) that he often brought with the people of his time, and in consequence, the mosque was visited for many other purposes than that of divine worship. The chief mosque, which for this reason was particularly large, was given a significant name. They talk of al-masâjid al-‘l-ajamî (al-Tabârî, ibid., 2494; ii, 734, 1701, 1702; Kuﬁ; al-Bâlûdhûrî, 35; al-Tabârî, Tâfîsr, xi, 21, centre; ibid. also al-masâjid al-akbar, Medina; cf. al-masâjid al-kabîr, al-Ya‘kûbî, Babûdân, 245) or masjid al-‘djm’a (Yâkût, iii, 896, Fustât; also al-Tabârî, ii, 1119; Ibn Kutayba, Mârifî, ed. Wûstenfeld, 106). Similarly conditions still prevail in the mosques.

2. THe mosque as a place of prayer. Fri-day mosques. As places for divine worship, the mosques are primarily "houses of which God has permitted that they be erected and that His name be mentioned in them" (sûra XXIV, 36), i.e. for His service demanded by the law, for ceremonies of wor- ship (manîsîk), for assemblies for prayer (djum’at) and other religious duties (cf. Chron. Mekka, al-Adhdîn, bdb 87, 1118; ibid., adhdîn, bdb 87, 1118; ibid., adhdîn, bdb 87; Bayûs, bâb 49). There are even hadîths which condemn private salâts: "Those who perform the salât in their houses abandon the sunna of their Prophet" (Muslim, Masîjid, tr. 45; but cf. 48 and al-Bukhârî, Salât, bâb 52). If much rain falls, the believers may, however, worship in their houses (al-Bukhârî, Djdîm’a, bâb 14). In this connection, a blind man was given a special roof; it is particularly bad to leave the mosque after the adhdîn (Muslim, Masîjid, tr. 45). It is therefore very meritorious to go to the mosque; for every step a man advances into the mosque, he receives forgiveness of sins, God protects him at the last judgment and the angels also assist him (Muslim, Masîjid, bâb 49-51; al-Bukhârî, Salât, bâb 87; Aqîhîn, bdb 36, 37; Djdîm’a, bâb 4, 10, 31; Corpus iuris di Zaid b. Ali, nos. 40, 156, 983).

This holds especially of the Friday salât (salât al-‘djm’a), which can only be performed in the mosque and is obligatory upon every free male Muslim who has reached years of discretion (cf. Juynboll, Handbuch, 86; Guidî, Sommario del diritto Malechita, i, 125-6. According to Ibn Hîghâm (290), this salât, which is distinguished by the kîba, was observed in Medina even before the hijâra. This is hardly probable and besides is not in agreement with other hadîths (see al-Bukhârî, Djdîm’a, bâb 11) but the origin of this divine worship, referred to in sûra LXII, 9, is obscure. The assemblies of the Jews and Christians on a particular day must have formed the model (cf. al-Bukhârî, Djdîm’a, bâb 1). Its importance in the earlier period lay in the fact that all elements of the Muslim camp, who usually went to the tribal and particular mosques, assembled for it in the chief mosque under the leadership of the general. The chief mosque, which for this reason was particularly large, was given a significant name. They talk of al-masâjid al-‘sâm (al-Tabârî, i, 2494; ii, 734, 1701, 1702; Kuﬁ; al-Bâlûdhûrî, 35; al-Tabârî, Tâfîsr, xi, 21, centre; ibid. also al-masâjid al-akbar, Medina; cf. al-masâjid al-kabîr, al-Ya‘kûbî, Babûdân, 245) or masjid al-‘djm’a (Yâkût, iii, 896, Fustât; also al-Tabârî, ii, 1119; Ibn Kutayba, Mârifî, ed. Wûstenfeld, 106). Similarly conditions still prevail in the mosques.

In the time of ‘Umar there was property in every town only one masjid for the Friday service. But when the community became no longer mainly military, this rule and the previous religion of the people, a need for a number of mosques for the Friday service was bound to arise. This demanded mosques for the Friday service in the
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country, in the villages on the one hand and several Friday mosques in the town on the other. This meant in both cases innovation, competition, envy, and criticisms, and thus there arose some degree of uncertainty. The Friday service had to be conducted by the ruler of the community, but there was only one governor in each province; on the other hand, the demands of the time could hardly be resisted and, besides, the Christian converts to Islam had been used to a solemn service for the reason just mentioned (al-Makrizi, 176; cf. 538). Ibn Hawkal mentions in his book that has survived); al-Makrizi (d. 927/1521) gives twenty


djidmi (i, 236). The word djami* in al-Makrizi always

imposed on the one hand and recently 7,000 mosques 

mentioned (al-Makrizi, iv, 2-3). Ibn Dukmak gives 130

djami* in al-Makrizi, i, 2-3). Al-Mukaddasi, who wrote (375/985) shortly after the Fatimid conquest, mentions the

Al-Mudhaylas, also one in al-Djazira, in Djiza and in 
al-Karafa, which was regarded as a separate town (cf. Ibn Rusta (399/1009), but this list is apparently only a fragment (in Al-Mugaffal, ed. Schefer, 134-5, 147). This was altered in 569/1173-4 by Salah al-Din (see above), but the principle was not abandoned that each town had only one djami*. The Fatimids, however, extended the use of Friday mosques and, in addition to those already mentioned, used the djami* in the suburb of Kalwadha. Ibn Hawkal in 367/977 mentions the latter and also the Djami* of Harun al-Rashld in the suburb of Kalwadha. Ibn Hawkal in 367/977 also mentions only one

All the indications of the 3rd/9th and 4th/10th centuries in their descriptions of towns as a rule mention only

"the djami". Ibn al-Fakhri, ca. 290/903, sometimes says masjid djami* or minbar (304-6, also minbar simply, 305). In keeping with the oldest scheme of town planning, it was very often in the middle of the town surrounded by the business quarters (Ibn Hawkal, 298, 325; al-Mukaddasi, 274-5, 278, 298, 314, 316, 375, 376, 413, 426, 427, etc.; Nasir-i Khusrav, ed. Schefer, 35, 41, 56) and the dar al-imara was still frequently in the immediate vicinity of the chief mosque (Ibn Hawkal, 298, 314; al-Mukaddasi, 426).
means a mosque in which the Friday worship was held (vi, 76, 115 ff.), but by his time this meant any mosque of some size. He himself criticizes the fact that such a term [al djam'i] was in Al-Akmar, although another djam'i stood close beside it (iv, 76; cf. also 86).

The great spread of Friday mosques was reflected in the language. While inscriptions of the 8th/14th century still call quite large mosques masjid, in the 9th/15th most of them are called djam'i (cf. on the whole question, van Berchem, C.I.A. i, 173-4); and while now the maddris (q.v.) begins to predominate and is occasionally also called djam'i, the use of the word masjid becomes limited. While, generally speaking, it can mean any mosque (e.g. al-Makrizi, iv, 137, of the Mu‘ayyad mosque), it is more especially used of the smaller unimportant mosques.

While Ibn Dukmāk gives 472 masjid in addition to the djam'i, madrasî, etc., al-Makrizi only gives nine-teen, not counting al-Karāfa, which probably only means that they were of little interest to him. Djam'i is now on the way to become the regular name for a mosque of any size, as is now the usage, in Egypt and Turkey at least. In Ibn al-Haḍīdī (d. 737/1336-7), al-djam'i al-kurāfa, a whole society, the Banu Djawha, delivered wazāz discourses from a kursi for three zam, especially used of the smaller unimportant mosques.

The use of the djam'i, kursi, etc., al-Makrizi only gives nine-teen discourses are given by Ibn Battuta (i, 54, 94; cf. the older expression zam, maddris, etc., al-Makrizi only gives nine-teen, in addition to djam'i masjid mentioned in circles every evening and recited (205). In the expression as the chief mosque; we therefore find the expression maddris, etc., al-Makrizi only gives nine-teen, in addition to djam'i masjid in addition to while Ibn Dukmāk gives 472

CIA, van Berchem, i, 173-4); and 9th/15th most of them are called masjid, while now the djam'i, madrasî, etc., al-Makrizi only gives nineteen, not counting al-Karāfa, which probably only means that they were of little interest to him. Djam'i is now on the way to become the regular name for a mosque of any size, as is now the usage, in Egypt and Turkey at least. In Ibn al-Haḍīdī (d. 737/1336-7), al-djam'i al-kurāfa, a whole society, the Banu Djawha, delivered wazāz discourses from a kursi for three zam, especially used of the smaller unimportant mosques.

The use of the djam'i, kursi, etc., al-Makrizi only gives nineteen, not counting al-Karāfa, which probably only means that they were of little interest to him. Djam'i is now on the way to become the regular name for a mosque of any size, as is now the usage, in Egypt and Turkey at least. In Ibn al-Haḍīdī (d. 737/1336-7), al-djam'i al-kurāfa, a whole society, the Banu Djawha, delivered wazāz discourses from a kursi for three zam, especially used of the smaller unimportant mosques.
months on end; their servant collected money in a begging-bowl during the discourse, and the shaykh distributed some of it among the poor (ibid., iv. 121).

The ka‘as was completely taken over by popular Sufism and later writers would hardly reckon, as al-Makki does, the “story-tellers” among the mutakallimun (Kut al-kulub, i, 152). The whole system degenerated to trickery and charlatanry of all kinds, as may be seen in the Makama [q.v.] literature (cf. thereon Yākūt, Ušāba, ii, 167-8, and see also Mez and Goldzieher, op. cit.). Al-Makrizī therefore distinguishes between al-ka‘as al-hājji, the regular and undisturbed, and what he terms al-‘ṣāmma, which consisted in the people gathering round all kinds of speakers, which is makhrūf (iv, 17). Others also have recorded their objections to the ka‘as as well as a halak (al-Makrizī, iv, 17).

When Ibn al-Hādhījī denounces speaking aloud in the mosque, it is in the interest of the pious visitors who are engaged in religious works and meditation. Ṣītāfī [q.v.], retirement to a mosque for a period, was adopted into Islam from the older religions.

The word ṣāfī means in the Kur‘ān the ceremonial worship of the object of the cult (sūra VII, 134; XX, 93, 97; XXI, 53; XXVI, 71; cf. al-Kumayt, Ḥādhimyya, ed. Horovitz, 86, 15) and also the ritual washing of the sanctuary, which was done for example in the Meccan temple (sūra II, 119; XXII, 25). In this connection, it is laid down in the Kur‘ān that in the month of Ramazān believers must not touch their wives “while ye pass the time in the mosques” (‘akūfīn ft ‘l-masjidī, sūra II, 183), an expression which shows, firstly, that there were already a number of mosques in the lifetime of the Prophet, and secondly, that these had already to some extent taken over the character of the temple. The connection with the early period is evident from a hadith, according to which the Prophet decides that ‘Umar must carry out a vow of i‘tikāf for one night in the Masjid al-Ḥarmā made in the Dihiyiyā (al-Bukhārī, Ṣītāfī, bāb 5, 15-16; Fard al-khums, bāb 19, Ṣītāfī, bāb 54; Ayrūm wa‘l-nudhur, 19; al-khums, bdb 3), and by his orders (al-Makrizī, iv, 87, 97), of one we are told that he spent his time in the mosque of the “Amr in his booth and chatted for an hour with her (al-Bukhārī, Fard al-khums, bāb 4; Ṣītāfī, bāb 8, 11, 12). According to another tradition, his ṣītāfūf was broken on another occasion by his wives putting up their tents beside him, and he postponed his ṣītāfūf till Shāwawīl (al-Bukhārī, Ṣītāfī, bāb 6, 7, 14, 18). According to Zayd b. ‘Ali, the ṣītāfūf can only be observed in a chief mosque (dārūrī) (Corpus turī ti Zaid b. ‘Ali, no. 447). During the early period, it was one of the initiatory rites for new converts. In the year 14/1635 ‘Umar ordered the retreat (al-kāyām) in the mosque on the first day of Ramazān for the people of Medina and the provinces (al-Tabarī, i, 2377). The custom persisted and has always been an important one among ascetics. “The man who retires for a time to the mosque devotes himself in turn to salāt, recitation of the Kur‘ān, meditation, ḥākur, etc.” says Ibn al-Hādhījī (Madkhal, ii, 50). There were pious people who spent their whole time in a mosque (akāmā fīhi‘; al-Makrizī, iv, 121). Al-Samhūdī says that during the month of Ramazān, he spent day and night in the mosque (Wüstenfeld, Medina, 95). Sa‘d al-Dīn (d. 644/1246-7) spent the month of Ramazān in the Mosque of the Umayyads without speaking (Ibn Abī Usayyib, ii, 192). Nocturnal vigils in the mosque very early became an established practice in Islam. According to Ḥadīth, the Prophet frequently held nocturnal salāts in the mosque with the believers (al-Bukhārī, Quum, bāb 29), and by his orders ‘Abd Allāh b. Unays al-Ansārī came from the desert for twenty-three successive nights to pass the night in his mosque in rites of worship (Ibn Kutayba, Ma‘ārif, ed. Wüstenfeld, 142-3). Out of this developed the tahādīfūf [q.v.] salāt, particularly recommended in the law and notably the tarawīh salāt [q.v.]. In Dīhil on these occasions, women singers actually took part (Ibn Battīṭa, iii, 155).

During the nights of the month of Ramazān, there were festivals in the mosques, and on other occasions also, such as the New Year, sometimes at the new moon, and in the middle of the month. The mosque on these occasions was illuminated: there was eating and drinking; incense was burned and ḥākur and khutba were read.

The Friday salāt was particularly solemn in Ramazān, and in the Fāṭimid period, the caliph himself delivered the khutba (see al-Makrizī, ii, 345 ff.; Ibn Taghībirdī, i, ii, ed. Juynboll, 482-6, ii/2, ed. Popper, 331-3). The mosques associated with a saint had and still have their special festivals on his mawlid [q.v.]: they also are celebrated with ḥākur, khutba, etc. (cf. Lane, Manners and customs, chs. xxiv ff.). The saint’s festivals are usually local and there are generally differences in the local customs. In the Mağrib, for example, in certain places the month of Ramazān is opened with a blast of trumpets from the manābīr (Madkhal, ii, 69).

The mosque thus on the whole took over the role of the temple. The rulers from ‘Umar onwards dedicated gifts to the Ka‘ba (Ibn al-Fakhr, 20-1, and BOA, iv, Indices, glossarium, s.v. qamūs), and, as in other sanctuaries, we find women vowing children to the service of the mosque (al-Bukhārī, Salāt, bāb 74; al-Makrizī, iv, 20). Tawāf was performed, as at the Ka‘ba, in mosques with saints’ tombs as is still done, e.g. in Hebron; Maḏjur al-Dīn sees a pre-Islamic custom in this (Sauvaire, Hist. Jérusalem 4). Especially important business was done here. In times of trouble, the people go to the mosque to pray for help, for example during drought, for which there is
special ʿalāt (which however usually takes place on the ʿmāyād) [see isTiSKA], in misfortunes of all kinds (e.g. Wustenfeld, Medina, 19-20; al-Makrizî, iv, 57); in the bier of a Relation, and praying with Karbân uplifted, were held in the mosques or on the ʿmāyād, in which even Jews and Christians sometimes took part (Ibn Taghrîbidî, ii/2, ed. Popper, 67; Ibn Baṭṭûţa, i, 243-4, cf. Quatremerê, Hist. Sult. Maml., i/1, 35, 40; i/2, 199) or for a period a sacred book like al-Bukhârî’s ʿalîb was recited (Quatremerê, op. cit. ii/2, 35; al-Dîbarsî, Meravitis, biographique, French tr. vi, 13). In the courtyards of mosques in Jerusalem and Damasus in the time of Ibn Baṭṭûţa, solemn penance was done on the day of ʿArâfa (i, 243-4), an ancient custom which had already been introduced into Egypt in the year 27/647-8 by ʿAbd al-ʿAzîz b. Marwân (kuḥdâd after the ʿasr; cf. al-Kindî, Wulât, 50). Certain mosques were visited by barren women (Wustenfeld, Medina, 133).

An oath is particularly binding if it is taken in a mosque (cf. J. Pedersen, Der Eid bei den Semitten, 144); this is particularly true of the Karbâ, where written covenants were also drawn up to make them more binding (ibid., 143-4, Chron. Mecca, i, 160-1). It is in keeping with this idea of an oath that Jews who had adopted Islam in Cairo had to take oaths in a synagogue which had become a mosque (al-Makrizî, iv, 57, 144; c. of ʿIsmâʿîl, Mecca, also is often concluded in a mosque (Ṣanilltana, Il Muḥtasar, i, 548; Mâdhâbî, ii, 72 below; Snouck Hurgronje, Mecca, ii, 163-4), and the particular form of divorce which is completed by the bârân [g. j. t.] takes place in the mosque (al-Bukhârî, ʿalāt, bâb 44; cf. Pedersen, Der Eid, 114).

It is disputed whether a corpse may be brought into the mosque and the ʿalât al-dînî performed there. According to one hadîth, the bier of ʿAbî Wâlâ took into the mosque at the request of the Prophet’s widow and the ʿalât held there. Many disagreed of this, but ʿAbî Ḥanîfî pointed out that the Prophet had done this with the body of Suhayl b. Baydâ (Muslim, Qamarâz, tr. 34; cf. also Ibn Saʿūd, i/1, 14-15). The discussion on this point is not unconnected with the discussions regarding the worship of tombs. This is permitted by al-Shâbî, while the others forbid it (see Juynboll, Handbuch, 170; I. Guidi, Il Muḥtasar, i, 151). The matter does not seem to be quite clear, for ʿUtb al-Dîn says that only ʿAbû Ḥanîfî forbids it, but he himself thought that it might be allowable on the authority of a statement by ʿAbû Yusûf (Chron. Mecca, iii, 208-10). In any case, it was a very general practice to allow it, as ʿUtb al-Dîn also points out. ʿUmar conducted the funeral ʿalât for ʿAbû Bakr in the Mosque of the Prophet and ʿUmar’s own dead body was brought there; later it became a general custom to perform the ceremony in Medina close to the Prophet’s tomb and in Mecca at the door of the Karbâ; some even made a sevenfold tawâf with the corpse around the Karbâ. This was for a time forbidden by Marwân b. al-Ḥâkâm and later by ʿUmar b. ʿAbî Azîz (Kutb al-Dîn, loc. cit., Wustenfeld, Medina, 77). The custom was very early introduced into the Mosque of ʿAmr (al-Makrizî, iv, 7, 1 ff.). That later scholars often went wrong about the prohibition is not at all remarkable; for it is not at all in keeping with the ever-increasing tendency to found mosques at tombs. Even Ibn al-Ḥâdîṣ, who was anxious to maintain the prohibition, is not quite sure and really only for bids the loud calling of the karbâ, and this became a very usual custom. Mecca and Medina, however, still held the preference. Although those of Mecca and Jerusalem were recognised as the two oldest (the one is said to be 40 years older than the other; Muslim, Masâṣûdî, tr. 1; Chron. Mecca, i, 301), the Prophet is however reputed to have said “A ʿalât in this mosque is more meritorious than 1,000 ʿalâts in others, even in al-Masjîd al-Ḥāram” (al-Bukhârî, Fadl al-ʿalât fi masjîd Makka wa l-Madina, bâb 16; Quatremere, tr. 93). The three mosques, however, retained their pride of place (Ibn Khaldûn, Mukaddasi, 440, ii, 311). Although this competition did not last long, the significance of Jerusalem was thereby greatly increased. Pilgrimage to Medina developed out of the increasing veneration for the Prophet. In the year 140/757-8, Abu Dâفار al-Manṣûr on his hajj visited the three sanctuaries (al-Tabârî, i, 129) and this became a very usual custom. Mecca and Medina, however, still held the preference. Although those of Mecca and Jerusalem were recognised as the two oldest (the one is said to be 40 years older than the other; Muslim, Masâṣûdî, tr. 1; Chron. Mecca, i, 301), the Prophet is however reputed to have said “A ʿalât in this mosque is more meritorious than 1,000 ʿalâts in others, even in al-Masjîd al-Ḥâram” (al-Bukhârî, Fadl al-ʿalât fi masjîd Makka wa l-Madina, bâb 1; Muslim, Hadîṣî, tr. 89; Chron. Mecca, i, 303). These ʿalâts aimed directly against Jerusalem and therefore probably dates from the ʿUmâyad period. According to some, it was announced because someone had condemned performing the ʿalât in Jerusalem, which the Prophet was against (Muslim, loc. cit.; al-Wâkidî-Wellhausen, 349). The three mosques, however, retained their pride of place (Ibn Khaldûn, Mukaddasi, fâṣd 4, 6; Ibn al-Ḥâdîṣ, Madkhal, ii, 55), and as late as 662/1264 we find Baybars founding awâkî for pilgrims who wished to go on foot to Jerusalem (Quatremerê, Hist. Sult. Maml., i/1, 248).

Although these three mosques officially hold a special position, others also are highly recommended, e.g. the mosque in ʿUthmân (see al-Maḥdlî). A ʿalât in this mosque is said to be as valuable as an ʿumâra or two visits to the mosque in Jerusalem (al-Dîbarsi, Khamsî, i, 381-2). Attempts were also made to raise the mosque of Kûfâ to the level of the three. ʿAli is said to have told someone who wanted to make a pilgrimage from Kûfâ to Jerusalem that he should stick by the mosque of his native town, it was “one of the four mosques” and two nakîs in it were equal to ten in others (Ibn al-Fâkhî, 173-4; Yâkût, Muṣammî, iv, 323); in another tradition, ʿalâts in the provincial mosques are said to be of special value worth as much as the pilgrimage (al-Makrizî, iv, 4), and traditions are said about the special blessings associated at definite times.
with different holy places of Islam (al-Mukaddasi, 183) and especially about their superior merits (Ibn al-Fakih, 174). The Meccan sanctuary, however, always retained first place, which was marked by the hadjijaj. It was imitated by al-Mutawakkil in Sámmará: he built a Ka’ba as well as a Mi’na and an ‘Arafa there and made his amirs perform their hadjijaj there (al-Mukaddasi, 122).

D. The component parts and furnishings of the mosque.

The development of the edifice. Except in the case of Mecca the earliest mosques as described above (B. 1) were at first simply open spaces marked off by a zulla. The space was sometimes, as in al-Fustat, planted with trees and usually covered with pebbles, e.g. in Medina (Muslim, Hadjijaj, tr. 95; al-Baladhurí, 6) and Fustat (al-MakrlzT, iv, 95; Ibn Dukmak, iv, 62; Ibn Taghhrift, i, 77), which was later introduced in Basra and Kufa, the courtyards of which were otherwise dusty (al-Baladhurí, 277, 348). These conditions could only last so long as the Arabs retained their ancient customs as a closed group in their simple camps. The utilisation of churches was the first sign of a change and was rapidly followed by a mingling with the rest of the population and the resulting assimilation with older cultures. The best example of this is found in the mosque in Medina and in Mecca also. He extended the Mosque of the Prophet by taking in the house of ‘Abbas; but like the Prophet, he still built with lath, palm trunks and leaves and extended the booths (al-Bukhari, Salat, bbb 62; al-Baladhurí, 6). In Mecca also, his work was confined to extending the area occupied by the mosque. He bought the surrounding houses and took them down and then surrounding the area with a wall to the height of a man; the Ka’ba was thus given its first form like the mosque in Medina (al-Baladhurí, 46; Chron. Mecka, i, 306; Wüstefeld, Medina, 68). Ugâmán also extended these two mosques, but introduced an important innovation in using hewn stone and piers (ddjurr) for the walls and pillars. For the roof he used teak (ddjurr). The booths, which had been extended by ‘Umar, were replaced by him by pillared halls (arwika, sing. of pl., ‘Umar’s hall). The columns were added to meditate (al-Bukhari, Salat, bbb 62; al-Baladhurí, 46; Wüstefeld, Medina, 70). Sa’d b. Abi Wakkās is said to have already taken similar steps to relieve the old simplicity of the poorly-equipped mosque in Kufa. The zulla consisted of pillars of marble adorned in the style of Byzantine churches (al-Tabarí, i, 2489; Yākūt, iv, 324). This was little in keeping with the simple architecture of the original town, for Basra and Kufa had originally been built of reeds and only after several great fires were they built of labin (see above, I. B. 1; cf. Ibn Kutayba, Ma’sirif, ed. Wüstefeld, 279). As to Kufa, Sa’d by ‘Umar’s orders extended the mosque so that it became joined up with the Dar al-Imara. A Persian named Kuzbīb b. Buzurgjmhr was the architect for this. He used fired bricks (ddjurr) for the building, which he brought from Persian buildings, and in the mosque he used pillars which had been taken from churches in the region of Hira belonging to the Persian kings; these columns were not erected at the sides but only against the kibla wall. The original plan of the mosque was therefore still retained, although the pillared hall, which is identical with the zulla already mentioned (200 ddjurr’s broad), replaced the simple booth, and the mosque was altered in every way (al-Tabarí, i, 2491-2, 2494). Already under the early caliphs we can therefore note the beginnings of the adoption of a more advanced architecture.

These tendencies were very much developed under the Umayyads. Even as early as the reign of Mu’awiyah, the mosque of Kufa was rebuilt by his governor Ziyād. He commissioned a pagan architect, who had worked for Kisrā, to do the work. The latter had pillars brought from al-Ahwāz, bound them together with lead and iron clamps to a height of 30 ddjurr’s and put a roof on them. Similar halls, built of columns (here like the old booth in Medina called yaffa) were added by him on the north, east and western wall. Each pillar cost him 18,000 dirhams. The mosque could now hold 60,000 instead of 40,000 (idem, i, 2492, 6 ff., cf. 2494, 7; Yākūt, iv, 324, 1 ff.; al-Baladhurí, 276). Al-Hajdjid also added to the mosque (Yākūt, iv, 325-6). Ziyād did similar work in Başrā. Here also he extended the mosque and built it of stone (or brick) and plaster and with pillars from al-Ahwāz, which were roofed with teak. We are told that he made al-yaffa al-mukaddasima, i.e. the kibla hall, with 5 columns. This seems to show that the other sides also—as in Kufa—had pillared halls. He erected the Dar al-Imāra close to the kibla side. This was taken down by al-Hajdjid, rebuilt by others, and finally taken into the mosque by Harūn al-Rashid (al-Baladhurí, 347, 348 of his chron.); see above (B. 1) were at first simply open spaces marked off by a zulla. The columns were added to meditate (al-Bukhari, Salat, bbb 62; al-Baladhurí, 46; Wüstefeld, Medina, 68).

These tendencies were very much developed under the Umayyads. These tendencies were very much developed under the Umayyads. The Mosque of Amr was extended in 53/673 with 79/698 in the reign of ‘Abd al-Malik and al-Hajdjid also added to the mosque (Yakut, iv, 307, 309). The Mosque of ‘Amr was extended in 53/673 with Mu’awiya’s permission by his governor Maslama b. Mukhaddal to the east and north; the walls were covered with plaster (ddjurr) and the floor was covered with teak. It is evident from this that here also the original booth of the south side was altered to a covered hall during the early Umayyad period. A further extension was made in 79/698 in the reign of ‘Abd al-Malik (al-MakrlzT, iv, 7, 8; Ibn Dukmak, iv, 62). Thus we find that during the early Umayyad period, and in part even earlier, the original simple and vaulted mosque was replaced by a mcroscope, which was not only no longer simple, but they were built with the help of Christians and other trained craftsmen with the use of material already existing in older buildings. Al-Hajdjid, for example, used materials from the sur-
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rounding towns when building his foundation of Wāsiṭ (al-Tabari, iii, 321; al-Baladhuri, 290). Columns from churches were now used quite regularly (e.g. in Damascus: al-Mas′ūdī, Murād, ii, 408-§ 1292; Ramlā: al-Mukaddasī, 165; cf. al-Baladhuri, 143 ff.; for Egypt, see al-Makrīzī, iv, 36, 124-5). Sometimes, remains of the older style remained alongside the new. In Irāq, al-Mukaddasī found in the chief mosque wooden columns of the time of Abū Muslim along with round columns of brick of the time of ʿAmr b. al-Layth (316). The building activities of al-Walīd extended to Fustāt, Mecca and Medina (cf. Ibn al-Fakīh, 106-7) where no fundamental alterations were made, but complete renovations were carried out. With these rulers, the builders of mosques reach the level of older architecture and gain a place in the history of art. There is also literary evidence for the transfer of a style from one region to another. In Istakhr, for example, there was a ḍājmī in the style of the Syrian mosques with round columns, on which was a baqara (al-Mukaddasī, iii, 436-7; cf. for Shirāz, 430). Al-Walīd also rebuilt the Mosque of the Prophet, in part in the Damascus style (ibid., 80; al-Kaṣwīnī, ed. Wüstenfeld, ii, 71).

This revolution naturally did not take place without opposition, any more than the other innovations, which were discussed in the courtyard and the open space around the mosque (al-Makrīzī, iv, 362). The discussions on this point are reflected in hadiths. When ʿUmar enlarged the Mosque of the Prophet, he is reported to have said: “Give the people shelter from the rain, but take care not to make them red or yellow lest you lead the people astray”, while Ibn ʿAbbās said: “You shall adorn them with gold as the Jews and Christians do” (al-Bukhārī, ed. Schwally, 393; al-Baladhuri, 82, 158, 165), this seems to suggest that the halls were closed, with flat stone roofs; for example in the mosques of ʿAmr until Maslama b. Muḥallad covered it with mats (see above, 1. D. 1); but this was altered with a more refined style of architecture. Al-Mukaddasī mentions that this was only found in Tiberias, out of all the mosques in Palestine (182). Frequently, as in Ramla, the halls were covered with marble and the courtyard with flat stone (ibid., 165). In the halls also, the ground was originally bare or covered with little stones; for example in the mosques of ʿAmr until Maslama b. Muḥallad covered it with mats (see below). The floor of the Mosque of ʿAmr was entirely covered with marble in the Mamlūk period (al-Makrīzī, iv, 13-14, cf. in Shirāz, Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, ii, 53). But in the mosque of Mecca, the ʿabn is still covered with little stones (al-Bāṭnūnī, Ribāh, 99 below); 400 dinārs used to be spent annually on this (Chron. Mekka, ii, 10-11). In Medina also, little pebbles were used (Ibn Dunṣās, al-Bayhakī, 196); Ibn ʿAbd al-Rahmān al-Samḥī gives the history of the maksūra in Medina (Wüstenfeld, Medina, 71-2, 89). The traditions all agree that the maksūra was introduced to protect the ruler from hostile attacks. According to some authorities, ʿUṯmān built a maksūra of labīn with windows, so that the people could see the ima’m of the community (ibid., and al-Makrīzī, iv, 7). According to another tradition, Marwān b. al-Hakam, governor of Medina after an attempt had been made on him by a Yaman in the year 44/664, was the first to build a maksūra of dressed stone with a window (al-Baladhuri, 6 below; al-Ṭabarī, ii, 70). Muḥāwiya is then said to have followed his example. Others, again, say that Muḥāwiya was the first to introduce this innovation. He is said to have introduced the maksīrūt with the accompanying guard as early as the year 40/660 or not till 44/664-5 after the Khaḍījī attempt (al-Ṭabarī, 1, 3465, 9; Ibn al-Fakīh, 109, 3; al-Makrīzī, iv, 12, 11 ff.; according to one story because had had seen a dog on a minaret (al-Bayhakī, ed. Wüstenfeld, 393 below, cf. on the whole question, H. Lammens, Muḥāwiya, 202 ff.). This much seems to be certain,
that the maksura was at any rate introduced at the beginning of the Umayyad period, and it was an arrangement so much in keeping with the increasing dignity of the ruler that, as Ibn Khaldun says, it spread throughout all the lands of Islam (Mukaddamia, Cairo 1322/1904–5, 212–13, fasl 37). The governors built themselves compartments in the principal mosques of the provinces, e.g. Ziyād in Kufa and Basra (al-Baladhurl, 277, 348) and probably Kurra b. Shārīk in Fustāt (al-Makrizi, iv, 12). In Medina, we are told that ‘Umar b. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz as governor (80–97/695–705) raised the maksura and built up the minbar, but according to Ibn al-Mahdī it had taken place in 160/777 and a new one built on the level of the ground (ibid., 7; Wüstenfeld, op. cit.; al-Baladhurl, 7 centre). We are further told that in 161/778, al-Mahdī prohibited the maksār of the mosques, and the al-Ma’mūn even wanted to clear all the boxes out of the masjīd al-ajmadī, because their use was a zinna introduced by Mu‘awiya (al-Makrizi, iv, 12; al-Ya‘qūbī, Tahāf, ii, 571). But this attempt did not succeed. On the contrary, their number rapidly increased. In Cairo, for example, the Dīmāl al-‘Askar built in 169/785–6 had a maksāra (al-Makrizi, iv, 33 ff.) and the mosque of Ibn Tulūn had a maksūra beside the minbar which was accessible from the Dar al-Imāra (al-Makrlzi, iv, 36, 37, 42; Ibn Taghrībirdī, ii, 8, 14). The maksūra was found in the larger mosques. In the Dīmāl al-Kufa, Muhammad b. Kālwīn in 718/1318 built a maksūra of iron for the sultan’s salāt (al-Makrlzi, iv, 132). According to Ibn Khaldūn, the maksūra was an innovation peculiar to the Islamic world. The question must however be left open, whether in its introduction and development there was an innovation peculiar to the Islamic world. The question must however be left open, whether in its introduction and development there were large numbers of such establishments in the desert and the provinces, e.g. Ziyad in Kufa and Sulayman Rasād in Medina (al-Mukaddasī, 146). Kitchens were therefore erected with the necessary mills and ovens and cooked food (ghurfah) and 15–16,000 loaves (rāghif) were distributed to those who stayed there and to visitors (Sauvaire, Ist. Musul., ser. 5, iv [1854], 174) and also beside the mosques (for al-Azhar, see al-Dubayr, Rihā, 240; cf. in Harrān, 243) and as happened in Salāh al-Dīn’s time in the Mosque of the Umayyads (al-Ahwāl, Umayya, ii, 182). It was, however, very usual for them to live in the side rooms of the mosque, as was the case for example, in the Mosque of the Umayyads (Ibn Dībāyūr, 269; Ibn Bāṭtūta, i, 206). In particularly holy mosques like that in Hebron, houses for mu‘takhfūn were built around the sacred place (Sauvaire, Hist. Jerus. et Hebron, 11-12) and also beside the Masjīd Yūnis at the ancient Nīnīveh (al-Makrdhasī, 146). Kitchens were therefore erected with the necessary mills and ovens and cooked food (ghurfd) and 14–15,000 loaves (rāghif) were distributed to those who stayed there and to visitors (Sauvaire, 20; cf. Quatremère, Hist. Strat. Maml., i, 213). Bread was also baked in the mosque of Ibn Tulūn (Quatremère, op. cit., i, 233) and kitchens were often found in the mosques (for al-Ashahr, see al-Dubayr, Merceutes, iii, 238-9; Sulaymān Rasād, Kanz al-dawla‘īn, ‘aṣīrīs, 121-2). The men who lived in and beside the mosque were called mu‘adhdhīn (cf. al-Mukrdhasī, 146; for Jerusalem, Nāṣīrī Khusrāw, 82, 91; for Mecca, Ibn Dībāyūr, 149; for Medina, Ibn Bāṭtūta, i, 279, where we learn that they were organised under a kādir, like the North Africans under an amīn in Damascas; Ibn Dībāyūr, 277-8). They were pious ascetics, students and sometimes travellers. The students generally found accommodation in the madāris, but large mosques like that of the Umayyads or al-Ashahr had always many students, who lived in them. The name of the halls, riwâq, was later used for these students’ lodgings (cf. van Berchem, CIA, i, 43, 1 n. 1; perhaps al-Makrzī, iv, 54, 23). Strangers always found accommodation in the mosques (cf. above, 1. C. 1). In smaller towns, it was the natural thing for the traveller to spend the night in the mosque and to get food there (Yākūtī, iii, 385; al-Kiflī, Tu‘rīkh al-Hukbā, 2, 252). Travellers like Nāṣīrī Khusrāw, Ibn Dībāyūr, Ibn Bāṭtūta and al-‘Abdār (JA, ser. 5, iv [1854], 174) were able to travel throughout the whole Muslim world safe keeping in a mosque (Su‘aft-nāma, 51). Large mosques were bequeathed for the rugs of those who lived in the mosques (Ibn Dībāyūr, op. cit.; al-Taghībirdī, ii/2, 105 ff.).
In later times, the rulers often built a lodge or pavilion (manzard) in or near the mosque (al-Makrizi, ii, 345, iv, 13, cf. on the word, Quatremeré, Hist. Sult. Islam., ii, 20, 128). There was often a special room with a clock in the mosques; this also is probably an inheritance from the church, for Ibn Rusta tells of similar arrangements in Constantinople (126 above). Ibn Djubayr (270) describes very fully the clock in the Mosque of the Umayyads (cf. JA, ser. 9, vii, 205-6). It was made in the reign of Nūr al-Dīn by Fāṣhr al-Dīn b. al-Sāʾītī (Ibn Abī Usaybāʾa, ii, 103-4; an expert was kept to look after it, ibid., 191). There was a clock in the Mustansiriyya in Baghdad (Sarre and Herzfeld, Arch. Reise, ii, 170), and the Mosque of ʿAmr also a ghurfat al-sāʾīt (al-Makrizi, iv, 13, 15). In the Mosque of Ibn Tūlūn it is still kept a sundial of the year 696/1296-7; cf. van Berchem, CTH, i, no. 415), but the clocks were usually mechanical (see also Dozy, Supplement, s.v. mindjdna, and on the clock generally, E. Wiedemann, in Nova Acta der K. Leop. Carol. Akad., c [Halle 1915]). In the Maghrib also we find mosquesclocks, e.g. in the Būʿnaniemīya (JA, ser. 11, xii, 357 ff.). The very varied uses to which the mosques were put resulted in their becoming storehouses for all sorts of things. In 668/1269-70, the Mosque of the Umayyads was cleared of all such things; in the courtyard there were, for example, stores for machines of war, and the zāʿābī fāyān of al-ʿAbīnī was a regular jāmīʿ (JA, ser. 9, vii, 225-6).

c. The prayer- niche or Miḥrāb [see for this, Mihrāb].
d. The pulpit or Minbar [see for this, Minbar].
e. The platform or Dakka. In the larger mosques, there is usually a corner of the mosque which was made into a pulpit or a platform on which a staircase leads up. This platform (dakka, popularly often dakkā) is used as a seat for the muʿādhthīn when pronouncing the call to prayer in the mosque at the Friday service. This part of the equipment of a mosque is connected with the development of the service (cf. below, under I. H. 4, and C. H. Becker, Zur Geschichte des islamischen Cultus, in Isl., iii [1912], 574-99 = Islamstudien, i, 472-500; E. Mittwoch, Zur Entstehungsgeschichte des islamischen Gebets und Kultes, in Arch. Pro. Ak. W. [1913], Phil.-Hist. C., no. 2). The first adhān call is pronounced from the minaret, the second (when the khatib mounts the minbar) and the third (before the salāt, īkāma) in the mosque itself. These calls were at first pronounced by the muʿādhthīn standing in the mosque. At a later date, raised seats were made for him.

Al-Halabi records that Maslama, Muʿāwīya's son, was the first to build platforms (here called mandsīr) for the calls to prayer in the mosques (Sīta Halabiyha, ii, 111 below). This story, however, given without any reference to older authorities, is not at all reliable. It seems that a uniform practice did not come into existence at once. In Mecca, the muʿādhthīnis for a time uttered the second call (when the preacher mounted the minbar) from the roof. As the sun in summer was too strong for them, the amir of Mecca, in the reign of Ḥārīn al-Raṣīḥī, made a little hut (zulill) for them on the roof. This was enlarged and more strongly built by al-Mutawakkil in 240/854-5, as his contemporary al-Azrākī relates (Chron. Mecca, i, 332-3). The position in the mosque of ʿAmr in Cairo was similar. Here also the adhān was uttered in a chamber (ghūrfa) on the roof, and in 336/947-8 there is a reference to its enlargement (al-Makrizi, iv, 11). As late as the time of Baybars, when the minbar chamber was removed from the roof of the Mosque of ʿAmr, the old ghūrfa of the muʿādhthīn was left intact (ibid., 14; cf. al-Kindī, Wulāt, ed. Guest, 469, n. 2). In the Mosque of Ibn Tūlūn, the adhān was pronounced from the cupola in the central dome (al-Makrizi, iv, 60). Al-Mukaddasi records in the 4th/10th century as a notable thing about Ḩūrārasīn that the muʿādhthīnis there pronounced the adhān on a sarīr placed in front of the minbar (327). The dakkān "platform" in front of the minbar in the mosques of Ẓahrāratūn must have had the same purpose (ibid., 357).

In the 8th/14th century, Ibn al-Hādhīdī mentions the dakka as a kind of general store, which should be condemned as it unnecessarily prevents freedom of movement within the mosque (Madschi, ii, 45 above). In the year 827/1424 a dakka in the mosque of al-Ḥākim is mentioned (al-Makrizi, iv, 61); the dakkass mentioned in inscriptions from Cairo all date from the period before and after 900/1495. Ibn al-Hādhīdī mentions that, in addition to the large dakka used for the Friday worship, there was sometimes a lower one for ordinary salāts (Madschi, ii, 46-7) and says that in the larger mosques there were several dakkas on which the muʿādhthīnis pronounced the adhān in succession so that the whole community could hear it (Ibid., ibid., 45-6). Lane also mentions several muballīthīnas in the Azhār Mosque (Manners and customs, Everyday's Library edn., 87, 2).

f. The reading-stand or Kursī; Kurṭānas and relics. In the mosques there is usually a kursī [q.v.], that is, a wooden stand with a seat and a desk. The desk is for the Kurṭān, the seat for the kāṣī, or reader, kārīn? ʿImr Djubayr attended the worship in Baghdad at which a celebrated preacher spoke from the minbar, but only after the kūrā, sitting on kārāsī had recited portions of the Kurṭān (Rihla, 219, 222). The wūdīz, often identical with the kāṣī, sat on a kursī made of teak (Ibn Djubayr, 200. Yakūt, Uthārī, i, 319; al-Makrizi, iv, 121); sometimes he spoke from the minbar to which the wūdīz often had access (cf. Ibn Djubayr; see Mez, Renaissance des Islams, 320, tr. Eng. tr. 332). The kūsīs are called by al-Makki aṣḥāb al-kārāsī, which in is keeping with this (Kūt al-kulsūb, i, 152, quoting K. al-Madkhal, i, 159). Several kārāsīs are often mentioned in one mosque (cf. for the Mosque of Ibn Rusta, i, 19). Whether the kārāsīs mentioned for the earlier period always had a desk cannot be definitely ascertained. The kārāsī with dated inscriptions given by van Berchem in his Corpus all belong to the 9th/15th century (nos. 254, 302, 338, 359f, 491). According to Lane, at the Friday service, while the people are assembling, a kārīn on the kūsī recites sûra XVIII up to the adhān (Manners and customs, 86). The same custom is recorded by Ibn al-Hādhīdī and condemned because it has a disturbing effect (Madkhal, ii, 44, middle).

The Kurṭān very soon received its definite place in the mosque, like the Bible in the church (cf. al-Bukhārī, Salāt, bāb 91: they prayed at a pillar beside al-maṣṣaf). According to one tradition, ʿUṯmān had several copies of his Kurṭān sent to the provinces (e.g. Nīldeke-Schweitzer, Gesch. d. Qor., ii, 112-13; al-Hāṣidīdī, a little later, is said to have done the same thing (al-Makrizi, iv, 17). The mosques had many other copies beside the one kept on the kursī. Al-Ḥākim put 814 maṣāḥīf in the Mosque of Ibn Tūlūn, where the founder had already put boxes of Kurṭānas (al-Makrizi, iv, 36, 40; cf. al-Suyūṭī, Hāṣm al-mubāhārā, ii, 138) and in 403/1012-13, he presented 1,289 copies to the Mosque of ʿAmr, some of which were written in letters of gold (al-Makrizi, iv, 12; al-Suyūṭī, ii, 136). Even earlier than this there were so many that the kāḍī al-Ḥarīrī b. Miskin (237-45/851-9)
appointed a special amīn to look after them (al-Kindī, 469); there are still a very large number in the Mosque of ‘Amr, prepared by ʾAbd al-ʿAzīz b. Marwān, later bought by his son and afterwards by his daughter Amīn; her brother left it in 128/746 to the mosque and it was used for public readings (see its whole history in al-Makrizī, iv, 17-18). Besides it, another copy was for some time also used for reading, which was said to have lain beside Ṣamāʿīn, when he was killed and to have been stained with his blood, but this one was removed by the Fātimids (ibid., 19). In the time of Ibn Bāṭūṭa, a Kur’ān for which the same claims were made was kept in Baṣra (ii, 10). On New Year’s Day, when the Fātimid caliphs used to go in procession through the town, the caliph at the entrance to the Mosque of ‘Amr took up in his hands a mushaf said to have been written by Ḥawālī and kissed it (Ibn Taghirībirdī, ii/1, 472 middle); it was perhaps the mushaf Amīn. In Syria, Egypt, and the Hijāz, in the 4th/10th century, there were Kur’āns which were traced back to ʿUthmān (al-Mukaddasī, 143; cf. Ibn Hawẕālī, 117). One of the Kur’āns made for ʿUthmān was shown in the Mosque of the Unayyāds in Damascus in the time of Ibn Dūbayr. It was produced after the daily salāt and the people knelt on a cushion to lean upon. The doors were also covered with carpets in a particularly luxurious fashion (see Ibn Taghirībirdī, ii/1, 483). The puritanical rejected all this as bid’ah and condemned the reverence paid to the Prophet’s foot, which had been black through wear; as a rule, he used a mat woven of palm leaves, qamarna (al-Bukhārī, Salāt, bāb 19, 20, 21; Ḥayd, bāb 30; Muslim, Masjdīd, tr. 47; Ahmad b. Hanbal, Munndī, iii, 145). In any case, it is clear from al-Baladhurī that the salāt was at first performed in the mosque simply in the dust and then on pebbles (al-Baladhurī, 277, 348; cf. al-Zurkānī, ʿabd al-l-Muwaffaqī, i, 283-4). Later, when the halls were extended, the ground, or the paving, was covered with matting.

The first to cover the ground in the Mosque of Ḥamr was at first performed instead of ḥawārī by Muʿāwīya’s governor Maṣʿūd b. Muḥḥalad (al-Makrizī, iv, 353), then by al-Suyūṭī, ii, 136; Ibn al-Fakhīh, 194, 195; Ibn Dūbayr, 194), a tabūr for alms Maḥbūlī, ii, 44, below), for the bayt al-māl or the property of the mosque (see below). There were also carpets for rose-wreaths (Maddkhali, ii, 50) which were in charge of a special officer. In the Mosque of ‘Amr there was a whole series of tawābitī (al-Makrizī, iv, 9).

The Kur’āns were not the only relics to be kept in the mosques. Bodies or parts of bodies of saints (cf. above, B, 4, C, 1) and other ṣuḥrā were kept and revered in mosques: the rod of Moses (in Kufa, Yākūt, iv, 325, previously in Mecca, see Goldziher, Muh. Stud., ii, 361), the Prophet’s sandals (in Kufa, Ibn-al-Fakhīh, 101, also in Damascus, where the Madrasa Ashrāfīyya had his left and the Damāmīyya his right sandal; Jaʾ, ser. 9, iii, 271-2, 402), his cloak (in Adhrū, al-Mukaddasī, 178), hair from his beard (in Jerusalem among other places, al-Batānūnī, Rihla, 165) and many other things (see Goldziher, Muh. Stud., ii, 358 ff.; Mez, Renaissance des Musulmans, 235-246, 359-360; cf. Ibn Fakhīh, 195). Among other things (see Goldziher, Muh. Stud., ii, 358 ff.; Mez, Renaissance des Musulmans, 235-246, 359-360; cf. Ibn Fakhīh, 195). The head of Usayn was buried in a tabūrī in his mosque in Cairo (Ibn Dūbayr, 45). There was a black stone like that in the Kaʿba in a mosque in Shahrastān (al-Muẓaffarī, 433).

On the other hand, pictures and images were excluded from the mosques, in deliberate contrast to the crucifixes and images of saints in churches, as is evident from Ḥadīth (al-Bukhārī, Salāt, bāb 48, 54; Qaṭānīz, bāb 71; Muslim, Maṣjdīd, tr. 3; cf. on the question, Becker, Christliche Polemik und islamische Dogmengeschichte, in ZA, xxvi [1911] = Islamstudien, i, 445 ff.). It is of interest to note that in the earliest period, Ṣād b. ʿAbī Wakkāṣ used no scruples about leaving the wall-paintings in the ʿĪsān of Kūra in Madāʾin standing, when it was turned into a mosque (al-Ṭabarī, i, 2443, 2451). The case was somewhat different, when, before the chief mosque in Dihlī, which had been a Hindu temple, two old copper idols formed a kind of threshold (Ibn Bāṭūṭa, iii, 151), although even this is remarkable (cf. Snouck Hurgronje, Verspreek geschreven, ii, 451 ff. = ZDMG, lxi [1907], 186 ff.). In some circles the opposition to pictures extended to other relics also. Ibn Taymiyā was convinced the reverence paid to the Prophet’s foot-print, which was shown, as in Jerusalem, in a Damascenus mosque also (Quatremerè, Hist. Sult. Maml., ii/2, 246).

g. Carpets. Carpets [see on these, bišār in Suppl.] were used to improve the appearance of the mosques. The first to cover the ground in the mosque is described by Ḥadīth to be that of Abū Mālik, which was afterwards the property of Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Salātī. In the time of Ibn al-Fakhīh, 194, 195; Ibn Dūbayr, 194), a tabūr for alms Maḥbūlī, ii, 44, below), for the bayt al-māl or the property of the mosque (see below). There were also carpets for rose-wreaths (Maddkhali, ii, 50) which were in charge of a special officer. In the Mosque of ‘Amr there was a whole series of tawābitī (al-Makrizī, iv, 9).

The Kur’āns were not the only relics to be kept in the mosques. Bodies or parts of bodies of saints (cf. above, B, 4, C, 1) and other ṣuḥrā were kept and revered in mosques: the rod of Moses (in Kufa, Yākūt, iv, 325, previously in Mecca, see Goldziher, Muh. Stud., ii, 361), the Prophet’s sandals (in Kufa, Ibn-al-Fakhīh, 101, also in Damascus, where the Madrasa Ashrāfīyya had his left and the Damāmīyya his right sandal; Jaʾ, ser. 9, iii, 271-2, 402), his cloak (in Adhrū, al-Mukaddasī, 178), hair from his beard (in Jerusalem among other places, al-Batānūnī, Rihla, 165) and many other things (see Goldziher, Muh. Stud., ii, 358 ff.; Mez, Renaissance des Musulmans, 235-246, 359-360; cf. Ibn Fakhīh, 195). Among other things (see Goldziher, Muh. Stud., ii, 358 ff.; Mez, Renaissance des Musulmans, 235-246, 359-360; cf. Ibn Fakhīh, 195). The head of Usayn was buried in a tabūrī in his mosque in Cairo (Ibn Dūbayr, 45). There was a black stone like that in the Kaʿba in a mosque in Shahrastān (al-Muẓaffarī, 433).

On the other hand, pictures and images were excluded from the mosques, in deliberate contrast to the crucifixes and images of saints in churches, as is evident from Ḥadīth (al-Bukhārī, Salāt, bāb 48, 54; Qaṭānīz, bāb 71; Muslim, Maṣjdīd, tr. 3; cf. on the question, Becker, Christliche Polemik und islamische Dogmengeschichte, in ZA, xxvi [1911] = Islamstudien, i, 445 ff.). It is of interest to note that in the earliest period, Ṣād b. ʿAbī Wakkāṣ used no scruples about leaving the wall-paintings in the ʿĪsān of Kūra in Madāʾin standing, when it was turned into a mosque (al-Ṭabarī, i, 2443, 2451). The case was somewhat different, when, before the chief mosque in Dihlī, which had been a Hindu temple, two old copper idols formed a kind of threshold (Ibn Bāṭūṭa, iii, 151), although even this is remarkable (cf. Snouck Hurgronje, Verspreek geschreven, ii, 451 ff. = ZDMG, lxi [1907], 186 ff.). In some circles the opposition to pictures extended to other relics also. Ibn Taymiyā was convinced the reverence paid to the Prophet’s foot-print, which was shown, as in Jerusalem, in a Damascenus mosque also (Quatremerè, Hist. Sult. Maml., ii/2, 246).

g. Carpets. Carpets [see on these, bišār in Suppl.] were used to improve the appearance of the mosques. The first to cover the ground in the mosque is described by Ḥadīth to be that of Abū Mālik, which was afterwards the property of Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Salātī. In the time of Ibn al-Fakhīh, 194, 195; Ibn Dūbayr, 194), a tabūr for alms Maḥbūlī, ii, 44, below), for the bayt al-māl or the property of the mosque (see below). There were also carpets for rose-wreaths (Maddkhali, ii, 50) which were in charge of a special officer. In the Mosque of ‘Amr there was a whole series of tawābitī (al-Makrizī, iv, 9).
preferred the bare ground (Madkhal, ii, 46, 49, 72, 74, 76), as the Wahhabis still do.

h. Lighting. Where evening meetings and vigils were of regular occurrence, artificial lighting became necessary. Al-Azraki gives the history of the lighting of the Meccan Mosque. The first to illuminate the Ka'ba was 'Ukba b. al-Azrak, whose house was next to the Mosque, just on the makām, here he placed a large lamp (masbāh). 'Umar, however, is said previously to have placed lamps upon the wall, which was the height of a man, with which he surrounded the mosque (al-Balādhūrī, 46). The first to use oil and lamps (kandālūd) in the mosque itself was Mu'āwiyah (cf. Ibn al-Fakhī, 20). In the time of 'Abd al-Malik, Khalīd b. 'Abd Allāh al-Kasrī placed a lamp on a pillar of the Zamzam beside the Black Stone, and the lamp of the Azrak family disappeared. In the reign of al-Ma'mūn in 216/851, a lamp-post was put up on the other side of the Ka'ba, and a little later two new lanterns were put up around the Ka'ba. Harrūn al-Raṣādī placed ten large lamps around the Ka'ba and hung two lanterns on each of the walls of the mosque (guwāyif; cf. Ibn Djugārī, Rīhla, 149, 150, 155, 271; van Berchem, CIA, i, no. 506). Khalīd al-Kasrī had the mas'ās also illuminated during the pilgrimage, and in 119/737 the torches called nāfšūd were used in both jedārīd and tawrīd (Madkhal, ii, 54) as ostentatious. At the same time, candles (sham, shama^) or kandālūd already mentioned, hung on chains were kandālūd, which from their shapes were called tannūr (Ibn Djugārī, Rīhla, 200-2, cf. CIA, nos. 502, 506, 507, 511), as, for example, the celebrated candelabrum of the Mosque of Mu'ayyad (al-Makrizī, iv, 137) which was made for the mosque of Ḥasan but sold by it (ibid., 110).

This great interest in the lighting of the mosque was not entirely based on practical considerations. Light had a significance in the worship and Islam here, as elsewhere, was taking over something from the Christian Church. When, in 227/842 the caliph was on his deathbed, he asked that the yulūd should be performed the holy cell, to which light belongs (cf. e.g. the document for al-Malik al-Ashraf's mausoleum, van Berchem, CIA, i, no. 252). But in the mosque generally the use of lights had a devotional significance and lights might be endowed for particular individuals (cf. al-Mukadālī, 74, quoted above). The lamps so given by al-Hākim were therefore placed in the mosques with great ceremony, with blasts of trumpets and beating of drums (Ibn Taghrībirdī, ii/2, 105).

On ceremonial occasions a great illumination was therefore absolutely necessary. In the month of Ramadān, says Ibn Djugārī, the carpets were renewed and the candles and lamps increased in number, so that the whole mosque was a blaze of light (Rīhla, 143); on certain evenings, trees of light were made with vast numbers of lamps and candles and the minarets were illuminated (ibid., 149-51, 154, 155). In the Mosque of the Prophet in the time of al-Sālimūdī, forty was candles burned around the sacred tomb, and three to four hundred lights in the whole mosque (Wüstenfeld, Medina, 100). On the mawlid al-nabi, says Kurb al-Dīn, a procession went from the Ka'ba in Mecca to the birthplace of the Prophet with candles, lanterns (fawānt) and lamps (masbāhūd) (see Chron. Mecca, iii, 439). In the haram of Jerusalem, according to Madjīr al-Dīn, 750 lamps were lit by night and over 2,000 at festivals (Sauvaire, Hist. Jérusalem, 138). In the dome of the Ka'ba al-Sākjā in 452/1060, a chandelier and 500 lamps fell down (ibid., 69); at the taking of the town in 492/1099, the Franks carried off 42 silver lamps, each
of 3,600 dirhams, 23 lamps of gold and a tannur of 40 raths of silver (ibid., 71). It was similar, and still is, in Coptic and other churches in the Musulman world. For the Masdj al-waskh in the Mosque of ʿAmr, 18,000 lamps were made for the Mosque of ʿAmr, and every night eleven-and-a-half litzāns of good oil were used (al-Makrī, iv, 21 and more fully, ii, 345-6). The four “nights of illumination” fell in the months of Raddja and Ḡaḥib, especially nisf Ṣahib (Quatemère, Hist. Sult. Maml., ii/2, 131; cf. also Snouck-Hurgronje, Mecca, ii, 77). In 1908 electric light was introduced into the Mosque of the Prophet (al-Batānūnī, Rihla, 245-6).

(i) Incense. According to some traditions, even the incense burned in the mosque (al-Tirmidhī, i, 116; see Lammens, Recueil d’Archeologie Orientale, vii [1924], 183-228; on the copper candelabra, see A. Wingham, Report on the analysis of various examples of oriental metal-work, etc. in the South Kensington Museum, etc., London 1892; F. R. Martin, Allert Kupferarbeiten aus dem Orient, Stockholm 1902; on glass lamp, see G. Schmoranz, Alterorientalsche Glass-Gießerei, Vienna 1898; van Berchem, CIA, i, 678 ff.; M. Herz Bey, La Mosquee du Sultan Hasan (Comité de Conservation des Monuments de l’Art Arabe), 1889, 8 ff.; see also the Bibliography in Isl., xvii [1928], 217 ff.).

1. Incense. According to some traditions, even the incense burned in the mosque (ibid., i, 116; see Lammens, Moʿawiyah, 367, n. 8) and in the time of ʿUmar, his client ʿAbd Allāh is said to have perfumed the mosque by burning incense while he sat on the minbar. The same client is said to have carried the censer (maḍām: cf. Lammens, loc. cit.) brought by ʿUmar from Syria before ʿUmar when he went to the saḥl in the month of Ramaḍān (A. Fischer, Biographie von Gebrüdernmenn, etc., 55 n.). According to this tradition, the use of incense was adopted into Islam very early as a palatable imitation of the custom of the Church. In keeping with this is the tradition that, in Fustāṭ as early as the governorship of ʿAmr, the mujaddasih was used to burn incense in the mosque (Ibn ʿAbd al-Hakam, 132; cf. Annātī dell’Islam, iv, 565). The Kubbat al-Ṣakhrā Mosque had (in 1899) a great censer in front of the throne which in the consecration ceremony (Sauvage, Hist. Jér. et Hébr., 705). Under the Umayyads, incense was one of the regular requirements of the mosque (ṭīb al-masdjīd al-Ṭabarī, ii, 1234, 10). Muʿawiyah is named as the first perfumer of the Kaʿba with perfume (ḥalalak) and censer (yajaba: Ibn al-Ḥakīm, 20, 12). It became the custom to perfume the sacred tombs with musk and ṭīb (Chron. Mekka, i, 150, 10; Ibn Djbayb, Rihla, 191, 9). Baybars washed the Kaʿba with rose-water (al-Mākri, iv, 96, 14). Incense, as well as candles, was used at burials (cf. de Goeje, ZDMG, lxx [1905], 403-4; Lammens, Moʿawiyah, 436, n. 8). Al-Muʿtāṣim’s desire to be buried with candles and incense (butahir) exactly like the Christians (Ibn Uṣaybiʿa, i, 165, 12 f., cf. above) shows that they were aware that the custom bore much the same relation to the Christian usage as the mosque building did to the church. The consumption of incense in the mosques gradually became very large, especially at festivals (see for the Fātimids, Ibn Taghrībidī, ii/1, 484, 12; ii/2, ed. Popper, 106, 3; al-Mākri, iv, 51; on vessels for holding incense, see the Bibliography in Isl., xvii [1928], 217-18, and Maʿdīn. 4. in Islamic art).

2. Water-supply. Nothing is said of a water-supply in connection with the oldest mosques. The Muʿtaṣim was building a new one in connection with the Zamzam in the year 198/814-15, probably for drinking-water; later (8th/14th century) a large basin surrounded by a railing is mentioned in the centre of the court. It was intended for drinking purposes, but became used for bathing and was therefore removed. Baths and latrines were built anew by al-Nasir’s mother (Wüstefeld, Medina, 69 f.).

In Damascus, where every house, as is still the case, was amply supplied with water, Yākūt (d. 626/1229) found no mosque, madrasa or khānakāh which did not have water flowing into a birka in the saḥn (Yākūt, ii, 590). Ibn Djbayb describes the arrangements in the Mosque of the Umayyads. In the saḥn, as is still the case, there were three kubbas. The centre one rested on four marble columns, and below it was a basin with a spring of drinking-water surrounded by an iron grille. The water flowed into it from a cistern, or “pool” (birkah) about 23 metres (h. 6.3 m. = 20 ft.) in diameter. The “pool” was a Masdjīd al-Kallāsī, in the sahn of which there was again a shariṣ of marble with a
spring (Ibn Dhubayr, Rihla, 267). There was also running water in an adjoining mashhad (269), in the adjoining manzara. The Fatimids had also arranged for drinking water to be led to the fawwdra; there was a birka (basin with a tap) and spring water (269). There were also sikayat against the four outer walls of the mosque, whole houses fitted up with lavatories and closets (273); a century earlier, we are told that at each entrance to the mosque there was a mi'ya' (159). The whole arrangements correspond exactly to those made by Khalid al-Kaari in Mecca in the Umayyad period and must therefore date from the Umayyads.

It was the same in other Syrian and Mesopo-
tian towns. In Samarrâ', al-Mutawakkil built in his new djami a fawwdra with constant running water (al-Yâkubî, Bulânî, 265). In Nisâbûn, the river was led through the sahn of the mosque into a shrîj; there was also a şirîj at the eastern entrance with two şirîjâ in front of the mosque (Ibn Dhubayr, Rihla, 239). In Mawsil in the mosque, which dated from the Umayyad period, there was a spring with a marble cupola over it (ibid., 235). In Harran, there were in the sahn three marble kubbas with a bi'āt and drinking water (ibid., 246), in Aleppo, two (ibid., 253). In Kufa, there were three hawdâ with Euphrates water in front of the Djami (ibid., 212), but in the mosque of a covering already in existence for the water (Yâkût, iv, 325, 326, here called târnâ; cf. Ibn al-Fakhî, 173, Ibn Dhubayr, 89, 267). It was the same in Amid (Nâsîr-i Khusrâw, ed. Schefer, 28) and in Qarânj in Sîđistân (Ibn Hawkal, 298-9). The principal mosques of 'Irâk had mayâdâ at the entrances, for which, according to a remarkable note by al-Mukaddasî, rents were paid (129, read kadîst; cf. mazâ'ib; Ibn Dhubayr, 89). In Fâliûn also, in al-Mukaddasî's time there were conveniences for ab-
lations at the entrances to the djamiâ (matâhk: 182; mayâdâ; al-Istakhri, and in Sa'nâ in the 4th/10th century, beside each mosque, there was water for drinking and for wudû (Ibn Rusta, 111). In Persia also, it was the custom to have a hawd in front of the mosque (al-Mukaddasî, 318) and there was drinking water in the mosque itself on a bench (kari) in iron jar in the djamiâ (ibid., 327). Not only at the Zamzam well but also in the mosques of 'Irâk, men were appointed whose duty it was to distribute drinking-water (al-Tabârî, iii, 2165). The regular custom, therefore, was to have at the entrance to, or in front of the mosque, conveniences for wudû, and in the court of the mosque itself a fountain as the traditional ornament and for drinking water. It was the exception for the wudû to take place in the mosque itself.

In Egypt, at first the Mosque of Ibn Tulûn was arranged similarly to the Syrian mosques. In the cen-
tre of the sahn there was a gilt dome, supported by six
teen marble columns and surrounded by a railing. This upper storey was supported by nineteen marble columns and below was a marble basin (birka) with a running fountain (fawwdra); the âdâm was called from the dome (al-Makrizî, iv, 37; the description is not quite clear). People complained that there were no arrangements for washing (mi'âda) there. Ibn Tulûn replied that he had not made them because he had concluded the mosque would be polluted thereby. He therefore made a mi'âda with an apothecary's shop behind the mosque (ibid., 38, 39; al-Suyûtî, ii, 139; Ibn Taghirî, ed., iii, 10). This suggests that previously in Egypt, the washing arrangements had been made directly connected with the mosque. After the fire of the year 376/986-7, the fawwdra was renovated by al-'Azîz (al-Makrizî, iv, 40), and again in 696/1297 by Lâdîn, whose inscription still exists (CIA, i, no. 16). A new mi'âda was built in 792/1390 beside the old one on the north, outside the mosque (al-Makrizî, iv, 45).

The Mosque of Amr first got a fawwdra in the time of al-'Azîz. In 378-9/998-9 his vizier Ya'qûb b. Kiliis installed one in the cupola, already in existence for the bayt al-mâl. Marble jars were put there for the water (probably drinking-water) (al-Makrizî, iv, 9, 11; cf. al-Suyûtî, ii, 136; Yâkût, iii, 899). A new water basin was installed by Sa'd al-Dîn beside his manzara in the mosque. The water was led to the fawwdra at-fiskiyya from the Nile. This was prohibited in the reign of Baybars al-Bundûkdhârî (658-76/1260-77) by the chief kâdi, because the building was being affected by it (al-Makrizî, iv, 14; al-Suyûtî, ii, 137). The amir, who restored it, brought the water for the fiskiyya from a well in the street (al-Makrizî, iv, 15).

Like Ibn Tulûn, the Fâtimids do not seem to have considered the mi'âda indispensable. For the Azhar Mosque had originally no mi'âda; as late as al-
Hâkim's waqfî document for the provision of mi'âda, money is given only with the provision that something of the kind should be made (al-Makrizî, iv, 51, 54).

A later date we hear of two mi'âda's, one at the adjoining Aḫbâghîwîyya (ibid., 54). On the other hand, there was already a fiskiyya in the centre of the mosque (ibid., 57), and it had been replaced by a new one not known. It had disappeared, when traces of it were found in 827/1424 in laying-out a new şirîj (ibid., 54). The fiskiyya of the Mosque of al-Hâkim was not erected by the founder. Like that of the Mosque of ʿAmr, it was removed in 660/1262 by the kâdi Taḍî al-
Dîn, but after the earthquake of 702/1302-3, it was again rebuilt and provided with drinking-water from the Nile (ibid., 56, 57) and again renovated after 780/1378 (ibid., 61). A small mi'âda, later replaced by another, was in the vicinity of the entrance (ibid., 61).

Other Fâtimid mosques had basins in the sahn, which were supplied from the Nile and from the Khalîlî (ibid., 76, 81, 120).

The traditional plan was retained in the period following also. For example, we know that the amir Tughdân in 815/1412 placed a birka in the centre of the Djami al-Masjid in al-Makridiyya (ibid., 56, 57) and again renovated after 780/1378 (ibid., 61). A small mi'âda, later replaced by another, was in the vicinity of the entrance (ibid., 61). Other Fâtimid mosques had basins in the sahn, which were supplied from the Nile and from the Khalîlî (ibid., 76, 81, 120).

The importance of the birka of the mosque, as a drinking-place, diminished as pious founders erected drinking fountains everywhere (cf. for Mecca, Chron. Mekka, ii, 116-18; also BGA, Glossarion, 211, s.v. habb; 258, s.v. sâhid) and especially when it became the custom to build a sâhid with a boy's school in part of the mosque (see below, i, 4, 2). A hawd for watering animals was also sometimes built in the vicinity of the mosque (al-Makrizî, iv, 76). Sometimes also the birka of the sahn was used for washing. In the year 799/1397 the amir Yalbughâ made arrangements for this in the Akmâr mosque so that one could get water for wudû from taps from a birka put up in the sahn (al-Makrizî, iv, 76). Al-Makrizî condemns this addition, but only because there was already a mi'âda in the mosque, and whether it had existed from the first is not clear (ibid.), and not on grounds of principle; and it was only because the wall was damaged that the amir's gift was removed in 815/1412 (ibid., 77). The custom of
using the water supply of the ǧāmāʿ for ṭuḥūţ survived in many places in Egypt. The arrangements were therefore usually called miḍa‘a or rather miḍā (which is not found in the inscriptions). If they had taps, they were called hanāfyya; according to Lane’s suggestion, because the Hanafis only permitted ablutions with running water or from a cistern 10 ells broad and deep (Lexicon, s.v.; cf. Manners and customs. Everyman’s Library, 69; cf. on the question M. Herz, Observations critiques sur les bassins dans les ḫāṭerān des mosquées, in BIE, i/1/7 [1896], 47-51; idem, La mosquée du Sultan Hasan, 2; Herz wrongly dates the modern usage from the Turkish conquest in 923/1517). In quite recent times, the miḍa‘as have often been moved outside to special buildings. Ibn al-Hāḍījī in his Masjidīn, 668, 59, 66 (Ed. Widow, 2004, 58, 69, 99 below).

E. The mosque as a state institution.

1. The mosque as a political centre. Its relation to the ruler. It was inherent in the character of Islam that religion and politics could not be separated. The same individual was ruler and chief admistrator in the two fields, and the same building, the mosque, was the centre of gravity for both politics and religion. This relationship found expression in the fact that the mosque was placed in the centre of the camp, while the ruler’s abode was built immediately adjacent to it, as in Medina (and in Fustat, Damascus, Baṣra, Kufa). We can trace how this dār al-imāra or Ǧārū (so for Kufa: al-Tabarī, ii, 230-1; Ǧārū al-imāra, ibid., 234) with the growth of the mosque gradually became incorporated in it at Fustat and Damascus and was replaced by a palace. The tradition remained so strong that, in Cairo, when the new chief mosque Dār al-Imāra was being in 169/785-6, a Dār Ulmarā Ǧīṣr was built beside it with direct access to the mosque (al-Makrizī, iv, 33-4), and when Ibn Ṭulūn built his mosque, a building called the Dār al-Imāra was erected on its south side, where the ruler, who now lived in another new palace, had rooms for changing his robes, etc., from which he could go straight into the māqṣūra (ibid., 42).

The ʿAbbasids at the foundation of Baghdād introduced a characteristic innovation, when they made the palace the centre of the city; the case was similar with Fatimid Cairo; but Sulaymān b. ʿAbd al-Malik in Ramla had already built the palace in front of the mosque (al-Baladhuri, 143). Later rulers, who no longer lived just beside the mosque, had special balconies or something similar built for themselves in or beside the mosque. Šalāb al-Din built for himself a māqṣūra under the great minaret of the mosque of ʿAmar (al-Makrizī, iv, 13; al-Suyūṭī, ii, 137) and just to the south of the Azhar mosque, the Fāṭimids had a māqṣūra from which they could overlook the mosque (al-Makrizī, ii, 345).

The caliph was appointed leader of the ǧāmāʿ and the leader of the Muslim community. The significance of the mosque for the state is therefore embodied in the minbar. The installation of the caliph consisted in his seating himself upon this, the seat of the Prophet in his sovereign capacity. When homage was first paid to Abī Bakr by those who had decided the choice of the Prophet’s successor, he sat on the minbar. ʿUmar delivered an address, the people paid homage to him and he delivered a khutba, by which he assumed the leadership (Ibn Hīšām, 1017; al-Ṭabarī, i, 1828-9; al-Diyārībāri, ii, 75; al-Yaḥyābī, Taḥārī, ii, 142); it was the same with ʿUmar and ʿUṯmān (ibid., 157, 187).

The khutba, after the glorification of God and the Prophet, contained a reference to the caliph’s predecessor and a kind of formal introduction of himself by the new caliph. It was the same in the period of the Umayyads and ʿAbbasids (see for al-Walīd, al-Ṭabarī, ii, 1177 ff.; al-Amin, ibid., i, 764; al-Mahdī, ibid., i, 398, 454, 457; cf. on this question also al-Bukḥārī, Aḥkām, bāb 43). The minbar and the khutba associated with it was still more important than the imāmāte at the salāt, it was minbar al-mulk (Ḥamāda, ed. Freytag, 656, v, 4). According to a hadīth, the Prophet carried the little Ḥasan up to the minbar. It was the same with ʿAbd Allāh al-Maʾmūn and the deposition of Muḥammad al-ʿĀmin (al-Ṭabarī, iii, 861-2; cf. for al-Mahdī: ibid., 389).

There are other cases in which the solemn deposition of a ruler took place on or beside the minbar (Aḥqāḥi, i, 12; Wūstenfeld, Medīna, 15). Even at a much later date, when spontaneous acclamation by the populace was no longer of any importance, the installation on the minbar was still of importance (al-Makrizī, iv, 94). It had become only a formality but still an important one. Homage was paid to the ʿAbbasid caliphs in Egypt in the great ṭawāqūf of the palace or in a tent in which a minbar had been put up, and similarly to the sultans whose investiture was read out from the minbar (cf. Quatremère, Hist. Sult. Maml., i/1, 117, 149 ff., 183 ff.). If one dreamt that he was sitting on the minbar, it meant that he would become sultan (ibid., i/2, 103). The ʿAbbasid caliph had, however, long had his own throne after the old Persian fashion in his palace (Ps. al-Dīnābādī, al-Tādīfī, al-Halbī, al-Mulkī, ed. Ahmad Zaki, Cairo 1914, 7 ff.; tr. Pellat, Le livre de la couronne, Paris 1954, 35 ff.) and so had the Fāṭimids (Ibn Ṭabhrībīh, ii/1, 457) and the Mamluks (Quatremère, op. cit., i/1, 87; cf. 147). When later we find mention of the kursī l-ʾkhudūfa (van Berchem, CJA, i, no. 33), sarīr al-mulk (Chron. Mecca, iii, 115), sarīr al-saltana (al-Makrizī, ii, 157; cf. al-salīr, royal throne: Ibn Ḥawkāl, 282, 285; kursī similarly: cf. Ibn ʿArabīsh, Viva Timurī, ed. Manger, ii, 186) or marbat al-mulk (Quatremère, op. cit., i/2, 61), the reference is no longer to the minbar. This does not mean that the ruler could no longer make public appearances: thus 648/1250, al-Muʿizz Aybak regularly gave audiences on the Ǧāmāʿ al-ṭalīḥīyya (Quatremère, Hist. Sult. Maml., 17) and
memorial services for Baybars were held a year after his death in several mosques, madrasī and khawdnik in Ceylon (ibid., ii/1, 101; ii/2, 341). The caliph spoke chiefly from the minbar of the capital, but when he made the pilgrimage he also spoke from the manābir in Mecca and Medina (cf. e.g. al-Ṭabarî, ii, 1234; al-Yaḳūbî, ii, 341, 501; Chron. Mecca, i, 160). Otherwise, in the provinces, the governor stood in the same relation to the mosques as the caliph in the capital. He was appointed "over salāt and sword" or he administered "justice among the people" and the salāt (al-Ṭabarî, iii, 860), he had "province and minbar" under him (ibid., ii, 611), al-urāyf was l-khutba (al-Mukaddasî, 337). Speaking from the minbar was a right which the caliph had delegated to him and it was done in the name of the caliph. 4Amr b. al-ʿĀṣ therefore refused to allow people in the country to hold ḥajjâma except under the directions of the commander (al-Makrīzî, iv, 7). This point of view was never quite abandoned. The khutba was delivered "in the name of" the caliph (ibid., 94) or for him (lahâ, ibid., 66, 74, 198; Ibn Taghrībirdî, i/1, 85 below; al-Mukaddasî, 485 above), and in the same way an amir delivered a khutba for a sultan (al-Makrīzî, iv, 213, 214). The sultan did not have the "secular" and the caliph the "spiritual" power at the same time. 5Anam al-Malik asked from the khwādnik his death in several mosques, and sword" or he administered "justice among the people" (al-Yaḳūbî, ii, 341; al-Ḥadīdī, ii, 254). Salāt and sword were thus closely associated in reality.

It thus came to be the custom for the enemies of the ruler and his party to be cursed in the mosques. This custom continued the old Arab custom of regular campaigns of objurgation between two tribes, but can also be paralleled by Byzantine ecclesiastical anathematization of heretics (cf. Becker, Islamstudien, i, 485. Zur Gesch. d. islamischen Kultus).

The first to introduce the official cursing of the ʿAlids from the minbar of the Kaʿba is said to have been Khalîd al-Kasîrî (Chron. Mecca, ii, 36). The reciprocal cursing of Umayyads and ʿAlids became general (cf. al-Ṭabarî, ii, 12, 4; Ṭaḥârî, x, 102; Ibn Taghrībirdî, 248; see also Islamstudien, Meśâvi, 180-1). Like the blessing upon the ruler, it was uttered by the kusâs (al-Makrīzî, iv, 16); it was even recorded in inscriptions in the mosque (Ibn Taghrībirdî, ed. Popper, ii/2, 63, 64; cf. also Mez, Renaisance, 61. Eng. tr., 64). As late as 284/897, al- OVERRIDEword Maṭmîd wanted to restore the anathematisation of Muʿawiya from the minbar but abandoned the idea (al-Ṭabarî, iii, 216). Another type occurred upon other occasions, for example, Sulaymân had al-Ḥadīdī cursed (Chron. Mecca, ii, 37), and al-Muʿtamid had Ibn Tūlûn solemnly cursed from the manābir (al-Ṭabarî, iii, 2048, 5 ff.); and other rulers had Muʿtâzili heretics cursed from the pulpite (see Mez, op. cit., 198, Eng. tr. 206; cf. against Ibn Taymiyya, Quatremère, Hist. Sult. Maml., ii/2, 256). Ibn Baṭṭûtâ describes the tumultuous scuffle with thousands of armed men uttering threats in the mosque in Baghdad when a Shiʿî kāhîb was on the minbar (ii, 58).

It was very natural to mention with a blessing upon the ruler in whose name the Friday khutba was delivered. Ibn ʿAbbas, when governor of Baṣra, is said to have been the first to pronounce such a duʿâ over ʿAli (Ibn Khālid, Mukaddima, fskl 37, end); it is not improbable that the custom arose out of the recurrent cursing in mosques of Umayyads and the kusâs, who had to curse the ʿAlids in the mosques, used to pray for the Umayyads (al-Makrīzî, iv, 17). Under the ʿAbbâsids, the custom became the usual form of expressing loyalty to the ruler (Ibn Taghrībirdî, ii/1, 151). After the caliph, the name of the local ruler or governor was mentioned (ibid., 156, 161); even in Baghdadî in 399/795-80 by order of the caliph al-Taʾṣî, the actual ruler ʿAbd al-Dawla was mentioned in the duʿâ (Ibn Miskawayh, vi, 499; ed. Cairo 1915, 396) and the Buṭyids, according to al-Mukaddasî, were generally mentioned in the khutba even in the remotest parts of the kingdom (this is evident from the above-mentioned expression khutba lalu, for which we also find ʿalâsh: Ibn Ḥakâwî, 20; al-Mukaddasî, 337, 338, 400, 472, 485; cf. Glossarium, s.v.). There is also evidence that prayers used to be uttered for the heir-apparent (al-Makrīzî, iv, 37; Kitâb al-Wuzara, ed. Amenroz, 420). Under the Mamlûks also, the sultan's heir was mentioned (Quatremère, Hist. Sult. Maml., ii/1, 101; ii/2, 3). Under the Fâtimids, it was even the custom to call salām upon the ruler from the minaret after the adhān al-fajr (al-Makrīzî, iv, 45); this also took place under the Mamlûks, e.g. in 696/1297, when Lâḏûn was elected, or even earlier, in 691/1292, under the Mamlûk of Egypt and Syria, adhān al-fajr; this was repeated in the mosque (Quatremère, Hist. Sult. Maml., ii/2, 45). The prayer for the sovereign in the khutba did not find unanimous approval among the learned (see Snouck Hurgronje, Verstreide Geschriften, ii, 214-15).

In general, the mosque, and particularly the minbar,
was the place where official proclamations were made, of course as early as the time of the Prophet (al-Bukhari, Salat, b. 70, 71), 'Uthman's bloodstained shirt was hung upon the minbar (al-Tabari, i, 3255); messages from the caliph were read from it (ibid., iii, 2084). Al-Walid announced from the minbar the deaths of two distinguished governors (Ibn Taghribirdi, ii, 242); the results of battles were announced in khotas (Yaqut, i, 647; al-Istalfi, Cairo 1321, ii, 149-50). In the Fātimid and 'Abbāsid periods also, proclamations, orders, edicts about taxation, etc., were read on the minbar. Thus al-Maqrizi, in his work on the principal mosque on special occasions, states (al-Maqrizi, ii/2, 49; iv, 13; al-Suyūṭī, 267; Yākūt, iii, 899). Al-Kindī records an attempt to steal the chest in 145/762 (al-Kindī, 112-13). In the disturbed period around the year 300/912, the wailāt al-Nūgārī closed the mosque between the times of salāt for the safety of the chest, which was also done in Ibn Rusta's time (al-Kindī, Wulāt, 266; Ibn Rusta, 116). New approaches to the bayt al-māl were made in 422/1031 from the khāzīnā of the mosque and from the Diwan (al-Maqrizi, iv, 13).

Ibn Kūfa, the bayt al-amūsil, at least during the early period, were in the Dār al-Imāra (al-Tabari, i, 2489, 2491-2); in the year 38/658-9, during the fighting, it was saved from Baṣra and taken with the minbar to the Mosque of al-Hudhdān (ibid., 3414-15). In Palestine, in the chief mosque of each town, everywhere introduced (184); in Iranshahr, in the time of al-İstakhrl, the Syrian custom had been everywhere introduced (184); in İran-hār, in the centre of the court, there was a building with marble columns and doors (al-Madsī, 246). In Armenia, it is recorded that the bayt al-māl was kept in the Diwānī in the time of the Umayyads as in Miṣr and elsewhere (Ibn Hawkal, 241). The khub was usually of lead and had an iron door. Ibn al-Ḥadīd considers it highly illegal to shut off a diwan in a mosque, since this is the same as forbidding entrance to it. This shows that the custom still survived in his time. Ibn Diubayr's remark about Ḥarrān suggests that here again we have an inheritance from Byzantium. It was probably the building belonging to the piscina (cf. above) that the Muslims put to a practical use in this way. For the Byzantines had the treasury (skeleto) in the palace, and it is doubtful if the treasury-chambers of the church (skenophylakion) were built in this way (cf. F. Dölger, in Byzantinisches Archiv, Heft 9 [1927], 26, 34).

3. The mosque as a court of justice. That the Prophet used to settle legal questions in his mosque was natural (see al-Bukhari, Aḥkām, b. 19, 27; Ibn Ḥajar, 116). It was a court where church officials could also deliver judgments in other places (ibid., passim). In Ḥadīth, it is recorded that some kādig of the earlier period (Shurayh, al-Shābi, Yabā b. Ya'far, Marwān) sat in judgment beside the minbar, others (al-Ḥasan, Zurā'a b. Awfā) on the open square beside the mosque (al-Bukhari, Aḥkām, b. 18). The custom had all the better chance of survival, as churches were used in the same way (Joshua Stylites, ed. Wright, ch.
Sitting in judgment was primarily the business of the ruler, but he had to have assistants and Abū Bakr’s kādi is mentioned as assisting ʿUmar (al-Ṭabarī, i, 2135), and a number of judges appointed by ʿUmar are mentioned (Ibn Rusta, 227). In the reign of ʿUṯmān, ʿAbd Allāh b. Masʿūd is said to have been judge and financial administrator of Kūfa (Ibn Kutayba, Maʿārif, ed. Wüstenfeld, 128). On the other hand, we are told that ʿAbd Allāh b. Nawfal, appointed by Marwān in 62/622, was the first kādi in Islam (al-Ṭabarī, i, 2477), it is recalled that in the year 132/749-50 the kādi of Medina administered justice in the mosque (ibid., 2505). In Baṣra, we are told that al-ʿAwdāw b. Ṣaʿīd al-Tamīmī immediately after the building of the mosque (i.e. in the year 14/635) worked in it as kādi (al-Baladhūrī, 346). In the early period, ʿUmar wanted to choose a kādi, who had been already acting as a judge before Islam (al-Kindī, Ṭalātī, 301-2; al-Suyūṭī, ii, 86). Even the Christian poet al-ʿAlḥṭāl was allowed to act as arbiter in the mosque of Kūfa (see Lammens, Moʿādwa, 435-6).

In Fustat, as early as 23/643 or 24/644 by command of ʿUmar, ʿAmr b. al-ʿĀṣ appointed a kādi named ʿAṣā (al-Suyūṭī, ii, 86; al-Kindī, 300-1). The kādi held his sessions in the Mosque of ʿAmr but not exclusively. The kādi Muhammad b. Khayyāt (d. 120/738-45) held his sessions sometimes before his house, sometimes in the mosque, and for Christians on the steps leading up to the mosque (al-Kindī, 351-2). A successor of his (177-8/793-800) invited Christian judges who had lawsuits into the mosque to be heard (ibid., 391); of another judge (205/820-6) it is recorded that he was not allowed to sit in the mosque (ibid., 428). It seems that the kādi could himself choose where he would sit. A judge, officiating in the year 217/832, sat in winter in the great pillared hall, turning his back towards the kibāl wall, and in summer, in the sahn near the western wall (ibid., 443-4). During the Fāṭimid period, the subsidiary building on the north-east of the Mosque of ʿAmr was reserved for the kādi. This judge, from the year 376/980 onwards ḫāṣa kādi (cf. al-Suyūṭī, ii, 91; al-Kindī, 590), sat on Tuesday and Saturday in the mosque and laid down the law (al-ʿAḍrā’, ii, 246; iv, 16, 22; cf. al-Kindī, 587, 589; cf. Nāṣīr-i ʿAlawī, tr. Schefer, 149).

In al-Yaʿqūbī’s time in Baghdaḏd, the judge of the city used to sit in its chief mosque (al-Bulūḏ, 245), in Damascus the vice-kādi in the 4th/10th century had a special rūṭā in the Mosque of the Umayyads (al-Mukaddasī, 158), and the notaries (al-sharīʿayn) also sat at the Mosque of the Umayyads at the Bāb al-Salāt (ibid., 17). In Nāṣīr, every Monday and Thursday, the magdīs al-bukm was held in a special mosque (ibid., 328). In course of time, the judge was given a magdīs al-bukm of his own (cf. al-Suyūṭī, ii, 96), and in 279/892 al-Muʿtaḍād wanted to forbid the kādīs to hold sessions in the mosque (Ibn Ṭabarī, i, 87 above; perhaps, however, we should read ṫāṣ: see Goldzhder, Muh. Stud., ii, 164, n. 4). Justice was also administered in the dār al-sal (Quatremère, Hist. Sult. Mam., ii, 79). But the administration of justice did not end in the mosque. Even outside the mosque walls under the Fāṭimids, the custom had been introduced that the kādi should hold sessions in his house, but Ibn al-ʿAḍrā’, appointed just after 400/1009-10, held them either in the ḡāna at the Bayt al-Māl or in a side-room (al-Kindī, 612; cf. Ibn Ṭabarī, ed. Popper, ii, 69; al-Kalākhandī, Subḥ al-aʿṣā, iii, 487; for 459/1066, see Nāṣīr-i ʿAlawī, ed. Schefer, text, 51, tr. 149). In Mecca, the dār al-kādi was in direct connection with the mosque (Ibn Ḏubayr, 104). In the 8th/14th century, Ibn Ṭabṭābā joined a court presided over by an eminent jurist in a mosque (madrasa) in Ṣirāz (ii, 56, 63; cf. al-Maḍāhī, ii, 54 below), and in Damascus the ʿṢāḥib al-ʿAḍrā’ himself held his sessions in the Ṣāḥibiyā Madrasa (so Ibn Ḏahlīkān, in Quatremère, Hist. Sult. Mam., ii, 22, cf. also for Egypt: ibid., 87, ii/2, 235). The vice-kādīs sat in the Ẓāhiryya Madrasa (Ibn Ṭabṭābā, i, 218). The judgment might even be put into execution in the madrasa (ibid., 220). During the Mamluk period in Egypt, we occasionally find a small mosque being endowed (al-Maḍāhī, ii, 270; Ibn Dhūmāk, 98 above); Ibn Ḏahlīkān held legal sittings in the Madrasa al-Ṣāḥibiyā (ʿErb, vii, 453).

A mufīj, especially in the large mosques, was also frequently appointed; he sat at definite times in a baḥkā liʿfawāʾi, e.g. in Cairo (al-ʿAzwānī, in al-Suyūṭī, i, 182; ʿDjalāl al-Dīn, ibid., 187), in Tunis (al-Zarkaqqī, Chronicle, in Fāṣī, tr. Faghīrī, in Rec. Mon., Soc. Arch. Cent. Arch. Correspond., xxi [1895], 197, 202, 218, 248). In Baghdaḏd, Abū Bakr al-Dīnawarī (d. 405/1014-15) was the last to give fawāʾi in the Mosque of al-Ṣāḥib according to the magdīs al-mīḥf of Sufyān al-Ṭawrī (Ibn Ṭabṭābā, ed. Popper, ii, 120).

The administration of the mosque

I. Finance. The earliest mosques were built by the rulers of the various communities, and the members of the community did all the work necessary in connection with the primitive mosques. The later mosques as a rule were erected by rulers, amirs, high officials or other rich men in their private capacity and maintained by them. The erection of the mosque of Ibn Ṭullūn cost its builder 120,000 dinārs, the Mosque of Muʿayyad 110,000 (al-Maṭṭāri, 114; al-Ṭabarī, i, 2135). The upkeep of the mosque was provided for by estates made over as endowments (wakf, ḥabs) (cf. thereon besides the fīḥk books, I. Krcsmar, Das Wakfrecht, in ZDMG, xlv [1891], 511-76; E. Mercier, Le code du hbeus ou ouakf selon la législation musulmane, 1899). In the 3rd/9th century we thus hear of houses which belonged to the mosque, and were let by the Madrāsis: Ezherszeg Rainer, Fichte, nos. 773, 837), and Ibn Ṭullūn handed over a large number of houses as an endowment for his mosque and hospital (al-Matrīzī, iv, 83). This custom was taken over from the Christians by the Muslims (see Becker, in Ist., ii [1911], 404). According to al-Maṭṭāri, estates were not given as wakf endowments until Muḥammad Abū Bakr al-Maḍāhī (read thus) bequeathed Birkaṭ al-Habāsh and Suyūṭ as endowments (about 300/912-13; this was however cancelled by the Fāṭimids again (ibid.). Al-Hākim made large endowments not only for his own, but also for mosques previously in existence, such as the Azhar, al-Hākimī, Dār al-Ḥāflahī al-Mtasī and Dāmī Dālghidā; the endowments consisted of dwelling-houses, shops, mills, a kādariyya and baḥsāʾi, and the document (ibid., 50-1) specifies how and for what purposes the revenues are to be distributed. Baths were also given as endowments for mosques (ibid., 76, for 529/1135; cf. 81 for the year 543/1148-9). Saḥāl al-Dīn granted lands to his madrasa: in 566/1170-1, for example, a kāsīriyya to the Kamhātī Madrasa, and in 568/1172-3, the teachers received wheat from al-Fayyūm; in the same year he endowed the Nāṣīrīyya with goldsmiths’ shops and a village (ibid., 193-4; cf. another document, 196-7). During the Mamluk period also, estates were given as endowments (for documents of this period, see van Berchem, C.I.A., i, nos. 247, 252, 528; Moberg, in MO, xii [1918], 1 ff.; J.A., ser. 9, iii, 264-6; ser. 11, x, 158 ff., 222 f.; xii, 195 ff., 236 ff.). They
were often a considerable distance apart: the mosques in Egypt often had estates in Syria (van Berchem, CIA, i, no. 247; al-Makrizi, vi, 107, 137). Not only were mosques built and endowed, but already existing ones were given new rooms for teachers, minbars, stipends for Kur'an reciters, teachers, etc. There were often special endowments for the salaries of the imam and the mu'adhdhins, for the support of visitors, for blankets, food, etc. (see Ibn Djubayr, 277 with reference to the Mosque of the Umayyads). The endowments, and the purpose for which they might be used, were precisely laid down in the grant and the document attested in the court of justice by the kadi and the witnesses (cf. al-Makrizi, iv, 50, 196 below).

The text was also often inscribed on the wall of the mosque (cf. ibid., 76; the above-mentioned inscriptions amongst others. For documents from Tadhkent, see RMM, xiii [1911], 278 ff.). Certain conditions might have been laid down e.g. that no Persian or Jews should be appointed there (al-Makrizi, iv, 202 below), or that the teacher could not be dismissed or some such condition (van Berchem, CIA, i, no. 201); that no women could enter (JA, ser. 9, iii, 389); that no Christian, Jew or Hanbali could enter the building (ibid., 405); etc. Endowments were often made with stipends, and the purpose for which they might be used, were also precisely laid down in the grant and the document attested in the court of justice by the kadi and the witnesses (cf. al-Makrizi, iv, 50, 196 below).

Just as the bayt al-mal of the state was kept in the mosque, so was the mosque’s own property kept in it, e.g. the maleKBa'abSahib, which al-Hakim paid the descendants of Ibn Tulun (al-Makrizi, iv, 89); in the Akbughawiyya, the Shafi'is kadi was appointed but his successors were also found, however, in which descendants of the founder successfully claimed the office of nåzir (al-Makrizi, iv, 218, 255). This was the result of the increasing power of the kadi (see below).

A. Administration. As İmām of the Muslim community, the caliph had the mosques under his charge. This was also the case with the sultan, governor or other ruler who represented the caliph in every respect. The administration of the mosques could not however be directly controlled by the usual government offices. By its endowment, the mosque became an object sui generis and was withdrawn from the usual state or private purposes. Their particular association with religion gave the kadi special influence, and, on the other side, the will of the testator continued to prevail. These three factors decided the administration of the mosque, but the relation between them was not always clear.

1. Administration of the Separate Mosques. The mosque was usually in charge of a nåzir or wali who looked after its affairs. The founder was often himself the nåzir or he chose another and after his death, his descendants took charge or whoever was appointed by him in the foundation charter. In the older period, the former was the rule and it is said to have applied especially in the case of chief mosques, if we may believe Nāṣir-i Khurasān, according to whom al-Hākim paid the descendants of Ibn Tulun 30,000 dinārs for the mosque and 5,000 for the minaret, and similarly to the descendants of Amr b. al-As 100,000 dinārs for the mosque of Sufa (Sarfānuma, ed. Scheler, text 39-40, tr. 146, 148). In 378/988 we read of an administrator (mutawalli) of the mosque in Jerusalem (al-Makrizi, iv, 11). In the case of mosques and madrasa founded during the Mamlûk period, it is often expressly mentioned that the administration is to remain in the hands of the descendants of the founder, e.g. in the case of a mosque founded by Baybars (al-Makrizi, iv, 89), in the Dā'imis Máks when the vizier al-Maški renovated it (ibid., 66), the Sāhibiyā (ibid., 205), and the Karāsuntkuriyya (ibid., 292), etc.; so also in the Badriyya in Jerusalem (“to the best of the descendants”, cf. van Berchem, CIA, i, ii, 192). Other cases are also found. Sometimes an amir or official was an administrator, e.g. in the Mu'ayyad (al-Makrizi, iv, 140), the Taybarsiyā (ibid., 224), the Azhar (ibid., 54-5) or the Mosque of Ibn Tūlūn (al-Kalkashandi, Bayt Mdl al-Djami el-Askariyya, ed. Enger, 172 above, 176 above).

In Tustar, a descendant of Sahl as-Sāhibiyā and was therefore also the leading professor; the two offices were hereditary (ibid., 204, the Sāhibiyā al-Bahā'iyā; and 238 above, the Djamal-iyā). In Tustar, a descendant of Sahil al-nāzir and teachers had a madrasa, with the help of four slaves (Ibn Bāṭtūta, ii, 25-6).

The nåzir managed the finances and other business of the mosque. Sometimes he had a fixed salary (in Baybars' khanakāh, 500 dinārs a month, van Berchem, CIA, i, 252; in the Dulāmīyā in Damascus in 347/1443-4, only 60 dinārs a month, JA, ser. 9, iii, 261), but the revenues of the mosque were often applied to his personal use. His control of the funds of the mosque was however often limited by the central commission for endowments (see below). The nåzir might also see to any necessary increase of the endowments. He appointed the staff and he fixed their pay (cf. e.g. al-Makrizi, iv, 41). He could also interfere in the affairs of the madrasa, on the other side of administration; for example, the amir Sawdāb, the nåzir of the Azhar in 818/1415-16, ejected about 750 poor people from the mosque. He was however thrown into prison for this by the sultan (ibid., 54).

Generally speaking, the nåzir's powers were considerable. In 784/1382 a nåzir in the Azhar decided that the property of a muqāwar, who had died without heirs, should be distributed among the other students (ibid., 54).

In Mecca, according to Kūtib al-Dīn, the
Nāżir al-Hārām was in charge of the great festival of the mawlid of the Prophet (12 Rabī‘ I) and distributed robes of honour in the mosque on this occasion (Chron. Mecca, iii, 349). In the Azhar, no Nāżir was appointed after about 493/1100 but a learned man was appointed Shaykh al-Azhar, principal and administrator of the mosque (Sulaymān Rāsād al-Zayyātī, Kanz al-ażhāre fī ta’rīkh al-Azhar, 123 ff.). Conditions were similar in Mecca in the late 19th century (Snouck Hurgronje, Mecca, ii, 235-6, 252-3).

Nāżir al-Hārām was in charge of the great festival of the mawlid of the Prophet (12 Rabī‘ I) and distributed robes of honour in the mosque on this occasion (Chron. Mecca, iii, 349). In the Azhar, no Nāżir was appointed after about 493/1100 but a learned man was appointed Shaykh al-Azhar, principal and administrator of the mosque (Sulaymān Rāsād al-Zayyātī, Kanz al-ażhāre fī ta’rīkh al-Azhar, 123 ff.). Conditions were similar in Mecca in the late 19th century (Snouck Hurgronje, Mecca, ii, 235-6, 252-3).

This was especially the case in the madārīs, where the kāfīs were often teachers (cf. al-Makrīzī, iv, 209, 219, 222, 238, etc.); the kāfīs were particularly anxious to get the principal offices in the large schools (cf. Kalkaşhanı, xi, 235). Their influence was however further increased by the fact that, if a Nāżir qualified by the terms of the founder’s will no longer existed, the kāfī of the madhīb in question stepped into his place (cf. ZDMG, xlv [1897], 552). By this rule, which often gave rise to quarrels between the different kāfīs (e.g. al-Makrīzī, iv, 218, the Zāhīriyya), a kāfī could accumulate a larger number of offices and “milk the endowments” (ibid., i, 364). Sometimes their management was so ruthless that the schools soon declined (e.g. the Shāhīyya and the Djamāliyya, al-Makrīzī, al-Mihār, 204-5, 236). They also exercised influence through the committee of management of the mosque.

b. Centralisation in the management of the mosques. The large mosques occupied a special position in the Muslim lands, because the caliph had to interest himself particularly in them, especially those of Mecca and Medina, where the rulers and their governors built extensions and executed renovations (cf. Chron. Mecca, i, 145; iii, 83 ff.). During the ‘Abbasid period, the kāfī occasionally plays a certain charge of the work (ibid., i, 312; ii, 43). In 263/877, al-Muwaffak ordered the Tulunid mosque, a commission was appointed to take charge of the repairs of the mosques to certain amirs, one to each (al-Makrīzī, iv, 21-2). But at a quite early date they were much reduced. The sultan would forbade the kāfīs to settle the dispute between the different madhāb in the mosque on this occasion (Chron. Mecca, iv, 15, 53). This principle was several times applied in later times, and the amirs frequently gained influence at the expense of the kāfīs. Thus after the earthquake of 707/1303 (cf. thereon Quatremére de Quincy, Hist. Sult. Maml., ii/2, 214 ff.), the mosques were allotted to amirs, who had to see that they were rebuilt (al-Makrīzī, iv, 15, 53). From the middle of the 7th/13th century, we often find amirs as administrators of the chief mosques. The kāfī had however obtained so much authority that he was conceded a general administration over all the mosques, and was frequently placed in the first rank of men in full charge of the endowments of his madhīb (al-Umarī, al-Tawrī ḫī l-mustalah al-sharīf, 117; cf. ZDMG, xlv [1891], 559); according to this theory the kāfī could intervene to stop abuses. In Syria in 660/1262 Ibn Khallīkān became kāfī over the whole area between al-‘Arīsh and the Euphrates and superintendent of waqf, mosques, madrasas, etc. (Quatremére, Hist. Sult. Maml., i/1, 170).

Sultan Baybars reformed these endowments and...
restored the office of nāzir al-aufāk or nāzir al-‘abbas al-mabārun or n. ‘abī mūsā al-harr (al-Kalkashandi, iii, 54, 38; v, 465, ix, 256; xi, 257; cf. Khaṭṭ al-Zuhūrī, Zuhūr al-dīn, 109). According to al-Makrīzī, the endowments were distributed among the Mamlūks in three departments (dtāḥ): 1. qādhāi al-‘abbar, managed by an ‘āmir, the Dāwūdī: this looked after the lands of the mosques, in 740/1339-40, in all 130,000,000 dinars; 2. qādhāi al-aufām wa l-hukmīyā bi-Mūsā wa l-Khūshū, which administered dwelling-houses; it was delivered to ‘alā ‘mat al-aufām, with the title Nāzir al-Aufām. This department came to an end in the time of al-Malik al-Nāṣir Farādji because an ‘āmir, supported by the opinion of the Hāfiz chief ḥāfiẓ, spent a great deal and misused the funds; 3. qādhāi al-aufām al-ḥāzīyya, comprised all the endowments which still had particular nāzirs, either descendants of the teastar or officials of the sultan and the khādi. The ‘āmir seized their lands and Barkūk, before he became sultan, sought in vain to remedy the evil by appointing a commissioner. The endowments in general disappeared somewhat later because the ruling ‘āmir seized them (al-Makrīzī, iv, 83-6). In modern times, as a rule, endowments in Muslim lands have been combined under a special ministry, a Wizārat al-Aufām.

At the consecration of the mosque was managed by the Shāfi‘i kādi ‘l-kūfī, or his amir, copied by the opinion of the Hanafī chief kādi, spent 100,000 dinars; 2. kādi ‘l-kūfī, in conjunction with the Shāfi‘i, supervised the building of a mosque (e.g. al-Makrīzī, iv, 49). Under the Mamlūks, there was also a clerk of works, mutawwallī ṣadd al-‘amīr or nāzir al-‘imāra: he was the overseer of the builders (ibid., 102; see Zuhūr al-dīn, 75). The caliph or the ruler of the country was in this, as in other matters, supreme. As we have seen, he intervened in the administration and directed it as he wished. He was also able to interfere in the internal affairs of the mosque, if necessary through his usual officers. In 253/867 after the rising in the Fayyum, the chief of police issued strict orders by which it was forbidden to say the noon prayer, which had been introduced among the officials of the mosques and Sufis (al-Makrīzī, iv, 83). This is a representative from Baghdad was also able to interfere in the administration and directed it as he wished. He had the people of the villages to celebrate the two salāts, one after the other each in his place, the Fātimids on ceremonial occasions, especially in the month of Ramadān (Ibn Taghrībrī, ed. Jyunboli, ii, 482 ff; al-Kalkashandi, iii, 509 ff); in many individual mosques, probably the most prominent man conducted the service; according to the hadith, the only man who could be the best knowledge of the Kur‘ān and, failing him, the eldest, should officiate (al-Bukhārī, Ahdān, bāb 46, 49).

The imām appointed was chosen from among those learned in religious matters; he was often a Hāshimite (Mez, Renaissance, 147, Eng. tr., 150); he might at the same time be a ‘āmir or his nā‘ib (see al-Kīnī, 575, 589; Ibn Baṭṭūtā, i, 276-7). During the salāt he stood beside the miḥrab; al-Mukādī mentions the anomaly that in Syria one performed one’s salāt “in the presence of the imām” (202). He could also stand on an elevated position; on one occasion Abū Hurayra conducted the salāt in the Meccan mosque from the roof (al-Bukhārī, Salāt, bāb 17). In Mecca, in Ibn Dābair’s time, each of the four recognised maghribī (with the Zaydīs in addition) had an imām; they conducted the salāt on after the hadith, in the following order: Shāhīn, Mālikī, Hāfīz and Hanbalīs; they only performed the salāt al-maghrīb together; in Ramadān, they held the tawwīb in different places in the mosque, which was also often conducted by the kūra‘ (Rihla, 101, 102, 143-4). This is still the case; very frequently one performs the salāt, not after the imām of one’s own maghribī (Snouck Hurgrone, Mekka, ii, 79-80). In Jerusalem, according
to Mudjir al-Din, the order was: Malikis, Shafiis, Hanafis and Hanbalis, who prayed each in their own part of the Haram; in Hebron the order was the same (Sauvère, Hist. Jdr. et Hebron, 136-7). In Ramadān, extraordinary imāms were appointed (ibid., 138).

When the imām no longer represented a political office, each mosque regularly had one. He had to maintain order and was in general in charge of the divine services in the mosque. In al-Mu'addasī's time the imām of the Mosque of 'Amr read a qawwāl of the Qur'ān. The imām was his deputy to conduct every salāt, which is only valid if djamā'a. He must conform to the standards laid down in the law; but it is disputed whether the salāt is invalid in the opposite case. According to some, the leader of the Friday salāt should be a different man from the leader of the five daily salāts (al-Māwardi, al-Ahkām al-tulūbīyya, ed. Enger, 171, Ibn al-Hajjāj, Madkhāli, ii, 45; al-Jārā'ī, 56; al-Mutani, ed. Myhrman, 163-4; for hadiths, see Wensinck, Hand- book, 109-10). Many misgivings against payment being made for religious services held by certain authorities, who quoted in support of their view a saying of Abū Ḥanīfa (al-Mu'addasī, 127).

3. The Ḳaṣīṭ or preacher [see Ḳaṣīṭ].

On the subject see above, I. C. 3. Sometimes, in later usage, waḍ' is used of the official speaker, very like the Ḳaṣīṭ (cf. Ibn Battātah, iii, 9), while al-bāṣ is only applied to the street storyteller (al-Subkī, Muṣil al-niṣām, 161-2). The kūrā' were also frequently appointed to maḍāras and particularly to maḍāras and specifically to maṣūlūrans (al-Makrīzī, ii, 233, Yākūt, iv, 509; al-Subkī, 162; van Berchem, CEF, i, no. 252).

4. The Muḥadhdhin. According to most traditions, the office of muḥadhdhin was instituted in the year 1, according to others only after the irā', in the year 2, according to some weak traditions, while Muhammad was still in Mecca. At first, the people came to the salāt without being summoned. Trumpets (bāk) were blown and rattles (nākās) used, or fires lit at the custom of salāt of Christians and Muslims. 'Abd Allāh b. Zayd learned the ḥaḍīl formula in a dream; it was approved by the Prophet and when Bilāl proclaimed it, it was found that 'Umar had also learned the same procedure in a dream (Ibn Hishām, 357-8; al-Dīyārābāki, i, 404-5; al-Bukhārī, Ḥadīth, bāb 1; al-Ẓuhrī, i, 121 ff). There are also variants of the formula. The Prophet, according to 'Umar's vision, or Abu Bakr or seven or fourteen of the Ansār. He must conform to the standards laid down in the law. In al-Mukaddasī's time the occasion of calling from a raised position became necessary because prayer had to be organised lest confusion result, and threats to the evening prayer were frequent. A year 60/680 had his mundād, thus the right hand of the ruler. Al-Husayn had his mundād with him, and the latter summoned to the salāt. Mundād with al-Husayn's instructions (al-Tahārī, ii, 297, 298; cf. Ibn Ziyād, ibid., 260 and in the year 196/811-12, the άίμι in Mecca, ibid., i, 861, 13; also Chron. Mekka, i, 340). During the earliest period, the muḥadhdhin probably issued his summons in the streets and the call was very short: al-salāt al-djadiy at (Ibn Sa'd, 7; Chron. Mekka, i, 340; al-Tahārī, iii, 861; cf. also in the year 196/811-12, Sira Halabiyya, ii, 70; Dīyārābāki, i, 404-5). This brief summons was, according to Ibn Sa'd, also used later on irregular occasions (i, 7 ff.; cf. the passage in the Taḥārī). Perhaps also the summons was issued from a particular place even at a quite early date (see I. D. 2a). After the public summons, the muḥadhdhin went to the Prophet, greeted him and called him to prayer; the same procedure was later substituted, or fires lit, when he had come, the muḥadhdhin announced the beginning of the salāt (akāma 'l-salāt). Cf. al-Bukhārī, Wudū', bāb 5; Aḥmad, bāb 48; Sira Halabiyya, ii, 104-5; al-Makrīzī, iv, 45, and iṣrāma. The activity of the muḥadhdhin thus fell into three sections: the summoning of the community, the summoning of the salām and the announcement of the beginning of the salāt. In the course of time, changes were made in all three stages. The summoning of the community by crying aloud was not yet at all regular in the older period. During the civil strife in 'Irāk, 'Ubayd Allāh b. Ziyād in the year 60/680 had his muḥadhdhin summon people with threats to the evening salāt in the mosque, and when after an Muharram day he had summoned to prayer, the ifāra announced (al-Tahārī, ii, 260). When a large number of mosques had come into existence, the public call to prayer had to be organised lest confusion result, and the custom of calling from a raised position became general after the introduction of the minaret. While previously the call to prayer had only been preparatory to the prayer, it was the official announcement, the public call (muḥadhdhin) and the ikāma now formed two distinct phases of the call to prayer. Tradition has assemblies were made by criers. This crier was called munādī or muʿadhdhīn (Sira Halabiyya, ii, 170; Lammons, Le Mosquée, 62 ff., 146; idem, Beroua, i, 229 n.; ibid., Mevâst, 121). Muʿadhdhīn therefore means proclamation, sūra IX, 3, and adhdhīna, muʿadhdhīn, sūra VII, 70, "to proclaim" and "crier." Munādī (al-Bukhārī, Fard al-khams, bāb 15) and muʿadhdhīn (ibid., Sām, bāb 69; Salāt, bāb 10 = Dīyya, bāb 16; Sira Halabiyya, ii, 270) are names given to a crier used by the Prophet or Abū Bakr for such purposes. Official proclamations were regularly made by criers (cf. al-Tahārī, ii, 154-5; cf. Ibn Sa'd, i, 7; Chron. Mekka, i, 340).

In these conditions, it was very natural for Muhammad to assemble the believers to common prayer through a crier (nādā lil' ilā ilā 'l-salāt, sūra V, 63; xii, 9). The summons is called nādā and adhdhīna, the crier munādī (al-Bukhārī, Wudū', bāb 5; Aḥmad, bāb 7) and muʿadhdhīn; the two names are used quite indiscriminately (e.g. ibid., Wudū', bāb 5; al-Tahārī, bāb 297 sq.). Munādī = il-salāt, al-Mu'addasī, 182, 12, also saḥ 'crier' is used (al-Tahārī, ii, 861; Chron. Mekka, i, 340).

Among the other possibilities, which were also frequently appointed to maḍāras and particularly to maṣūlūrans, were other methods mentioned in the hadiths, or dubtingu, see Wensinck, Hand-book, 109-10). Many misgivings against payment being made for religious services held by certain authorities, who quoted in support of their view a saying of Abū Ḥanīfa (al-Mu'addasī, 127).
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retained a memory of the summoning in the streets, now completely fallen into disuse, when it tells us that 'Uthmân introduced a third adhan, a call in al-Zawâra', which was made before the call from the minaret: this call, however, was transferred by Highâm b. ʿAbd al-Malik to the minaret (al-Bukhâri, Q. 2:22, 25; Sîra Halabiyya, ii, 110; Ibn al-Hâdjî, Madkâlî, ii, 45). This may be evidence of the gradual cessation of the custom of summoning the community by going through the streets. Ibn Baṭtûta (but this is exception) tells us that the muâdhâhdhins called first and the others followed together (al-Mâkîrizî, iv, 43), but very quickly other mosques were also given muâdhâhdhins: their calls were sufficiently audible in the whole town. The chief mosque reserved to itself the privilege, that its muâdhâhdhin called first and the others followed together (al-Mâkîrizî, iv, 43, below), 44).

The summoning by the imâm in Medina was therefore quite a natural thing. The custom, at first associated with the ruler’s mosque, was not observed in Medina only (see for 'Uthmân and 'All, al-Tabârî, ii, 3059-60), but was also usual under the Umayyads. The formula was al-salâm 'alâ šiyârat yârûd wa-râhmatu 'llâh wa-barakâthu, hayya 'alâ 'l-fâlidi, hayya 'alâ 'l-fâlidi, hayya 'alâ 'l-fâlidi, yarhamuka 'llâh (al-Mâkîrizî, iv, 45; Sîra Halabiyya, ii, 105). After the alteration in the adhan and the greater distance of the ruler from the mosque, to summon him was no longer the natural conclusion to the assembling of the community. In the 'Abbasîd period and under the Faṭimid, there was a survival of the old custom, as in much as the muâdhâhdhins ended the adhan call before the salât al-fâjdîr on the minarets with a salât upon the caliph. This part of the muâdhâhdhins’ work was thus associated with the first adhan call. When Sâlâm al-Dîn came to power, he did not wish to be mentioned in the call to prayer, but instead he ordered a blessing upon the Prophet to be pronounced a maghrib, the foremost muâdhâhdhin pronounced a du’â upon the Âbâsîd Imâm and on Sâlâm al-Dîn from the Zamzam roof, in which those present joined with them during the adhân (al-Mâkîrizî, iv, 48). In the time of Âhidâm b. Tûsîn and Khumârawâyah, the muâdhâhdhins recited religious texts throughout the night in a special room. Sâlâm al-Dîn ordered them to recite an ‘âshira in the night adhân and after 700/1300-1, du’â was performed on Friday morning on the minarets. In the 9th/15th century it was performed every hour to be heard by the muâdhâhdhins all through the night until fajr. This is explained as a polemical imitation of the Christians, for the governor was troubled by the use of the nauwâsît at night and forbade them during the adhân (al-Mâkîrizî, iv, 48). In the time of Muhammad b. Khâmil and Khûrûnî, similar litanies are kept up in modern times, as well as a special call about an hour before dawn (eshel, tarhim: see Lane, Manners and customs, Everyman’s Library, 75-6, cf. Snouck Hurgronje, Mekka ii, 84 ff.).

The original call of the muâdhâhdhins thus developed into a melodious chant like the recitation of the Kurân. Al-Mušâdâdî tells us that in the 4th/10th century in Egypt during the last third of the night, the adhân was recited like a dirge (205). The solemn effect was increased by the large number of voices. In large mosques, the muâdhâhdhins were called first from a minaret, then the others came in turn (Chron. Mekka, iii, 242-5; Ibn Dâubby, 145 ff.; cf. Ibn Rusta, 111, 1 ff. and above). But in the mosque itself, the ikâma was pronounced by the muâdhâhdhins in chorus on the donkâ (see above, I, D, 2e) erected for this purpose, which is also traced to Masmâlî. In the 3rd/9th and 4th/10th centuries we hear of these melodious recitations (atâbî) of the muâdhâhdhins on a raised podium in widely separated salâats between the two calls (al-Bukhârî, Adhân, bâb 14, 16). Some are said to have introduced the practice of the muâdhâhdhins calling hayya ‘alâ ‘l-salât at the door of the mosque between the two calls (Sîra Halabiyya, ii, 105). From the nature of the case, the ikâma was always called in the mosque; at the Friday service, it was done when the imâm mounted the mimbar (al-Bukhârî, Q. 2:22, 25; Sîra Halabiyya, ii, 110; al-Mâkîrizî, iv, 43) while the muâdhâhdhins stood in front of him. This muâdhâhdhin, according to some, ought to be the one who introduced the call in the mosque (Sîra Halabiyya, ii, 109), while Ibn al-Hâdjî ignoring the historical facts only permits the call from the minaret (Madkâlî, ii, 45). In Tunis, the ikâma was announced by ringing a bell as in the churches (al-Zarkashî, tr. Fâgman, in Rec. Soc. Arch. CONSTANCIE [1894], 111-12). A similarity to the responses in the Christian service is found in the fact that the call of the muâdhâhdhins, which contains a confession of faith, is to be repeated or at least answered by every one who hears it (al-Bukhârî, Q. 2:23); this is an action which confers religious merit (Ibn Kûtîlbûghâ, Tabakât al-Hanafîyya, ed. Flügel, 30). It is possible that we should recognise in this as well as in the development of the formulae the influence of Christians converted to Islam for whom the ‘âshira and the recitation of the five salâts are from the time of the imâm (Stark, Islam, iii [1912], 374 ff., and Islamstudi en, i, 472 ff., who sees an imitation of the Christian custom in the ikâma in general; on the possibility of Jewish influence, see Mitwocch, in Abh. Pr. A. W. [1913], Phil.-Hist. Cl. 2).
parts of the Muslim world (Sanqa, Egypt, Khurasan, al-Muqaddasi, 327; Ibn Rusta, 111; the expression al-mu'addhins, "the musicians", if correct, probably refers to the mu'addhaTins, al-Muqaddasi, 205; cf. also al-Kindi, Wulat, 469; for Fars we are expressly told that the mu'addhaTins call without tarih, al-Muqaddasi, 439, 17). Sometimes in large mosques, they were stationed in different parts of the mosque to make the iman's words clear to the community (tabligh). The singing, especially in chorus, was a prominent form of the tabligh. It was sometimes hereditary.

The new demands made on the mu'addhaTins necessitated an increase in their number, especially in the large mosques. The Prophet in Medina had two mu'addhaTins, Bilal b. Ribi'a, Abu Bakr's musâlah, and Ibn Umm Maktûm, who worked in rotation. 'Uthmân also is said occasionally to have called the adhdh in front of the minbar, i.e. the ikdam, (al-Makrlzi, iv, 76). Ibn Battuta reported that a certain mosque in Batnîya had two mu'addhaTins at a mosque (Muslim, Salât, tr. 4; cf. al-Subkl, Mu'd, 165). Abu Mahdîhâra was also the Prophet's mu'addhaTin in Mecca. Under 'Umar, Bilal's successor as mu'addhaTin was Sa'd al-Karaz, who is said to have called to prayer for the Prophet in Kûbâ (al-Makrlzi, op. cit.; cf. Sira Halabiyâ, ii, 107 ff.). In Egypt under 'Amr, the first mu'addhaTin in al-Fustat was Abu Muslim, who was a musâlah, i.e. the large mosques. The Prophet in Medina had two mu'addhaTins (al-Makrlzi, iv, 44) and Ahmad b. Tulun in Cairo had a mu'addhaTin (al-Bukhari, 132, 279), in Mecca, the sons of Abu Karaz officiating (Ibn Kutayba, Ma'â, ii, 104; cf. al-Subkl, Mu'd, 165-6; cf. also al-Makrlzi, iv, 14). In Mecca, the ra's al-mu'addhaTins was identical with the mu'addhaTin al-Zamami, who had charge of the singing in the upper story of the Zamam building (Chron. Mekka, ii, 424-5; cf. Ibn Djubayr, 145; cf. Snouck Hurgronje, Mekka, ii, 322). The ra's was next to the imam but subordinate to him; in certain districts, it was the custom for him to mount the pulpit during the sermon with the iman (when the latter acted as khatib) (Makrlzi, ii, 74). The position of the mu'addhaTin, therefore, was one that was seen from the part which they play in public processes of officials, e.g. of the Kâ'dî'l-Kudâ, when they walk in front and lead the ruler and his vizier (al-Makrlzi, ii, 246).

Closely associated with the mu'addhaTin is the muwaq-kti, the astronomer, whose task it was to ascertain the kibla and the times of prayer (al-Subkl, Mu'd, 165-6 and see Mu'âk), sometimes the chief mu'addhaTin did this (Snouck Hurgronje, Mekka, ii, 322).

5. Servants. According to Abu Hurayra, the Mosque of the Prophet was swept by a negro (al-Bukhari, Salât, bâb 72, cf. 74). The larger mosques gradually acquired a large staff of servants (khudddm), notably waqâb, farasâq, and water-carriers (cf. e.g. Ibn al-Fakfh, 100; van Berchem, CIA, i, no. 201). In the Mosque of Jerusalem in about 300/912-13, there were no less than 140 servants (khudddm; Ibn al-Fâkhî, 100); others give the figure 230 (Le Strange, Palestine, 163) and according to Muqîrî al-Dîn, 'Abd al-Malik appointed a guard of 300 black slaves here, while the actual menial work was done by certain Jewish and Christian families (Sauvageau, Hist. Isr. et Hbr., 56-7).

In other mosques, superintendents (kayyim, pl. kawama) are mentioned, a vague title which covered a multitude of duties: thus the Madrasa al-Madhdîyya had a kayyim who looked after the cleaning, the staff, the lighting and water-supply (al-Makrlzi, iv, 251). In the Azhar Mosque had one for the madrasa, who was paid twelve dinars (ibid., 51) and also 4 kawama, who were paid like mu'addhaTins (two dinars a month and are mentioned between them and the imâms, probably supervisors of the staff (ibid., 51). In other cases, a kayyim al-dîm (sometimes a kâ'dî), is mentioned, who was apparently the same as the imâm, the khatib or some similar individual of standing (ibid., 75, 121, cf. 122; cf. Ibn Djubayr, 51). A muqîrî, inspector, is also mentioned, e.g. in the Azhar (al-Makrlzi, iv, 51).

Bibliography: given in the article.

H. The architecture of the mosque

1. Introduction. Although generalise about regional variations in mosque architecture are fraught with difficulty and have often miscarried. One solution, admittedly a compromise, is to select a few of the most celebrated mosques, to imply in more or less arbitrary fashion that they are typical, and to base the requisite generalisations on them. This approach has at least the merit of clarity, and it could indeed be argued that it is the finest mosques of a given period and region that local peculiarities are apt to find their fullest expression. Nevertheless, such a broad-brush
approach, for all its superficial attractions, is simply not specific enough. Another approach, which might be termed typological, cuts across regional and temporal boundaries in order to isolate the significant variants of mosque design and trace their development. Yet, precisely because it ignores such boundaries, this approach tends to minimise the significance of regional schools and fashions. The categories and sub-species which it proposes tend to have a somewhat academic flavour; while technically defensible, they somehow lose the point. A third approach might be to rely on statistics and, by chronicling all known mosques of pre-modern date, to discover the types and distribution of the most popular varieties. The picture to emerge from such a study might indeed be literally accurate, but it would not distinguish between the djam* and the masdjid, that is, between the major religious building of a town or city and the neighbourhood mosque (on the djam* and its functions, see above, I. C. 2.). Since virtually all the mosques under discussion here fall into the category of djam*, such a study would be of limited value in this context, and would assuredly blur the sharp outlines of regional peculiarities of mosque design. After all, the simplest types of mosques not only vastly outnumber the ones in question but also tend to be found throughout the Muslim world. It is such mosques, therefore, which make up the standard distribution of this building type. They dominate by sheer weight of numbers, but—by the same token—they distort the overall picture, suggesting a uniformity that actually exists only at the level of the most primitive buildings. Only when a statistical survey of this kind is relieved of the effectively dead weight of such buildings can regional and temporal distinctions stand out in their full clarity.

Such are the difficulties attendant on venturing a tour d’horizon of formal developments in the pre-modern mosque. What, then, is the best way of tackling this problem? The most promising line of approach is probably to identify those mosque types which are most distinctive of a given area and period, describing their constituent features but avoiding a detailed analysis of individual buildings. It should be emphasised that the over-riding aim of highlighting significant regional developments entails the suppression of much corroborative detail and, more importantly, of those periods when a given region was simply continuing to build mosques in a style already well-established. Admittedly the lulls in innovation have their own part to play in the history of mosque architecture; but that part is too modest to rate any extended discussion here.

For that same reason, areas in which the pace of change was sluggish are allotted less attention in the following account than those which were consistently in the forefront of experiment. The Magrib, for example, receives less space than Iran, while Trak* and the Levant take second place to Egypt and Anatolia. These emphases, moreover, reflect the basic regional traditions, for they draw very heavily on a reservoir of ideas, practices and forms which owe very little to Islam. Thus for reasons which are as much historical as cultural, geographical they do not belong in the mainstream of mosque architecture. Yet the interconnections between these buildings are such as to make light of their geographical remoteness from each other.

Accordingly, a pan-Islamic survey of the early architectonic history of the mosque will preface the individual accounts of local developments. These accounts in turn will be of unequal length. Pride of place will go to the Arab mosque plan, which not only had the widest diffusion but also covers the longest chronological span. Next in length will be the survey of the Persian tradition, almost as ancient as that of the Arab plan but more restricted in geographical scope. Shortest of all will be the discussion of the Turkish mosque type, whose creative development is confined in time to the 8th-11th/14th-17th centuries and in space to Anatolia.

2. Early history of the mosque: 622-1000 A.D.

(a) The house of the Prophet. Beyond doubt, the genesis of the mosque is to be sought in a single seminal building: the house of the Prophet, erected to Muhammad’s own specifications in Medina in 1/622. It was a near-square enclosure of some 56 x 53 m. with a single entrance; a double range of palm-trunk columns thatched with palm leaves (a feature of many African mosques to this day) was added on the qibla side, with a lean-to for destitute Companions to the south-east and nine huts for Muhammad and his wives along the western perimeter. By a curious paradox, it was not built even secondarily as a mosque. This fact cannot be over-emphasised, since to ignore it is to misinterpret the subsequent history of mosque architecture. The venerated model for all later mosques itself became a mosque only, as it were, by the way and in the course of time. How is this to be explained? The accumulated deposit of many centuries of reverence makes it difficult to disentangle the full original context of the building. Yet this much is clear: it was first and foremost a house for Muhammad and his family to live in. It was also conceived from the beginning as a gathering place for the growing band of Muslims: in fact a kind of community centre, complete with the attendant associations of welfare. At the same time it served political, military
and legal functions, while its high walls and single entrance allowed it at need to act as a place of refuge for the community. To be sure, by degrees people began to pray in it; but they prayed in many other places too and there is no evidence that it was used as the regular place of worship in the earliest years of the community. The mere fact that dogs and camels were allowed free access to it effectively disposes of such a notion. In short, Muhammad had, it seems, no intention of building a place of worship. To be sure, by degrees people began to pray in it; but they prayed in many other places too and there is no evidence that it was used as the regular place of worship in the earliest years of the community. The mere fact that dogs and camels were allowed free access to it effectively disposes of such a notion. In short, Muhammad had, it seems, no intention of building a place of worship. To be sure, by degrees people began to pray in it; but they prayed in many other places too and there is no evidence that it was used as the regular place of worship in the earliest years of the community. The mere fact that dogs and camels were allowed free access to it effectively disposes of such a notion. In short, Muhammad had, it seems, no intention of building a place of worship.

At the Cordova mosque the column shafts bore piers braced by strainer arches; but this device, for all its ingenuity, served to reinforce the structure and the corners, with doorways after every second buttress. At Susa the exterior dispenses with buttresses in favour of rounded corner bastions, while in the mosque of al-Hākim in Cairo (381/991 onwards) the minarets at the corner of the façade rise from two gigantic square salients. The emplacement of the miḥrāb [q.v.] was marked by a corresponding rectangular projection on the exterior wall. Entrances were commonly allotted a measure of extra decoration—as in the series of shallow arches along the flank of the Cordova mosque—but massive portals on the scale of those in Western cathedrals found no favour in the early mosques of Arab plan. The absolute scale of some mosques (the mosque of Sāmarrā, for instance, could have accommodated 100,000 people) would have been all the more inappropriate for the actual fact that the actual number of worshippers was not so large. Whatever the scale, however, the courtyard was a standard feature of most large mosques. It is in part a propo to note that the earliest Christian places of worship, the so-called masdjid and its various functions, see above, I. A. 1.

The so-called "Arab plan". Although there were large measure of coincidence in the adoption of Muhammad’s house as the model par excellence of later mosques, that form could not have enjoyed the popularity it did unless it had answered to a nicety the needs of Muslim liturgy and prayer. Its components—an enclosed square or rectangular space with a courtyard and a covered area for prayer on the kibla side—could be varied at will so as to transform the original plan. Thus the addition of the so-called "Arab" or "hypostyle" mosque plan. From the first it showed itself capable of quite radical modification according to circumstances. At Kūfa in 17/638 the location of the mosque within one of the garrison cities (amṣār) allowed the builders to dispense with the element of security, and the perimeter—its dimensions fixed, according to al-Balāḏūrī, by four bowshots—is marked by ditches; elsewhere, as at Baṣra in the year 14/635, a reed fence served the same purpose. At Fustat in the rebuilt mosque of ʿAmr (53/673), corner turrets served simultaneously to articulate the exterior, to single out the mosque from afar and to provide a place from which the call to prayer could be made: the germ of the future minaret. Minarets, if they are to serve a dual function, were there evolved what is known as the first mosque of ʿAmr at Fustat (22/643), admitting exterior light to the musalla [q.v., and also above, I. B. 6] and allowing maximum ease of circulation.

The sunny climate of the southern Mediterranean and the Near East allowed the courtyard to accommodate the huge numbers of extra worshippers attending the Friday service. This was when its large expanse justified itself. For the rest of the week it was largely empty, and the heat and light emitted by this expanse could cause discomfort. This was especially likely if there were no provision for shade on three of the four sides, as in the early versions of the Great Mosques of Cordova (170/787), Kāravān (221/836) and Córdoba (250/864). Hence there arose the practice of adding arcades or smaller area of covered spaces, so that people could walk around the mosque in cool shade. In time these arcades could be doubled, tripled or even quadrupled. A change in the alignment of their vaulting from one side of the mosque to another brought welcome visual relief and excluded the danger of monotony; so too did variations in the depth or number of the arcades (the so-called "Amr mosque in Cairo). As the surface area of the covered sanctuary was increased so did new spatial refinements suggest themselves, such as the progressive unfolding of seemingly endless vistas in all direction. Rows of supports (often spolia) with fixed intercolumniations created hundreds of repetitive modular units, perhaps deliberately mirroring the long files of worshippers at prayer.

Externally, the accent was on simplicity, with regular buttresses giving the structure a warlike air. At the Great Mosque of Sāmarrā (completed 238/852) there are large and long side, not covering the corners, with doorways after every second buttress. At Susa the exterior dispenses with buttresses in favour of rounded corner bastions, while in the mosque of al-Hākim in Cairo (381/991 onwards) the minarets at the corner of the façade rise from two gigantic square salients. The emplacement of the miḥrāb [q.v.] was marked by a corresponding rectangular projection on the exterior wall. Entrances were commonly allotted a measure of extra decoration—as in the series of shallow arches along the flank of the Cordova mosque—but massive portals on the scale of those in Western cathedrals found no favour in the early mosques of Arab plan. The absolute scale of some mosques (the mosque of Sāmarrā, for instance, could have accommodated 100,000 people) would have been all the more inappropriate for the actual fact that the actual number of worshippers was not so large. Whatever the scale, however, the courtyard was a standard feature of most large mosques. It is in part a propo to note that the earliest Christian places of worship, the so-called masdjid and its various functions, see above, I. A. 1.
could not rival the popularity of superposed arcades in the fashion of Roman aqueducts (Damascus mosque, finished 98/716).

The apparently minor detail of whether the arcades ran parallel to the kibla or at right angles to it was sufficient to transform the visual impact of the roof. In the latter case, it focused attention on the kibla, and this was the solution that recommended itself to Maghribi architects (mosques of Cordova, Tunis and Kayrawân). Syrian architects, on the other hand, with only one major exception (Ağş mosque, Jerusalem), preferred arcades running in both directions (Great Mosques of Sfax and Susa, both finished 236/850), but with these exceptions the early experiments with this idea are all on a relatively modest scale which betrays some uncertainty of purpose. They comprise a small group of 9-bayed mosques with a dome over each bay and no courtyard: a type represented in Toledo, Kayrawân, Gharb, and perhaps also in small mosques of the eastern Islamic provinces, including the Damascus mosque of 69/690, the small mosque of 70/691, and the Umayyad mosque of 70/691. These buildings inaugurate the much more ambitious use of vaults in later mosques. No such solutions are to be found in the larger mosques built before the 5th/11th century. This early Islamic vaulting drew its ideas impartially from the Romano-Byzantine tradition and from Sassanian Iran, and产量 various articulating devices which cannot all be explained as public a way as the dictates of religious architecture would permit, the importance of the ruler in religious ceremonies. It was the duty of the caliph or of his representative to lead his people in prayer and to pronounce the khatûba (q. v.). The political overtones of the latter ritual, which proclaimed allegiance to the ruler in much the same spirit as the diphtychs in the contemporary Byzantine liturgy, in large part explain the physical form of the minbar (q. v.) from which the khatûba was pronounced. Similarly, the mihrâb, another latecomer to mosque architecture, can be interpreted in secular terms, most conveniently as a throne apse transposed into a religious setting. These royal connotations could only be intensified by the addition of a dome over the bay directly in front of the mihrâb. Understandably enough the first such building is the al-Hakîm, a tiny mosque of 316/928, with a small dome over the mihrâb, and a series of domes, three in number, over the entire kibla wall. This close juxtaposition of the secular and the sacred features in mosques located next to the residence of the ruler that places their political associations beyond any doubt. The relation of the ruler to mosque architecture is, however, more complex. The extra height of the gable and the way it cleaves the pointed vault soon dominated.

(c) The secular element in early mosque architecture. In some mosques, the desire to emphasise the covered sanctuary (musalla) was achieved simply by adding extra bays and thus increasing its depth. In other mosques, especially those with royal associations, the requisite emphasis was achieved by some striking visual accentuation of the musalla: a more elaborate façade, a higher and wider central aisle, a gable or a dome. Once this idea of glorifying the musalla had taken root it was enthusiastically exploited, for example by furnishing this area with several carefully placed domes (Cordova, al-Azhar). On occasion, indeed, the musalla became virtually a new sanctuary, especially if its greater width and the consequent break in the even linearity of the roof surface is, or at least is supposed to be, in front of the mihrâb and transversely vaulted bays adjoining the kibla—could itself become the mosque, with no attached courtyard (al-Ağş). The effect of singling out the musalla by these various means is to emphasise that this area is more important than any other in the mosque. Since this latter notion runs counter to the widely-expressed belief that all parts of the mosque are equally sacred, and that gradations of sanctity within it run counter to the spirit of Islam, its origins are worth investigating. It should be stressed at the outset that these various articulating devices cannot all be explained as efforts to counteract the kibla. Some measure of emphasis for this purpose was certainly required. Hence, no doubt, the greater depth of arcades on that side and the provision of an elaborate façade for the musalla alone. Similarly, the use of a different alignment or type of vaulting for the bays immediately in front of the kibla would make sense as a means of signposting this crucial area. Yet the addition of a dome or gable, or both, along the central aisle of the musalla, and the greater width and height of the aisle, cannot be explained—as is so often the case—simply as a means of highlighting the mihrâb. After all, the entire kibla wall served to mark the correct orientation for prayer, so that the mihrâb was technically redundant. The relatively late appearance of the mihrâb (no 1st/7th century mosque appears to have possessed one and it is described as an innovation introduced by al-Walîd I in his re-building of the Mosque of the Prophet in Medina in 84/703) further suggests that it was not devised to meet some liturgical imperative. The emphasis on the greater width, and—by virtue of the emphasis on the broader central nave terminating in the dome over the mihrâb remains unchanged. It seems likely that these articulating devices were intended to mark out a processional way, presumably the formal route by which the ruler approached the mihrâb.

So much, then, for the various elements in mosque design for which princely associations have been proposed. Yet their mere enumeration does not tell the full story. It is above all the occurrence of these features in mosques located next to the residence of the ruler that places their political associations beyond doubt. This close juxtaposition of the secular and the religious may well have had its roots in the Prophet’s house. Be that as it may, at Baṣra, Kûfa, Fuṣṭât, Damascus, to name only a few very early examples, the principal mosque and the private residence of the ruler adjoined each other, and the vicerey Ėṣâd b. Abîhi [q. v.] said of this arrangement ‘it is not fitting
that the Imam should pass through the people”—a sentiment, incidentally, not shared by many later Islamic rulers. The analogy with the palatine chapel in Byzantium and mediaeval Europe—at Constantinople and Ravenna, Aachen and Palermo—is striking. Perhaps the most public expression of the idea in the mediaeval Islamic world was in the Round City of Baghdad, where the huge and largely empty space at the heart of the city held only two buildings: the palace and the mosque, next door to each other. It would be hard to find the concept of Caesaropapism expressed more explicitly, or on a more gargantuan scale, than this. The local expression of the articulating features under discussion varied from one part of the Islamic world to another, but they had come to stay. Henceforth, the *diwan* of Arab plan only rarely returned to the simplicity of the 1st/7th century. Such, however, was the strength of the traditions formed at that time that the basic nature of the earliest mosques remained substantially unchanged. They were proof, for example, against immense increases in size and against a growing interest in embellishment by means of structural innovations and applied ornament. Even the conversion into mosques of pre-Islamic places of worship at Damascus and Hamah, was power on a smaller scale, than this.

In much the same way, their idiiosyncrasies of structure and decoration were purely cosmetic. The range of ornamental devices was gratingly small. Windows and lunettes bore *jouar* grilles in stone or plaster with geometric and vegetal designs (Damascus mosque); wooden ceilings were painted or carved and coffered (San`a` mosque, 1st/7th century onwards); a wide range of capitals, at first loosely based on classical models but in time featuring designs of Central Asian origin (Samarra) was developed; and piers with engaged corner colonnettes (Ibn Tulun mosque, Cairo) rang the changes on the traditional classical column. Finally, the aspect of these early mosques could be varied still further by the type of flooring employed—stamped earth, brick, stone or even marble flags—and by applied decoration in carved stone or stucco, fresco, painted glass, embossed metalwork or mosaic.

3. Later history of the “Arab plan” mosque.

The essentially simple components of the Arab plan set a limit to the degree of diversity that could be achieved within these specifications. Most of the room for manoeuvre had been exhausted within the first four centuries of Islamic architecture. Thus the subsequent history of the Arab plan cannot match the early period for variety and boldness; the later mosques, moreover, lie very much in the shadow of their predecessors, to such an extent, indeed, that it is hard to single out significant new departures in these later buildings. It can scarcely be doubted that the presence of Islamic rulers. The analogies for the palatine chapel at the period when the Islamic world was at the peak of its material prosperity, acted as a signal deterrent to later architects with substantially less money, men and materials at their disposal. In these early centuries the caliphal permission, not readily granted, had been required for the construction of a *diwan* making it therefore a major undertaking, and correspondingly hard to emulati. The 9th/11th century, moreover, most of the major Muslim cities had their own *diwan*, so that the need for huge mosques had much declined.

Although mosques of Arab plan have continued to be built throughout the Islamic world until the present day, in the mediaeval period there were only two areas where they achieved dominance: in the Western Islamic lands before they fell under Ottoman rule, and in pre-Ottoman Anatolia. These areas will therefore provide the material for most of the discussion which follows. Nevertheless, sporadic references will be made to mosques elsewhere, for instance in Egypt and the Maghrib, to catch other. It would be hard to find the concept of Caesaropapism expressed more explicitly, or on a more gargantuan scale, than this. The local expression of the articulating features under discussion varied from one part of the Islamic world to another, but they had come to stay. Henceforth, the *diwan* of Arab plan only rarely returned to the simplicity of the 1st/7th century. Such, however, was the strength of the traditions formed at that time that the basic nature of the earliest mosques remained substantially unchanged. They were proof, for example, against immense increases in size and against a growing interest in embellishment by means of structural innovations and applied ornament. Even the conversion into mosques of pre-Islamic places of worship at Damascus and Hamah, was power on a smaller scale, than this.

In much the same way, their idiiosyncrasies of structure and decoration were purely cosmetic. The range of ornamental devices was gratingly small. Windows and lunettes bore *jouar* grilles in stone or plaster with geometric and vegetal designs (Damascus mosque); wooden ceilings were painted or carved and coffered (San`a` mosque, 1st/7th century onwards); a wide range of capitals, at first loosely based on classical models but in time featuring designs of Central Asian origin (Samarra) was developed; and piers with engaged corner colonnettes (Ibn Tulun mosque, Cairo) rang the changes on the traditional classical column. Finally, the aspect of these early mosques could be varied still further by the type of flooring employed—stamped earth, brick, stone or even marble flags—and by applied decoration in carved stone or stucco, fresco, painted glass, embossed metalwork or mosaic.

3. Later history of the “Arab plan” mosque.

The essentially simple components of the Arab plan set a limit to the degree of diversity that could be achieved within these specifications. Most of the room for manoeuvre had been exhausted within the first four centuries of Islamic architecture. Thus the subsequent history of the Arab plan cannot match the early period for variety and boldness; the later mosques, moreover, lie very much in the shadow of their predecessors, to such an extent, indeed, that it is hard to single out significant new departures in these later buildings. It can scarcely be doubted that the presence of Islamic rulers. The analogies for the palatine chapel at the period when the Islamic world was at the peak of its material prosperity, acted as a signal deterrent to later architects with substantially less money, men and materials at their disposal. In these early centuries the caliphal permission, not readily granted, had been required for the construction of a *diwan* making it therefore a major undertaking, and correspondingly hard to emulati. The 9th/11th century, moreover, most of the major Muslim cities had their own *diwan*, so that the need for huge mosques had much declined.

Although mosques of Arab plan have continued to be built throughout the Islamic world until the present day, in the mediaeval period there were only two areas where they achieved dominance: in the Western Islamic lands before they fell under Ottoman rule, and in pre-Ottoman Anatolia. These areas will therefore provide the material for most of the discussion which follows. Nevertheless, sporadic references will be made to mosques elsewhere, for instance in Egypt and the Maghrib, to catch other. It would be hard to find the concept of Caesaropapism expressed more explicitly, or on a more gargantuan scale, than this. The local expression of the articulating features under discussion varied from one part of the Islamic world to another, but they had come to stay. Henceforth, the *diwan* of Arab plan only rarely returned to the simplicity of the 1st/7th century. Such, however, was the strength of the traditions formed at that time that the basic nature of the earliest mosques remained substantially unchanged. They were proof, for example, against immense increases in size and against a growing interest in embellishment by means of structural innovations and applied ornament. Even the conversion into mosques of pre-Islamic places of worship at Damascus and Hamah, was power on a smaller scale, than this.

In much the same way, their idiiosyncrasies of structure and decoration were purely cosmetic. The range of ornamental devices was gratingly small. Windows and lunettes bore *jouar* grilles in stone or plaster with geometric and vegetal designs (Damascus mosque); wooden ceilings were painted or carved and coffered (San`a` mosque, 1st/7th century onwards); a wide range of capitals, at first loosely based on classical models but in time featuring designs of Central Asian origin (Samarra) was developed; and piers with engaged corner colonnettes (Ibn Tulun mosque, Cairo) rang the changes on the traditional classical column. Finally, the aspect of these early mosques could be varied still further by the type of flooring employed—stamped earth, brick, stone or even marble flags—and by applied decoration in carved stone or stucco, fresco, painted glass, embossed metalwork or mosaic.
infill between the ribs; the overall effect is one of feathery lightness and grace. The light filtered through these domes suffuses the area of the mihrāb with radiance, perhaps as a deliberate metaphor of the heaven and the earth; the likeness of His Light was normally placed along the axis of the mihrāb in hypostyle plans. Flat-roofed prayer halls, some with wooden-roofed porches (Meram mosque, Konya, 804-27/1402-24) and others, especially in the Karaman (largely 6th/12th century) follow Iranian precedent in their emphasis on a monumental dome rearing up out of the low roofing of the sanctuary and set squarely in front of the mihrāb bay. Their foreshortened courtyards, however, owe nothing to Iranian precedent and instead presage later developments. So too did the increasing tendency to use domical forms rather than modular trabeate units as the principal means of defining space.

The buildings of the 6th/12th and 7th/13th centuries sufficiently demonstrate the embryonic state of mosque design in Anatolia, for the variety of plans is bewildering and defies easy categorisation. The absence of direct copies of the classical Arab type of plan is striking, though modifications of it were legion. A common solution was to do without the courtyard altogether—perhaps a response to the severe Anatolian winter—and reduce the mosque to a wooden structure resting on a monolithic base. Their trabeated construction is well marked even at this experimental stage. Whatever the roofing system adopted in these enclosed mosques, the scope for development in either direction was small, while poor lighting, a sense of cramped space and inadequate ventilation were virtually inevitable. Huge piers and low vaults gave many of these mosques a crypt-like appearance and thus served as a secondary accent for it, in the principal feature of Turkish mosque architecture, and as a natural corollary fostered a compact and integrated style. Sometimes a small courtyard was integrated into this design (Malatya, 655/1257; Kayseri, Mosque of Kâbed Khatūn, 633/1237; Harput, 560/1165). By degrees, however, the courtyard was relegated to one of two functions: as a forecourt, akin to the atrium of Byzantine churches and thus heralding the mosque proper, instead of being co-equal to the sanctuary; and as a bay within the mosque, furnished with a skyline and a fountain as a symbolic reminder of the world outside. Sometimes these two uses coincided. The skyline bay (şahâde’dan) was normally placed along the axis of the mihrāb and thus served as a secondary accent for it, in much the same manner as a central dome.

The 8th/14th century saw no major developments in hypostyle plans. Flat-roofed prayer halls, some with wooden-roofed porches (Merâm mosque, Konya, 804-27/1402-24), others, especially in the Karaman
region, without them, continued to be built. So too did hypostyle mosques with vaulted domical bays (Yivi Minare mosque, Antalya, 775/1373; the type recurs both in eastern Anatolia and Ottoman territory in Bursa and Edirne). Variations in the Damascene schema, with the transept replaced by one or more domes, a raised and wider central aisle, a skyline bay, or any combination of these were frequent (Īsā Bey mosque, Selcuk, 776/1374; Ulu Cami, Birgi, 712/1312; mosque of Aḥḥā Elūvān, Ankara, 760/1360). In all cases, the major domed bay in front of the miḥrāb spread from their earlier base in south-eastern Anatolia, an area bounded to the east by the Ulu Cami in Van (791-803/1389-1400) and to the west by that of Manisa (778/1376). In the latter mosque the kibla side is dominated by the dome and takes up almost half the mosque; a large arcaded courtyard with a portico accounts for the rest. With such buildings the stage is set for Ottoman architecture and Arab prototypes are left far behind.

These Anatolian mosques depart still further from the norm of the hypostyle type in their predilection for elaborate integrated façades. While earlier mosques of Arab type frequently singled out the principal entrance by a monumental archway, often with a dome behind it, the tendency was to keep the façade relatively plain. The later development of elaborate Mamluk building areas of the major cities of the Near East, such as Cairo, Jerusalem, Damascus and Aleppo, did the extreme shortage of space, and often the small scale of the mosques themselves, oblige architects to decorate mosque façades if they wished to draw attention to them, e.g. the Akmar mosque, Cairo, 519/1125. In Anatolia, however, the Islamic tradition, which favoured extensive external sculpture and articulation, may well have predisposed Muslim architects in Anatolia to develop integrated decorative schemes for the main façades of their mosques. A monumental stone portal or pīṭḥāk (q.v.), often an iwan (q.v.) was the standard centrepiece for such designs. It could be strongly salient and tower above the roofline (Divriği Cami). Further articulation was provided by ranges of recessed arches with decorative surrounds (Dunavīsir), open or blind arcades along the upper section of the façade (Mayyāfārīḵīn and ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn mosque, Konya), and windows with densely carved frames (Īsā Bey mosque, Selcuk).

(c) Egypt and Syria. It seems possible that some of these elaborately decorated mosques in the Yemen proved models for the foundations of those built in the Islamic states of Egypt and Syria. The mosque of Baybars (660/1262) and Sultān Hasan (757/1356) may derive, if at several removes, from Anatolian prototypes of the kind discussed above. It is noteworthy, however, that in general the mosques of the Ayyubid and Mamluk period offer little scope for large-scale reworking of the hypostyle plan, since they were too small. The major cities of the Near East, such as Cairo, Imam da, 4th/10th century and others), frescoes with epigraphic, floral and geometric decoration, may well have predisposed Muslim architects in Anatolia to develop integrated decorative schemes for the main façades of their mosques. A monumental stone portal or pīṭḥāk (q.v.), often an iwan (q.v.) was the standard centrepiece for such designs. It could be strongly salient and tower above the roofline (Divriği Cami). Further articulation was provided by ranges of recessed arches with decorative surrounds (Dunavīsir), open or blind arcades along the upper section of the façade (Mayyāfārīḵīn and ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn mosque, Konya), and windows with densely carved frames (Īsā Bey mosque, Selcuk).

(c) Egypt and Syria. It seems possible that some of these elaborately decorated mosques in the Yemen proved models for the foundations of those built in the Islamic states of Egypt and Syria. The mosque of Baybars (660/1262) and Sultān Hasan (757/1356) may derive, if at several removes, from Anatolian prototypes of the kind discussed above. It is noteworthy, however, that in general the mosques of the Ayyubid and Mamluk period offer little scope for large-scale reworking of the hypostyle plan, since they were too small. The major cities of the Near East, such as Cairo, Imam da, 4th/10th century and others), frescoes with epigraphic, floral and geometric decoration, may well have predisposed Muslim architects in Anatolia to develop integrated decorative schemes for the main façades of their mosques. A monumental stone portal or pīṭḥāk (q.v.), often an iwan (q.v.) was the standard centrepiece for such designs. It could be strongly salient and tower above the roofline (Divriği Cami). Further articulation was provided by ranges of recessed arches with decorative surrounds (Dunavīsir), open or blind arcades along the upper section of the façade (Mayyāfārīḵīn and ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn mosque, Konya), and windows with densely carved frames (Īsā Bey mosque, Selcuk).

(d) The Yemen. Apart from the Maghrīb, it was principally in the Yemen that the large hypostyle mosque maintained its popularity throughout the mediaeval period. Inadequate publication has meant that these buildings are less well known than they deserve, and without excavation the dating of many of them remains problematic. This is particularly regrettable because several of the early mosques, in the site of pre-Islamic temples, churches or synagogues (e.g. al-Djīlāʾ mosque, Ṣanʿāʾ), and spolia from these earlier buildings—such as columns, capitals, inscriptions and even sculptures of birds—are used very widely. Persistent local tradition attributes the djamiʿīs of Ṣanʿāʾ and al-Djānād to the time of the Prophet; both were probably rebuilt by al-Walīd I. The former has preserved much more of its original appearance: perimeter walls of finely cut stone in stepped courses enclose a roughly square shape with a central courtyard and the muṣalā only slightly deeper than the other sides. Al-Djānād, on the other hand, has had its similar original layout transformed by the addition of prayer halls, mausolea, ablutions facilities and the like is a recurrent pattern in the Yemen (djamiʿīs of Ṣabīb and Ibb).

Small hypostyle mosques of square form (al-ʿAbbās, 7th/13th century), or of rectangular shape, whether broad and shallow oblongs (Ṭiḥṣīd, 7th/13th century) or narrow and deep (Ṭaṃrūz, 5th/11th century or earlier), are common, and a few larger mosques of this kind, still without a courtyard, are known (Dhībin, after 648/1250). The commonest form, however, comprises a structure that is rectangular or trapezoidal (Masdjid al-Ṣawmâʾa, Ḥūt, 7th/13th century) with a central courtyard and extensive covered nūdās on all sides (Rawḍa Ḧāmā, 7th/13th century). Often this formula is enriched by a lavishly carved or painted wooden ceiling over the sanctuary area alone (Ṣhibām Ḧāmā, 4th/10th century or by the incorporation of mausolea (Zafār Dhībin, 7th/13th century; funerary mosque of the Imam al-Hādī Yahyāʾ, Saʿūdā, 4th/10th century and later) or of minarets (Ṭiḥṣīl, 480/1087; Dhī Al-Aqrāk, 410/1020). Indications from the courtyards and prayer halls explain the use of wider central aisles in the muṣalās (Zafār Dhībin, Ibb, Ḫībīl, Dhī Al-Aqrāk and a concentration of domes along the kwīla wall (enlargement of Ibb Ḧāmā, 7th/13th century). The glory of these Yemeni mosques as a group lies in their decoration: exceptionally long bands of stucco inscriptional (mosques of Dhāmār and Rada, 7th/13th century and later), frescoes with epigraphic, floral and geometric designs (Rasūlīd mosques of Tāʾizz) and a matchless series of carved and painted wooden ceilings (Zafār Dhībin, al-ʿAbbās, Sirha, Dhībin, Ṣibām, Ṣanʿāʾ and others).

4. The Iranian tradition.

(a) The early period. Such was the prescriptive power of the "Arab plan" that its influence permeated mosque architecture in the non-Arab lands too. It would therefore be an artificial exercise to consider the development of the Iranian mosque in isolation, the more so as many early mosques in Iran (Bīšāpūr, Sirāf, Susa, Ẓaďr) were of Arab plan. Some also had the square minarets which were an early feature of that plan (Dāmghān; Sirāf). Rather
did the Iranian mosque acquire its distinctive character by enriching the hypostyle form by two elements, the deep domed chamber and the mihrab, a vaulted open hall with a rectangular arched façade. The domed chamber derived from the mostly diminutive Sasanian fire temple with four axial arched openings, the so-called chahar tak. Set in the midst of a large open space, it served to house the sacred fire. This layout obviously lent itself to Muslim prayer, and literary sources record that it was a freestanding fire temple converted into mosques (e.g. at Bukhara) by the simple expedient of blocking up the arch nearest the kibla and replacing it with a mihrab; but conclusive archaeological evidence of this practice is still lacking, though the mosques of Yazd-i Khast and Kurwa may be examples of it. Such domed chambers, whether converted fire temples or purpose-built Muslim structures, may have served as self-contained mosques, converted fire temples or purpose-built Muslim structures, though the mosques of Yazd-i Khast and Kurwa may be examples of it. Such domed chambers, whether converted fire temples or purpose-built Muslim structures, may have served as self-contained mosques, converted fire temples or purpose-built Muslim structures, though the mosques of Yazd-i Khast and Kurwa may be examples of it. Such domed chambers, whether converted fire temples or purpose-built Muslim structures, may have served as self-contained mosques, converted fire temples or purpose-built Muslim structures, though the mosques of Yazd-i Khast and Kurwa may be examples of it. Such domed chambers, whether converted fire temples or purpose-built Muslim structures, may have served as self-contained mosques, converted fire temples or purpose-built Muslim structures, though the mosques of Yazd-i Khast and Kurwa may be examples of it. Such domed chambers, whether converted fire temples or purpose-built Muslim structures, may have served as self-contained mosques, converted fire temples or purpose-built Muslim structures, though the mosques of Yazd-i Khast and Kurwa may be examples of it. Such domed chambers, whether converted fire temples or purpose-built Muslim structures, may have served as self-contained mosques, converted fire temples or purpose-built Muslim structures, though the mosques of Yazd-i Khast and Kurwa may be examples of it. Such domed chambers, whether converted fire temples or purpose-built Muslim structures, may have served as self-contained mosques, converted fire temples or purpose-built Muslim structures, though the mosques of Yazd-i Khast and Kurwa may be examples of it. Such domed chambers, whether converted fire temples or purpose-built Muslim structures, may have served as self-contained mosques, converted fire temples or purpose-built Muslim structures, though the mosques of Yazd-i Khast and Kurwa may be examples of it. Such domed chambers, whether converted fire temples or purpose-built Muslim structures, may have served as self-contained mosques, converted fire temples or purpose-built Muslim structures, though the mosques of Yazd-i Khast and Kurwa may be examples of it. Such domed chambers, whether converted fire temples or purpose-built Muslim structures, may have served as self-contained mosques, converted fire temples...
attenuated or otherwise modified. At Ashtardjan everything is subordinated to the principal axis announced by the double minaret façade, an emphasis which is taken up and intensified by the single great iwán which takes up the full width of the courtyard and leads into the domed sanctuary. At Warāmnīn, too (722/1322 onwards), which is of standard 4-iwān type, the sense of axial progression is strong, and is made rather more effective than at Ashtardjan by the absolute length of the mosque and the extreme clarity of the structure which distinguishes it in Tabrīz, by contrast (ca. 710-20/1310-20) deliberately returned, it seems, to much earlier models, for it comprised essentially a huge cliff-like iwán preceded by a courtyard with a central pool and clumps of trees in the corners—perhaps a deliberate reference to the Tāk-ī Kīsā itself. For smaller mosques, Qal‘alikār models were again at hand; hence, for example, the trio of domed chamber mosques virtually level at the entrance of Kāj and Dastspī, all datable ca. 725/1325. Yet another compliment to earlier masters was the Ishānīd tendency to add new structures to existing mosques: a madrasa to the Isfahān qāmī (776-8/1374-75), an iwán to the mosque at Ǧaz (ca. 715/1315), and so on.

(2) The Timūrid period. The Timūrid period took up still further ideas which had been no more than latent in earlier centuries. While some mosques of traditional form were built such as the Mosque of Gavhar Shāh, in Maḥjībd, of standard 4-iwān type (821/1421), attention focused particularly on the portal and kibla iwāns, which soared to new heights. Turquoise tiles were used and their magnified these proportions still further. This trend towards gigantism is exposed at its most eminently in the 4-iwān qāmī of Ziyāratgāh, near Ḥarāt (887/1482), where the absence of decoration accentuates the sheer mass of the sanctuary iwán looming over the courtyard. At its best, however, as in the mosque of Bībī Khānum, Samarkand (801/1399) where these exceptional proportions are consistently carried through to virtually every part of the plan is transformed by the use of a domed iwán dārī to the mosque at Gaz (ca. 715/1315), and so on.
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chambers behind the lateral iwans give extra space for prayer, while two nāmasūs with courtyards flank the main courtyard to the south. Thus even at the height of its popularity, the 4-iwan mosque could accommodate quite major innovations without impairing its essential character. Later Safavid mosques, such as the ġāmān's of Sarm and Čashum, the Masdjīd-i Wazir in Kāhān and that of Šāh ʿAbbās in Isfahan, serve by their very modesty, however, to highlight the absurdity of vaulting for the two mosques on the Isfahan maqāma. Even such a spacious and handsome version of the traditional 4-iwan schema as the Masdjīd-i Hākim, Isfahan (1067/1656) could not fail to be an anticlimax in their wake.

5. The Turkish tradition.

(a) Early domed mosques. The earliest Anatolian mosques follow Arab prototypes, and by degrees some of them take on an Iranian colouring, especially in their free use of iwāns for portals and for sanctuaries entrances. Already by the 7th/13th century, however, an emphasis on the isolated domed chamber as a mosque type began to make itself felt. This idea too might have had Iranian origins, but it soon developed in ways that owed nothing to Iran, since the central courtyard was not a perpendicular feature for early mosques with no courtyard was itself enough to encourage experiments in the articulation of interior space. The dome quickly became the most favoured device to this end. In Iran, by and large, the domed chamber behind the kibla iwan remained spatially isolated from the rest of the mosque. In Anatolia, by contrast, architects were always seeking new ways of integrating the main domed space with the area around it. A consistent emphasis on domical forms created the necessary visual unity to achieve this. Already in the Saljuq period tentative experiments in this direction may be noted, for example the Ala-i-Din mosque, Nigde (620/1223), whose kibla is marked by three domed and cross-vaulted bays with further parallel aisles behind. In the Ulu Cami of Balıkesir (553/1160), a single great dome replaces these smaller bays, while in the Gök mosque and nāmasūs, Amasya (665/1266), the masjīd comprises a series of triple-domed aisles. Experiment with domical forms was therefore deeply rooted in Anatolian architecture from the beginning. It is above all, however, the hallmark of the great Ottoman mosques, and can be traced to the very earliest years of that dynasty.

(b) Ottoman architecture before 857/1453. The sequence begins very modestly with a series of mosques comprising a simple domed cube with a lateral vestibule (ʿAlāʾ-al-Dīn mosque, Bursa, 736/1335, a structure typical of well over a score of such Ottoman mosques built in the course of the 8th/14th century) and minor variants of this schema, such as the mosque of Orhan Gazi, Bilecik, and the Yeşil Cami, Iznik, 780/1378. Such structures have a natural affinity with larger mausolea throughout the Islamic world, and with the simplest forms of Iranian mosques. It is only with hindsight that their significance for later developments, in which the theme of the central courtyard becomes the central feature of the Ottoman mosque, can be traced to the very earliest years of that dynasty.

Yet a significant element, crucial to Hagia Sophia and a cliché of Ottoman architecture after 857/1453, had not yet entered the architectural vocabulary of the Turkish mosque before that date. This was the use of two full semi-domes along the mسبح axis to buttress the main dome. The long-rooted tradition of placing one central domed and two lower domes along the great dome rendered such a feature otiose. Once the decision had been taken to make the largest dome the central feature of a much larger square, the way was open for the adoption of this Byzantine feature, and with it the transformation and enrichment of interior space was a foregone conclusion. Otherwise, most of the architectural vocabulary of the Ottoman mosque was already to hand by 857/1453: flying buttresses, the undulating exterior profile created by multiple domes, tall pencil-shaped minarets and a cer-
tain parsimony of exterior ornament allied to exquisite stereotomy. It has to be admitted, however, that these features had yet to find their full potential, notably in the failure to develop a suitably imposing exterior to match the spatial splendours within. That potential could be realised only when these features were used in tandem with each other by masters seeking to express a newly-won confidence and bent on creating an integrated style for that purpose. The mosque was, moreover, their chosen instrument; indeed, its name, the Fatih Mosque (867-75/1463-70), this has a single huge semi-dome butressing the main one but also displacing it off the main axis; clearly, the spatial, aesthetic and structural implications of such a semi-dome had not yet been fully grasped. Within a generation, this anomaly at least had been rectified; the mosque of Bayazid II (completed 913/1506) has two such semi-domes on the main axis, and these are often called “clumsy and lopsided expedients with little functional justification. Yet the resultant lack of coordination and unity at the expense of the exterior. As the viewpoint changes, so too does the profile of the building binds it together and defines the sacred space. The layout is a model of clarity and logic. Flooded with light, their volumetric subdivisions apparent at a glance, these interiors are at the opposite pole from the dim mysteries of Hagia Sophia. Frescoes reminiscent of manuscript illumination and of carpet designs vie with Iznik tiles to decorate the interior surfaces, and often (as in the case of fluted piers) to deny their sheer mass.

Externally, these mosques attest a well-nigh fugal complexity by virtue of their obsessive concentration on a very few articulating devices like windows, arches and domes. The repetition of the same forms on varying scales intensifies the sense of unity. Even the most ornate and opulent mosques are clad in a skin of smooth limewash, and their façades are so constructed that the principal surfaces are incised by narrow horizontal bands. The mosque’s surface area are brought into play; for example, those of the Sultan Ahmed Mosque (completed 1025/1616) have the bases of their balconies so calibrated as to coincide with the top of the main dome, its collar and the collar of the main subsidiary half-domes, while their location at the corners of the building binds it together and defines the sacred space from afar. Detailing is sparse and crisp, with a strong linear emphasis, a flawless sense of interval and a pronounced attenuation of features like wall niches and engaged columns (Süleymaniye mosque). Nothing is allowed to impair the primary aesthetic impact of cliff-edge expanse of smooth grey stone. Most notable of all is the monumental ensemble whose outer edges are so accentuated in the great dome which crowns and develops the entire ensemble. These individual units are each locked into place within a gently sloping pyramidal structure whose inevitable climax is the central dome. From this peak the subsidiary domes, semi-domes and domed buttresses cascade downwards to form a rippling but tightly interlocked silhouette. These highly articulated exteriors are a triumphant realisation of the standard Islamic preference in mosque architecture for stressing the interior at the expense of the exterior.

As the viewpoint changes, so too does the profile of this feature re-appeared under numerous guises, especially in the doubled form (Mihırımah mosque, completed ca. 973/1565). The Şehzade mosque (955/1548) presents a much more streamlined appearance, with dome chamber and courtyard of approximately equal proportions. Within the sanctuary, the great central dome opens into semi-domes on all four sides, with small diagonal semi-domes opening off the main ones and corner domes. It is instructive thus to see Ottoman architects developing the possibilities of the centralised plan like the builders of Christian churches and martyria a millennium before, and coming to very similar conclusions. Smaller mosques with domes on hexagonal (Ahmed Paşa, completed ca. 970/1562) or octagonal bases (Mihırımah mosque) were scarcely less popular than domes on circular bases. So too did the various types of wooden-roofed mosques perpetuating earlier modes, and with their roots in the Arab tradition, survive (e.g. Razanaz Efendi in Koçamustafapaşa, 994/1585, and Tekkevi Ibrahim Ağa, 999/1590) as reminders of a very widespread type of Ottoman mosque now almost entirely eclipsed by more durable structures.

In the ferment of experiment which marks 10th/16th century Ottoman architecture, the key figure was undoubtedly Sinan, an Islamic equivalent to Sir Christopher Wren, who transformed the face of the capital city as of the provinces with some 334 buildings (mostly mosques) erected in his own lifetime, and whose pivotal role as chief court architect (effectively Master of Works) allowed him to stamp his ideas on public architecture from Algeria to Irāk and from Thrace to Arabia in the course of a phenomenally long career which spanned virtually the entire century. The Süleymaniye mosque in Istanbul (963/1556) is by common consent the masterpiece of his middle age. It takes up and refines the model of the Bayazid II mosque by adding ideas taken from the Şehzade mosque, like the succession of semi-domed spaces billowing out from the main dome, though only along the principal axis. Huge arches serve to compartmentalise the spatial volumes.
these mosques, from a continuous smoothly undulating line to a series of sharp angular projections formed by stepped buttresses and roof-turrets. The preference for saucer domes rather than pointed domes with a high stilt fosters the sense of immovable, rock-like stability, with the topmost dome clamped like a lid onto the mobile, agitated roof-lines beneath it.

This, then, can justly claim to be architects' architecture. It merits that term by virtue of its unbroken concentration on the single germinal idea of the domed centralised mosque. It is against that consistent unity of vision that the role of the Hagia Sophia must be assessed. Of course, Turkish architects were not blind to its many subtleties, and they freely quarried it for ideas. But it was as much a challenge that inspired them to emulate it as was a source for technical expertise. Finally, it was the Ottomans who succeeded where the Byzantines had failed: in devising for these great domed places of worship an exterior profile worthy of the splendours within. The triumphant issue of their labours to that end can be read along the Istanbul skyline to this day.


II. In Muslim India

A. Typology. The nature of the regional building styles and their characteristic decoration have been treated s.v. HIND.
The interior of the mosque admits of little variation outside two well-defined types. In one the western end (known in India as 
liwānid) is a simple arrangement of column-supported roof, usually of at least three bays in depth but possibly of many more; the roof may be supported by beam-and-bracket or by the arch; the former arrangement being by no means confined to compilations of pillaged Hindu/Djyaś material. The liwānid openings may be connected directly with the arcades or colonnades of other sides of the mosque. (This was the position of the Hindu temple enclosure whereby the kibla is composed into one or more halls; there is always an odd number of maksura arches, and it is common for the bay which stands in front of the principal mihrāb to be singled out for special treatment, either by being made taller than the rest, or by being specially decorated (the latter treatment common in the mosques of Bījāpur [q. v.]).) This is not invariably the central bay, as mosques are not necessarily symmetrical about the principal mihrāb axis; cf. the "Stonecutters' M." in Fatḥpur Sīkri, where a cill occupies two additional bays at the north end of the liwānid, or the Aḥā'ī Kangāra M. at Kāghi Banārās, where the side riwāds of the liwānid are of unequal length.) In one mosque at Bījāpur (Makkā M.), the liwānid stands within and unattached to the surrounding courtyard. A staircase is commonly provided to give access to the liwānid roof, either separately or incorporated within the walls or the base of a minaret, as was also done in Iran. Here this is not made the subject of special treatment; a staircase may be provided within a gateway for the same purpose. The liwānid roof may be surmounted by one or more domes. Inside the liwānid, the principal mihrāb stands within the west wall opposite the main opening; if there are other mihrābs, the central one is always the most sumptuously decorated and may be set deeper within the west wall than the other. The minbar is usually a permanent stone structure, with an odd number of steps, only occasionally made an object of decoration (splendid examples in the older Bengal mosques and in the Mālāw sultanate). A simple minbar is often provided when not liturgically necessary, as in the mosque attached to a tomb. There is an minbar at Bījāpur in the mosque built for the eunuch of Aḥā'ī Kangāra M. and the minbar is now often used as a mihrāb. The liwānid is two-storeyed, the two halls being exactly similar except that a minbar is provided only in the lower one. (In another first-floor mosque at Bījāpur, the Aḥā'ī M., there is no minbar; the ground floor is apparently a well-guarded sargāc, and the suggestion has been made that the whole structure was intended for sargāc use.) The floor of the liwānid is often marked out into musallās of mihrāb shape for each individual worshipper. Lamps may be suspended from the liwānid ceiling.

The continuous history of the mosque begins with the M. Kuwawt al-Īslām in Dihlī, founded immediately after the Muslim conquest in 587/1191. This mosque was the first in a series of large structures designed for access by the general public. The internal arcade or colonnade) is a later development, although the idea is occasionally met with in earlier, e.g. under the 'Abbasīd caliphate in Sind [q. v.], by small communities of Muslim traders, especially in Gudjarāt and the Malābār coast, and by individual Śūfī pīrs who gathered a community around them. The remains of these are mostly too exiguous to be of value in a general statement. Recent explorations by M. Shokoohy, not yet published, have revealed a few structures, of a century or two before the conquest, at Bhdherjwār in Gudjarāt. These, in common with the first structures of any fresh conquest of expansion, are constructed from the remains of Hindī buildings; in the case of mosques built after a conquest there has been a deliberate pillaging of Hindī or Dījan temples, as an assertion of Hindu supremacy as well as for the expediency of making use of material already quarried and of local impressed labour before the arrival of Muslim artisans. Examples of this are cited for different regions of India s.v. HIND, vii. Architecture, in Vol. III, p. 441 above. (It should be pointed out that the practice of pillaging the buildings of the conquered is known in India in the case of rival Hindī kings also.)

Mosques which might be described as "public"—i.e. not only the Masjid-i ġāmi of a particular locality (and of course in a conurbation there may be a separate ġāmi for each original mahalla) but also the indigenous type of mosque introduced within the town—are enclosed on all sides. This has not been required of mosques within a sargāc or a dargāh, or when the mosque is an adjunct of a tomb, and there are countless instances of small private mosques where there seems never to have been any enclosure. The enclosure for the public mosque is particularly necessary for Islam in partibus infidelium, and those courtyards which are not enclosed are protected from the infidel gaze in some other way, e.g. by the sargāc standing on a high plinth (examples: the ġāmi of M. at Ṣāḥibjāhānābād, Dihlī, Ṣāḥib M. at Dījanpūr, where in both the courtyard is limited only by an open arcade or colonnade). The principal entrance is usually on the east, although any gate may be on occasion in the west, a royal entrance; it is rare, though not unknown, for any entrance to be made in the western wall, and where this has happened it is not designed for access by the general public. The internal position of the principal mihrāb [q. v.], sometimes of subsidiary mihrābs also, is indicated on the outside of the west wall by one or more buttresses; a feature of mosques in India is the way the exterior elevation of the west wall is brought to life by decorative expedients.

vii. Architecture, in Vol. III above. This section deals with the essential typology of mosques in India, and excludes the simplest structures used only for occasional prayers, such as the kibla-indications at some tombs and graveyards [see MUKARRA. 5, India], and the special structures (ṣiqqā) provided for the "ītikāf; for these see MUSALLĀ. 2.

The continuous history of the mosque begins with the M. Kuvawt al-Īslām in Dihlī, founded immediately after the Muslim conquest in 587/1191. This mosque was the first in a series of large structures designed for access by the general public. The internal arcade or colonnade) is a later development, although the idea is occasionally met with in earlier, e.g. under the 'Abbasīd caliphate in Sind [q. v.], by small communities of Muslim traders, especially in Gudjarāt and the Malābār coast, and by individual Śūfī pīrs who gathered a community around them. The remains of these are mostly too exiguous to be of value in a general statement. Recent explorations by M. Shokoohy, not yet published, have revealed a few structures, of a century or two before the conquest, at Bhdherjwār in Gudjarāt. These, in common with the first structures of any fresh conquest of expansion, are constructed from the remains of Hindī buildings; in the case of mosques built after a conquest there has been a deliberate pillaging of Hindī or Dījan temples, as an assertion of Hindu supremacy as well as for the expediency of making use of material already quarried and of local impressed labour before the arrival of Muslim artisans. Examples of this are cited for different regions of India s.v. HIND, vii. Architecture, in Vol. III, p. 441 above. (It should be pointed out that the practice of pillaging the buildings of the conquered is known in India in the case of rival Hindī kings also.)

Where a mosque is actually constructed on the plinth of a destroyed Hindī building (e.g. M. Kuvawt al-Īslām at Dihlī; Ṣāḥib M. at Dījanpūr) the kibla [q. v.] will probably not be accurately located and the original cardinal west made to serve the purpose; but in general an effort is made to observe the correct kibla, which varies between 20° north of west in the south of India to 25° south of west in the extreme north, with a conventional west used only rarely in original buildings.

Mosques which might be described as "public"—i.e. not only the Masjid-i ġāmi of a particular locality (and of course in a conurbation there may be a separate ġāmi for each original mahalla) but also the indigenous type of mosque introduced within the town—are enclosed on all sides. This has not been required of mosques within a sargāc or a dargāh, or when the mosque is an adjunct of a tomb, and there are countless instances of small private mosques where there seems never to have been any enclosure. The enclosure for the public mosque is particularly necessary for Islam in partibus infidelium, and those courtyards which are not enclosed are protected from the infidel gaze in some other way, e.g. by the sargāc standing on a high plinth (examples: the ġāmi of M. at Ṣāḥibjāhānābād, Dihlī, Ṣāḥib M. at Dījanpūr, where in both the courtyard is limited only by an open arcade or colonnade). The principal entrance is usually on the east, although any gate may be on occasion in the west, a royal entrance; it is rare, though not unknown, for any entrance to be made in the western wall, and where this has happened it is not designed for access by the general public. The internal position of the principal mihrāb [q. v.], sometimes of subsidiary mihrābs also, is indicated on the outside of the west wall by one or more buttresses; a feature of mosques in India is the way the exterior elevation of the west wall is brought to life by decorative expedients.
The liwan façade is open to the sahn; i.e. there is never any portion closed off like the zimistdn of mosques, this seems not to have produced any overall adaptation of layout, unless in the development of the undercroft.

The sahn usually is an open courtyard, containing a hawd [q.v.] for the wudu; this is usually placed centrally, except that in some Shi'i mosques the hawd may be placed to one side of the central axis. There are rare cases where the sahn is completely or partially covered (e.g. the Diāmī M. at Gulbarga [q.v.]) is completely covered; in two mosques of the Tughlukid period at Delhi, the hawd of the Ballādī M. and of the Dhūn-dhūn (q.v.) is entirely open, with additional risalas leaving only four small open courts in the middle of the sahn). In such cases provision must be made for the wudu outside the sahn; some major mosques may also make provision, outside the sahn, for the khāwil. In some Gudjarāt mosques there is a water reservoir under the floor of the sahn, sometimes with chambers wherein to take refuge from the heat of the sun, with some sort of kiosk standing in the sahn from which water may be drawn; the idea is imitated on a small scale in the floor of the Diāmī M. in Fathpur Sikri. In one complex (Rādžūn ki bā‘īn) south of the M. Kuwāt al-Īslām the mosque and an associated tomb seem subordinate to an enormous step-well (bā‘īn [q.v.]).

In such cases provision may be made for the wudu outside the sahn; some major mosques may also make provision, outside the sahn, for the khāwil. In some Gudjarāt mosques there is a water reservoir under the floor of the sahn, sometimes with chambers wherein to take refuge from the heat of the sun, with some sort of kiosk standing in the sahn from which water may be drawn; the idea is imitated on a small scale in the floor of the Diāmī M. in Fathpur Sikri. In one complex (Rādžūn ki bā‘īn) south of the M. Kuwāt al-Īslām the mosque and an associated tomb seem subordinate to an enormous step-well (bā‘īn [q.v.]).

In such cases provision may be made for the wudu outside the sahn; some major mosques may also make provision, outside the sahn, for the khāwil. In some Gudjarāt mosques there is a water reservoir under the floor of the sahn, sometimes with chambers wherein to take refuge from the heat of the sun, with some sort of kiosk standing in the sahn from which water may be drawn; the idea is imitated on a small scale in the floor of the Diāmī M. in Fathpur Sikri. In one complex (Rādžūn ki bā‘īn) south of the M. Kuwāt al-Īslām the mosque and an associated tomb seem subordinate to an enormous step-well (bā‘īn [q.v.]).
The Arab conquest of Sind. It is recorded that the first mosque in Sind was built by Muhammad b. Kasim at...
framed, and supporting an octagonal cornice; above, round the base of the smooth dome, are 32 arched niches, four of them pierced to admit light. The grace of the interior is achieved by a balance between the four main arches, the squinches, and at a reduced scale the muhrab and pairs of small arches at each corner, sustaining interest at each level. Each arch, inside or out, is contained by bands of inscriptions on the extrados (derived from Cish?), set off by lotus buds lining the intrados, in recessed planes above the angle shafts for reinforced structural members, probably starting point for the Gudjarati style with latticed windows, coffered ceilings over carefully-grouped columns, and domes of two sizes over the iwán. The Djamî Masjîd at Khambayat (ca. 1325) owes a more direct debt to Dihí in its arches and massing, but local features are evident in the merlon parapet, pinnacles on the frontispiece, latticework set in a grid-like frame, and pillars carrying a cusped arch just inside the main archway. These examples attest to the diffusion of the style in western Hindustân.

An altogether different treatment of the mosque was to characterise Tughluk building. Most of the examples at Dihí are undated, and have been ascribed to Firûz Shâh, but it has been suggested (Burton-Page, op. cit. he Îbâd, 1974, 85) that the large Begampur Masjîd is better explained as built by Muhammad b. Tughluk for his new city of Dihánpanâh (ca. 725/1325). Raised on a high plinth, it is important in introducing the Iranian four-iwán plan to India. North and south, the iwânas are advanced well into the court between heavy walls, boxing entrances at each side; to each wall, a corner vault with single-aisled riwâq, its arch rises to twice the roof height between tapering round towers and massive walls had met the needs of mud construction, than to the need for defence (Ghîâyâh al-Dîn, a Kara‘una Türk, may have mediated this influence). The Djamî Masjîd at Firuzâgh Kôlî (755/1354), now ruined, was built to incorporate a tahkhânâ or undercroft, with arcaded vaults accessible from three sides, the east fronting the river. It once had three-aisled riwâq with multiple domes, and 216 stone pillars about 16 ft. (4.87 m.) high, around a central octagonal pool with its own dome. A single riwâq, one of these domes, was re-erected on a three-storey, arched pyramid as a marker. The materials for this and Firûz Shâh’s other mosques are rough rubble stonework faced with cûnâ plaster, once whitewashed or painted, with a minimum of mouldings. The common répertoire included tall plain walls with merlons, plain lintels on plain, squared quarzite piers set in twos or fours, with wide shadâr, the courts themselves were probably still Hindu in type, and two-centred arches of variable width sunk in panels, sometimes concentric. Domes were of a similar, helmet-like profile, set on framed, recessed squinch arches. Externally, the mass is emphasised by long flights of steps, projecting porches, and battered towers at the angles. The device of the tâhkhânâ, which allows easy access to the prayer space, is repeated at the Kalâqâb Kumbhâm (790/1397?) which exhibits these features, and an unusual corridor around the prayer hall, besides cannon-like guldâsta pinnacles crowning the angle-towers of the porch. The Khîrîk Masjîd, also on a tahkhânâ, repeats the three-aisled riwâq, but in combination with three-aisled passages which traverse the court on both axes, dividing it into four smaller square courts. This four-court plan is to be seen in a perhaps earlier form at the Sandîjar Masjîd (772/1370-1) at Nizâm al-Dîn, though there the riwâq and the passages are only one aisle deep, and the courts are rectangular. This scheme, possibly derived from Djąyn temple plans, was presumably intended to provide a more direct connection with single-aisled riwâq, but those covered by awnings, as in palaces at the time. It intruded on the essential unity of the sâhn and its congregation, and the experiment was not repeated. The mosque of Shâhî Âlam includes an early example of a mezzanine gallery in the northwest corner; the inaccessibility of such retreats leaves their purpose uncertain.

The Djamî Masjîd at Irîc (815/1412), some 40 miles north of Jhansi, demonstrates the transition from the Tughluk to the Sayyîd manner. The plan, with single-aisled riwâq, is centred on a prayer chamber whose dome spans the full depth of the hall, with two aisles and six smaller domes on each side. The structure is wholly arcuate, on low piers carefully detailed to articulate both axes, with frequent use of recessed planes; the arches are now stilted, with marked corbelling at the impost giving a shouldered effect, and set in deep panels. The riwâq has groined vaulting. The dome is single, a little pointed inside, with ribs, and still set on concentric squash arches. The generally ponderous effect is offset by the assurred but simple proportions, and the skyline is relieved with merlons (see Mem. ASI, xix, Calcutta 1926, for drawings).

The Lôdî mosque (Tughlukid) at Khaypur (900/1494) incorporates similar features, while its massing shows the continuity of Tughlukid tradition despite Timûr’s incursion. Attached by a walled court and connecting to the Bara Gumbhâm, the structure opposite: a significant precedent for later tombs. An arcade basement makes up the change in
level at the rear, with tapering round buttresses at each rear corner, and at each angle of the projecting bay of the central mihrāb, whose tops are alternately recessed below guidestān pinnacles; a Hindu window is corbelled out from the middle, and from either end wall. The hall has five bays; the three in the middle are domed, but the ends have low, flat vaults. The elevation reiterates the pattern, with three broad shouldered arches, and narrow ones at the extremities. At Iśtī, the central pishtāk is raised a little over the narrow side door piers, and the outer two bays are united by the line of a chadidjī. Like its dome, the central arch, thrice recessed, is a little higher than the others, and a muscular tension results from the contrast of line. The surfaces, worked outside and in with deeply cut plaster, vibrate with countless arabesques, each extrados is inscribed, and inscribed rossettes fill the spandrels. Inside, they enhance pendettive systems of oversailing lintels carved with makaraṇa [q. v.] niches. The vocabulary is further enlarged by blind merlon parapets, counterset trefoils around the octagonal dome bases (precursors of later foliation), and spreading lotus finials, makrābdma. The development of this type is apparent in the Mūḥār ki Masdjid (ca. 943/1535), whose central dome is related to the two end bays, in a much freer space. There they are supported on similar corbelled pendettives, as long used in Iran, while the central dome rests on squinch arches. The five façade arches are narrower, and a lancet window is added at each end. The pishtāk now encloses a lofty blind arch reching the parapet, which frames the entrance arch below, and a window above, as anticipated in the mihraḥ at Khayrpur. The two corner buttresses give way to polygonal towers, arcaded in two storeys. White marble is used to set off the red sandstone, with coloured tilework, notably on the chaturā at the courtyard corners, and painted claser plaster. Despite his dissatisfaction with this style, Bābur appears to have secured little improvement at his mosques (932/1526) at Kābuli Bāgh, Pānipat and Sambhal, beyond introducing Timūrid squinch netting. Hūmāyūn, however, developed it further in the Djamālī Masdjid (943/1535) at Delhi, in the same five-bay format. This only has one dome. The pishtāk is contained between engaged reeded shafts that anticipate the Mughal use of minarets. The four-coronet corbel arches are supported on superimposed niches, which help to maintain the rhythm, and their haunches are slight. Khālīṣi lotus buds are re-introduced on the central intradoses. The Masdjid-i Kuhna at the Purāṇā Kīl‘a (ca. 1535-60) shows further refinement. Each of its five arches is contained within a taller blind one, and that in a panel. The end bays, broken forward, resemble the Djamālī pishtāk, but the three middle ones are set deeper, with delicate angle shafts, and are proportionately taller. The fine ashlar incorporates the first geometric marble mosaic, after Timūrid models, and elaborate moulding profiles. Inside, the rippling recessed arches carry squinch arches below the prominent central dome, nched pendettives on either side, and intermediate "corner" buttresses; the central verandah dome has a roof with four curved eaves—a lauwīṭā. It was once tiled outside and in. The Gunmast Masdjid at Gāwī (ca. 880/1475?) has a single square chamber of brickwork surmounted by a single dome; it has single openings centred north and south, and three to the east giving on to a vaulted verandah running the full width, again with single doors to north and south, and three to the east. The piers between the arched openings carried aedicules set high, and glazed tilework. The Lattan Masdjid (880/1475-6) is similar, but with a more complete symmetry, having three openings to north and south, and three pishtāks opposite the doors, three domes over the verandah, and intermediate "corner" buttresses; the central verandah dome has a roof with four curved eaves—a lauwīṭā. It was once tiled outside and in. The Gunmast Masdjid at Gāwī (889/1484?) encloses four bays of three aisles, all domed, on either side of a central mukāra, the stonework of whose vault is carved in relief. A further variation is illustrated by three mosques at Gāwī (925/1519), in which the large central mihraḥ (988/1480) is rectangular, enclosing five bays of two large, with a single line of four stone pillars to carry its ten domes. Fine terracotta reliefs fill the spandrils and the two registers of aedicules on the piers outside. At the Chōţā Sonā Masdjid, built between 899/1493 and 925/1519, the plan is comparable, but of three aisles; its central bay is wider, and has three lauwīṭā roofs in lieu of domes. Its ashlar front is finely carved, and the dome was once gilded. The Bāfā Sonā Masdjid (932/1526) combines eleven bays of three aisles with a verandah forming a further aisle down the front, facing an open quadrangle with arched gateways; the stone is remarkably plain. Such forms continued well into the Mughal period, as seen in the Kutb Shahi mosques and the Masdjid-i Kuhna at Dwānpūr. A mosque begun in 778/1376 by FIRŪZ SHĀH TUGHLUQ was completed under the independent Šāhī sultans (811/1408); its name, Āţā Masdjid, apparently refers to the pylon-like pishtāk which was to become the dominant trait of subsequent buildings here (Sk. āţāla = "watch tower"); see Lehmann, op. cit., 22), exaggerating the great screen-arch at Dihāl. The four-tower plan is apparently derived from the Begampur Masdjid at
Dhāli, though the īwān walls are reduced to massive spurs outside the enclosure, and those to north and south have domes carried on clustered columns, leaving the three-aisled pishtāk arches, whose recessed tympanum is pierced in three registers, to reveal the open air beyond. This pylon, used for arching the continuity of the three prayer hall aisles; the axial symmetry, three arches on either side maintain the same triality is seen in the facade. The simply niched screen and the dome hidden behind is nowhere more than that of any other region on the Hindu and Jain traditions, two tendencies in mosque design had emerged in the Khaldji phase already referred to.

The Masdjid of Malik Alam ASWI, (ca. 852/1447), built on the same pattern, the structure behind the main īwān is still fighter, minimising obstruction of the prayer hall below the central dome, though mezzanines are set on either side; the absence of lateral domes, due to the smaller scale, leaves that as the central feature. The domes, with massive Hindu brackets, contrast oddly with the Islamic slenderness of the colonnades. In structural terms, the Dāmī Masdjid (842/1438, but finished under Husayn Sharki) is a reversion to the Begampur type, with boxed-in, domed īwāns on all four sides, and the same high undercut. In the prayer chamber the colonnades are eliminated except under the mezzanines where the central pillars are paired to match its piers, for the wings are again boxed in by heavy masonry supporting the roof of a single pointed barrel vault spanning east and west, on either side. The prayer hall is thus divided into three spaces free of supports, but separated by their cross walls and the two-storey mezzanines. The structure is divided under the façade. The three large towers and arcaded tympana of the earlier pishtāks are transmuted into a rhythmic display of framed and fretted openings. The dichotomy between high frontal screen and the dome hidden behind is nowhere more pronounced than here. Related mosques are to be found at Itāwā (Dāmī Masdjid) and Banārās (720/1320) Djami Masdjid

Gudjarāt. In a sandstone architecture, drawing more than that of any other region on the Hindu and Jain traditions, two tendencies in mosque design had already emerged in the Khaldji phase already referred to: the screening of the prayer-hall front between a series of archways, as at Khambāyat (after Niğām al-Dīn at Dhāli), or the treatment of the hall as an open colonnade, given additional rhythm by the surge of domes above the ābadāna line, as at Bharotā. In either case the domes were carried by the Hindu device of beams spanning between two columns grouped to convert each square bay to an octagon. Remaining square bays were panelled in intricately recessed layers of coferring, whose cellular carving matched that of the domes. Pillars with markedly stratified round shafts above squared, faceted pedestals, carry vigorously curved brackets never far from living movement. The proportions of the three-arched screen are carefully repeated at Dhōlkā in the mosque of Hīlāl Khān Kādī (733/1333), but with bracketed, tiered pinnacles marking the pishtāk so prominently as to suggest the minarets which followed; the central dome, raised a storey above the roof, is surrounded by pierced screens. The same scheme, with its lower wings on either side, recurs at Ahmādābād in Sayyid ʿAlām’s mosque (815/1412), with half-rounded, tiered and bracketed buttresses framing the central arch as bases for fully functional minārs in a comparable style. The larger domes are now true, hemispherical ones. The development reaches fruition in the Dāmī Masdjid at Ahmādābād (826/1423) where the roof at the front of the three central bays is raised for a clerestory, with mezzanine galleries between, and the central dome is raised a further storey, though the plan may be filtered by a pierced screen set in the usual Gudjarāt gridframe of stone: the remaining domes, three deep and five in the length of the hall, surround these three at the lower level. The minārs, once four times this height, fell in 1819 (see J. Forbes’ drawing of 1786 at AŚWī, vii [1906], 30). The Masdjid of Malik ʿAlām (1422?) combines a single arch with such minarets and an open front. Continuing interest in the open type of hall is seen, as at the mosque at Sarkhej (855/1451), where 140 pillars, grouped as usual to support two rows of five equal domes, are set throughout in pairs to achieve an elegantly simple unity below a continuous roof line; there is little carving but for the mihrāb. The Dāmī Masdjid at Čāmpānēr (Māhūmādī, 805/1402) works variations on that at Ahmādābād. The eleven main domes, are staggered, the central one being set over a single central bay rising through three roof levels, behind a pishtāk which now overlaps the minār on either side, and incorporates three corbelled bay windows. The hall wings (bāzūbā) thus maintain a single roof line, with a plain walled front pierced by arches each side, but there are two arches respectively above the minār, which is still corbelled, and the carved panels have filigree tendril-work. As at Ahmādābād, the pishtāk is one aisle deep; three entrance pavilions outside the wall carry prominent Dāris, and the wall itself is strongly modelled. The mosque of Rānī Rūpāwātī (ca. 916/1510) shows a hall of only three domes treated similarly, with heavily planted landing a more open space in modulating the front and ends. The culmination of the open hall design at the mosque of Rānī Ṣīpīr (Sabārī), also at Ahmādābād (920/1514), fronting her tomb, has two rows of three corbelled domes, with only one row of pillars down the centre, and another, paired, row of pilasters, similarly influenced by alternating pilasters. In the extreme delicacy of this small-scale scheme is most evident in the slender, but solid and purely decorative minār now set at each end of the façade—a device already introduced at the mosque of Muhāfīz Khān (897/1492) with full minarets. These two traditions were reconciled in the mosque of Shaykh Ḥasan Muḥammad Ǧūǧī (973/1563-6), a pillared hall of three minārs in which the front is arcaded between terminal minārs, and the central five bays are raised in an upper storey of verandahs around a single dome. Sīdī Saʿīd al-Ḥabšī’s mosque (980/1572-3), still at Ahmādābād, has five bays of three aisles with intersecting arches, supporting shallow domes over squinches, lintels and corbels, but is remarkable for its ten large traceried lunettes, of which two are univalved in the sinuous naturalism they bring to the interior. Mālwa. An initial phase of redeployed temple material is distinguished by a simple grace which remained typical of the kingdom. At the Dāmī Masdjid (or Lāt Masdjid) at Dāhr (807/1404-5) the proportions of a single smooth hemispherical dome impart a spaciousness to the centre of the prayer hall colonnades, complemented by a pattern of flagstones,
and a peaked, cusped mihrāb arch; outside, its coronet of merlons enhances the traces of a tiled merlon porch over the open front. One domed porch is surrounded by coved vaults, and in another false arch profiles are inserted between the pillars as in Gudjarāt temples. The first mosque at Māndū, that of Dīlāwār Khān (808/1405-6) is spartan, however, with its hall of elemental columns relieved only by seven mihrābs. Its successor, that of Malik Mughāh (835/1432) presents a true Tughlūkī mihrāb, with an arched undercroft in front between domed turrets, and the prominent stair often used here. The open, pillared prayer hall has three low, helmet-like domes. These, though still supported by an octagon of lintels, are partly enclosed by similar false arches below, with web spandrels, well integrated with the mihrābs behind. The Dījāmī Masjīd (858/1454) has the same reiteration of arched bays is already apparent larger thereby (997/1589). The interior of the open hall of 19 arched bays has square piers, and the five-aisle interior round pillars, carrying small domes on squinches. Heavy piers form a maṣjīda enclosing the central three bays, from which squinches on minarets carry a tall 16-sided drum lit by fine dūla, and a single large dome whose outer form is close to the domes at Mūltān [q.v.] while its supports recall the Tughlūkī iṣān at Begumpur. The small three-bayed Langar ki Masjīd at Gulgārga (ca. 838/1435) introduces a single pointed brick vault over two arched ribs.

At Bīdār, the use of tall arches on low impost is resumed at the Dījāmī Masjīd (ca. 926/1520?), recessed once, with angular matching squinches articulated with great clarity below plain domes (cf. those in southern Iran). A transition to the Bīdārī vocabulary can be seen in the Kālī Masjīd (1106/1694-5), where the three front arches are framed by a pointed, slender, formalised mihrāb, and the decagonal mihrāb recess is housed in a square octagonal tower carrying a cadrāj lantern, and a slightly bulbous dome as introduced at the Madrasa of Māhmūd Gawan (877/1472); a domical vault roofs the central bay. A small mosque at the tomb of ʿAlī Barīd (984/1576), handled similarly, has three domes on squinch-net pendientes, and a fretted cresting.

The Dījāmī Masjīd at Gālwāntī [q.v.], rebuilt in 893/1488, already combined a seven-arched hall façade on square piers with a square pylon at either end topped by a thātris with dūla-work in the sides, and thāthicā in serpentine brackets, but otherwise follows the Bahmani pattern of a dome over every bay, and a larger one raised on a tall drum at the centre; an arched screen wall surrounds its court. This is repeated at a smaller scale in the Dījāmī Masjīd at Rohankhed (990/1582), where four pylons with thātris now form the hall ends, with a single central dome: the imposing southern gateway has extensive carving.

Nīzām Shāhī. The Dāmīrī Masjīd at Ahmadnagar, in a similar façade flanked by ornate pylons, which carry four graceful minārs capped by bud-like domelots. Octagonal pillars form two arched aisles supporting a flat roof. At the centre of a decorative parapet two slim minarets frame an arch profile, as in the Bādāl Maḥallī Darwāza at Čandērī. No superstructure remains on the corner pylons of the Dīlāwār Khān mosque at Khed, but the exterior is enhanced by small domes set in the rear, and a series of crowned squares on the panelled bands running all round, and lotus medallions in relief. The central dome set on a square base imitates a tomb, complete with thāthicā and corner thātris. Inside, columns with volutes carry a coved ceiling.

Adil Shāhī. At Rāyūf [q.v.] in the disputed Dūbā, a series of liwāns were built, with their ceilings on black basalt Cālukiyan pillars whose short, heavy profiles are compensated by a deep parapet; the Ek Minār ki Masjīd has a tapering, free-standing minār.
MASDjid
20 m. high (919/1513). In Bidjapur [q.v.] the Bidar vocabulary was elaborated in dark stone. Thus in the Djami [q.v.] the Bidar vocabulary was elaborated in dark stone. Thus in the Djami of Ibrahim (ca. 957/1550?), where a flat, domeless roof with sturdy domed guldasta bulbs, set on a tall cylindrical drum, is Masdjid of Yusuf (918/1512-3) the slightly c pinnacles at each corner is relieved by a panelled mindr (ca. in the Djami above the roof line. The same three-bay format is used and the domed lanterns at each corner, well and characteristic, is the prominence given the dome, the Bidar masjid. In all of these have one of the first double domes in India. At the Djami of Ikhlas Khan (968/1560?) is (ca. The mosque of Ikhlas Khan [q.v.] may (985/1577-8?), these elements achieve mature expression. Its prayer hall, nine bays long and five aisles deep, is articulated with a calm strength, only an alternation of squinch detail varying a uniform structure with shallow domes; four piers at the centre are omitted, and intersecting pendentive arches are inserted in a miraculously change of scale to carry the dome (as already found in the tomb of Sultan Kahan Allah at Bidar and based on Timurid antecedents. Clerestory arches with fine ajalis light it through a square base rising above the roof, but the dome, still of the Multan shape above its foiling, remains dim, as usual here. Two features are innovations. At the east end of each seven-bayed nisaâ is an octagonal base for an unbuilt mindr; the entire external wall is modelled with two registers of arcing, the upper a corridor, and the lower blind. Both may be derived from the Musallah at Harat (841/1437-8) [q.v.]. A central courtyard tank anticipates Mughal practice. Stucco is partly replaced by carved stone at Malika Djanâ Begam’s mosque (ca. 995/1586-7), in which the square, hollowed sphere in its collar of leaves, is repeated at each stage of four corner minarets; guldasta lanterns, fretted cresting, and pendant stone chains compound a new elegance. The same character informs the Andâ Masdjid (1017/1608) in fine ashlar, set back above a sarat, and with a garden wall, and the mosque at the Mihâr-i Mahall, domeless, with rod-like mindrs, and four prolonged chadjid brackets, is not. Its acme is the mosque at the Ibrahim Rawda (1036/1626), facing the tomb across a plinth within a walled garden; brilliant use is made of elements repeated at a miniature scale to complement the whole. Afjâl Khan’s mosque (1064/1653) is on two floors, the upper probably for women, as at the Andâ mosque. The style was taken as far south as Sante Bennur. Much of the extraneous ornament is discarded in the Makk Masdjid, in the latter half of the century, free-standing within a risaâ continued to the west.

K. u. b Shâhi. At Golkonda [q.v.], the first capital, the ruins include a Djami Masdjud built by Suljan Kull Kuhl (1094/1681) in the style of the earlier Andâ mosque. The regional achievement is best represented by the mosques at Haydarabad [q.v.], which were given a new emphasis on height, accentuated by the concentration of external detail in the fascia between the chadjid and the skyline, and complemented by arcaded galleries around powerfully contoured mindrs. The multiple guldastas on fretted parapets, and foliated bulbous domes are, like the stucco, inherited from Bidjapur. The Djami Masdjid (1006/1597-8) has a spacious arched hall behind a front of seven bays divided unusually into two registers, the upper one of cusped arches being carved on struts from the pier impost; the central arch, broadest and tallest of all, is surmounted by a plain profile in the upper section. The Makk Masdjid, begun ca. 1026/1617, and continued until finished by Awrangzib in 1105/1693, is set behind a square courtyard reputed to hold 10,000 worshippers, with a hall two aisles deep and five tall bays wide. In the plain ashlar façade, the central arch is slightly larger, as the only variation below the strong horizontal of a chadjid on linked brackets, spanning between the broad galleries of the turrets at either end, each of which is crowned by a bulbous dome on a marked necking. The columns carry arched pendentives and domes, with a coved central bay. Verticality is particularly pronounced in the Tol Masdjid (1043/1633-4), where the five narrow arches of the front are stilted above a richly carved plinth. In the Djami above the roof level. Extensive use is made of cut plaster, syncretic in style. For other developments in the south, see MAHISUR. 2. Monuments. K. a. h. [q.v.]. The combination of a mountain climate and plentiful timber have resulted in a tradition of mosque building in a blockhouse technique of laid decord logs and pitched roofs with birch bark sarking topped by turf. In parallel with Dakhani mosques, the basic constructional unit had much in common with the local tomb type, a near-cubical volume set on a stone base, the corners emphasised by timber jointing, and roofed by a pyramid, sometimes tiered, with a slim spire at the centre. Frequent renewal after fires renders dating unreliable, though the type seems to have been used since the 8th/14th century. At Shirinagar in the mosque of Shâh Hamadan, the volume is modulated by large roofed balconies on each outside face, and the roof by a square arcaded muâdan’s gallery below the peaked spire. Four tapering galleries, with corbelled levings, are carried up to the parapet of arched screens joins the mindr galleries for their full height; each shaft has two further galleries above roof level. Extensive use is made of cut plaster, syncretic in style. For other developments in the south, see MAHISUR. 2. Monuments. M. u. h. E. During Akbar’s minority, the Timurid innovations introduced under Humâyûn remained in currency, associated with the mughal faction, as in the mosque and madrasa of Mâham Anaga (Anga), the Khayr al-Manâzil (969/1561-2) whose three bays to the court are close in format to the cen-
tral three at Purānā Kīla with a slightly raised *pishtak* advanced between clustered shafts, and four-centred arches whose tympana are pierced with archways at a lower level; only the single dome has an awkward old-fashioned stilt. The arch spandrels are inlaid. The screened upper storey of rooms enclosing the court on three sides appears to be unique for the period, while the portal is the first to use a semidomed *iwan*. At Fathpur Sikri [*q. v.*] these forms are less in evidence. Although the front of the Stonecutters' Mosque (ca. 949/1543) and the adjacent gate both feature a row of thin slabs set between thicker posts, the *chādāfis* is supported by long, sinuous brackets, and the internal row of pillars is Hindu. The organisation of the great Dājmī Masjid (979/1571-2) stems from Dājnwpur via Bayānān, where the technique of assembling cut stone components was already well-developed a century earlier (fieldwork by Shokohlī 1997). Although the front of the mosque is in one plane but still unlike the profile of the Dājmī Masjid, with blind arcuated screens which separate their courts from the outside, the lateral domes of the Atalā Masjid have been completely screening the stilted and lumpish dome behind. The wings are of half the height, and relieved by queues of little *chātris* along the skyline, like the *riwāsā* with their central *iwan*: these once served as stilt; the whole is in marble. On a larger scale, the Shah Dājmī Masjid at Agra, flanked by the same flaring turrets, has a fully bulbous dome, but a tall marble *pishtak* in front over a deep *iwan*, and low wings; its red stone is finely worked in relief, notably in the pendentes and inner dome. Like it, the Māṭī Masjid at Lāhwār (ca. 1055/1645) is fronted by cusped arches flanking the plain central one, but it offers a further solution to the problem with a barely raised *pishtak* linked to the wings by a continuous parapet in *partīn-kārī*. The three marble domes still have the cavetto and profile of Dājmī's mosque, now clearly visible. These smaller mosques owe much to the consonant detail of arcuate screens which separate their courts from the outside, and still have a fineness that extends to the *chātars*; the whole is inlaid in the floor. On a larger scale, the Shah Dājmī Masjid at Agra, completed in red stone in 1058/1648. Its plan is essentially that of the five-compartment prayer hall from Lāhwār, complete with its corner turrets and another pair at the east corners of the court. Its capacity is increased by the addition of a second row of compartments in front of the first, the central one forming a deep *iwan*, whose *pishtak* is thus spaced well forward from the domes over the main row behind; the two lateral domes are placed over the ends, for better balance, and all three are double and distinctly bulbous, with a pointed profile accentuated by inlaid chevrons of white marble (structural inner domes were from henceforward the norm). The front of the tall tapers, with pendentives on the axes, is the largest enclosed mosque in northern India. Gateway *iwan* on these axes regain their prominence,
and the *riwāk*s are open to the external air on all three sides. A collision between these and the *līwān*, a weakness at Agra, is avoided by returning them along the west, and then advancing the hall forward between full-size minarets at the corners. The *līwān* plan fuses those of Agra and Fatehpur Sikri, with alternating main compartments, and slimmer piers at the front; cusped arches are used throughout. The domes, now on tall drums are, like the *mindār* and the *līwān*, striped with marble inlay, and the entire front is panelled in marble, with plain merlons above. Such domes essentially the marble calyces topping the largest of the marble series, complete with domes on smooth pendentives, that rise bulbous to the courtyard, and the *līwān* of brick faced with red stone, is closed in. The *līwān*, of which the *mindār* however carry long foliations, lotus buds and floral relief playing on many surfaces; the domes, rebuilt after the Mutiny, were originally lower, and gilded.

The Mōtī Masdjid at Agra Fort (1063/1653), the largest of the marble series, complete with *riwāk* and axial gateways, combines a restraint of outline and of *pishtāk,* with elaborate marble calyces and floral relief playing on many surfaces; the domes, rebuilt after the Mutiny, were originally lower, and gilded.

The last of the great congregational mosques, the Bādhāhi Masdjid at Lāhawr (1084/1673-4) derives its plan almost entirely from the great mosque at Dihlī, its three low domes and the four octagonal *mindār*s are now set at the four corners of the court, and the *līwān* itself reverts to the local scheme with a domed octagonal turret at each corner. The *riwāk*s, too, are subdivided into an alternating series of *hādīras* for teaching, accessible only through doorways, and though raised as before, the court is thus closed in. The *līwān* of brick faced with red stone is rather taller than at Dihlī, and panelled in the local manner, but the surfaces swarm with relief carving; the marble domes formerly had dark drums to relate them to the wings. Internally the squinched dome chambers alternate with Bangālī vaults, and the walls, arch soffits and domes are panelled or worked in net-patterns. The central bay, set off by Bangālī vaults, rises from intersecting pendentive work over a zone of 16 arches, pierced for a clerestory at the angles, and tiled throughout in mosaic (more than 100 pieces per sq. ft.) in ranks of wheeling stars. The smallest sound at the *mibār*b can be heard throughout the mosque, perhaps by virtue of its domes. In both these mosques the red brick is defined by white pointing which accentuates the arches. Further excellent tilework at the *Djāmī* Masdjid of Khudābād has been badly damaged. The treatment of its façade shows stronger Lāhawr influence in proportions and panelling; the external walls, however, are noteworthy for three superimposed registers of repeated blind arches, a few feet pierced at the lower levels.

At Aḥmadābād, the mosque of Nawwāb Sārdrā Khān (ca. 1070/1660) combines a relatively orthodox Gujārātī treatment of a three-bayed *līwān*, having three plain arches between narrow piers, a *gharābāh* bay on each end wall, and balconied *mindār*s framing the front, with features that seem to bridge the styles of Bijāpur and Agra. The *līwān*s have long foliations, but have *hādīras* framing the arches. Further excellent tilework at the *Djāmī* Masdjid of Khudābād has been badly damaged. The treatment of its façade shows stronger Lāhawr influence in proportions and panelling; the external walls, however, are noteworthy for three superimposed registers of repeated blind arches, a few feet pierced at the lower levels.

In general, it may be seen that whereas the enclosure of the court only achieves full architectural expression in cathedral mosques, or the later court mosques, the prayer hall is the subject of consistent architectural development. The particular structural means adopted in each region for enclosing the space become the vocabulary for a series of variations which in fine glazed tilework, owning much to Iranian influence, and apparently that of Harāt [q.v.] in particular. This is already apparent in the Dābghī Masdjid at Thātārī (997/1589-9), of which the *līwān* remains in a ruined state, containing a square central compartment flanked by a rectangular one at each side, with arches connecting them between massive piers, and three deep *riwāk*s, set in slightly raised *pishtāk*s. The central dome, like the *līwān* below it, is notably larger than those either side, but all three are set on double octagonal drums of an Iranian type, the central cornice of each house a well-shaped arch within another; at the west the interval contains an arched window set on either side of the bluff carved sandstone *mibār*b. The tilework, floral, geometric and calligraphic, in cobalt and azure on a white ground, filled arch spandrels and soffits. The *Djāmī* Masdjid of Shāhjāhānī (1057/1647) in the same city is unusual in plan, the two large domes forming the two aisles of the broad *riwāk*, and the three of the prayer hall, around a very deep court, focussed on a great *pishtāk,* with small subsidiary courts on each side of an east entry passing under two domes in series (cf. the Masdjid-i *Djāmī* at Kirmān). The multiple bays are roofed by 80 small domes, with larger single ones over the corners. The central bay, set off by Bangālī vaults, has a dome replacing four bays in front of the *mibār*b; this rises from intersecting pendentive work over a zone of 16 arches, pierced for a clerestory at the angles, and tiled throughout in mosaic (more than 100 pieces per sq. ft.) in ranks of wheeling stars. The smallest sound at the *mibār*b can be heard throughout the mosque, perhaps by virtue of its domes. In both these mosques the red brick is defined by white pointing which accentuates the arches. Further excellent tilework at the *Djāmī* Masdjid of Khudābād has been badly damaged. The treatment of its façade shows stronger Lāhawr influence in proportions and panelling; the external walls, however, are noteworthy for three superimposed registers of repeated blind arches, a few feet pierced at the lower levels.
in most cases go far beyond the immediate needs of the liturgy or of mere shelter, and can be recognised as successive resolutions of the need for balance, harmony and unity at the chosen scale.

The walls of the mosque itself are rather low, but the roof of the mosque is of an ornamental type that includes a cupola, a type of roof that is typical of the Javanese style. The cupola is constructed with a series of domes that are gradually smaller, starting with a large dome at the center and gradually tapering off. This type of roof is found in many mosques in Java, particularly those built in the 19th and early 20th centuries.

Another characteristic feature of a mosque in Java is the presence of a minbar, which is a pulpit where the mosque's leader gives sermons and recites the Koran. The minbar is usually located in the central area of the mosque, facing the kibla, or the direction towards Mecca. In some cases, the minbar is elevated, with steps leading up to it. This feature is an example of the intricate woodcarving that is characteristic of Javanese architecture.

In Java, the mosque is not just a place of worship, but also a symbol of the social and cultural life of the community. The mosque is often the center of community gatherings, where people come together to discuss local issues, celebrate holidays, and participate in other community activities. The mosque is also a place where people can seek refuge in times of hardship, and where the community can come together to support each other.

In conclusion, the mosque in Java is a remarkable example of the unique blend of Islamic and Javanese architecture. It is a testament to the ingenuity and creativity of the people of Java, who have developed this form of architecture over many centuries. The mosque is not just a place of worship, but also a symbol of the rich cultural heritage of the Indonesian people.
tion, however, they prove to be representations of flowers and leaves of the lotus, arranged as wings ... but, on account of the Saracen traders who frequent the kingdom with their ships, they have been converted to

One mosque in Java possesses a drum, called bidug, stretched with buffalo-skin. Before the adhdin [q.v.] (Javanese and Sundanese: adhan) this drum is beaten vigorously at least five times a day. The adhdin itself is made either from the minaret (Javanese: mënara, Sundanese: munara) or, more often, in the mosque itself since not every mosque has its minaret. The mu'adhthin, called modin or bilal, stands at the entrance of the mosque or on its roof.

The highest official of the mosque is the panghulu (thus in Sundanese; Javanese: pangulu; Madurese: pangöl, Malay: pangkula), often a learned Malay, panghulu (Ar. 'alam) who has studied theology and is a pupil of the pesantren, the Indonesian religious school, or of the more modern madrasa; he may even have studied in Mecca. Traditionally, the panghulu are highly-considered in Indonesian society. Sometimes the function is hereditary. One of his tasks is to supervise and coordinate the functions of the lower officials of the mosque: the imam, the khatib, the mu'adhthin [q.v.] and the marbut, the official who is responsible for maintenance. According to the linguistic area, these officials are called imam, kátib or ketip, modin or bilal, and marbot, marbot or occasionally marboti.

In Java the mosque is also used for 'istíkla [q.v.], especially during the last ten days of Ramadán.


IV. In the rest of South-East Asia.

That the traditional South-East Asian mosque originated in Indonesia and that it is formally sui generis cannot be disputed. Whether, as has been claimed, it developed in Java is less certain. Indeed, the history of Islam in Indonesia would suggest another possibility. The building in question was of wooden construction. It consisted of a simple structure on a square groundplan, erected on a substantial base. This distinguished it from the classic Indonesian house on stilts. The existence of internal pillars probably depended on its size. It had openings in the walls, probably closed with shutters, and an entrance in the east side, opposite the later mibrab. It is not known how the kibla was originally indicated, but some mark on the west wall seems likely. Above this groundfloor hall, which had relatively low walls, there were a number of upper stories of decreasing area, up to a total of four: each individual storey, including the main hall, had its own roof, usually in palm thatch, with widespread eaves. The upper stories contained loft-like rooms which were functional. The whole building was topped by a finial which traversed the enclosure. There was no måraba, the adhdin was given either from the doorway of the mosque or from its top storey. The kibla was probably pointed by the vigorous beating of a large skincovered drum, as is generally the practice today. A more simple structure, essentially a traditional Indonesian dwelling on stilts, serves as the model for a prayer hall which does not have the status of the mosque. It is still to be found in communities which cannot muster the requisite forty souls to constitute a congregation or, on occasions, as a supplementary building in a compound where it serves as a meeting place, a rest-house for visitors, an administrative centre as well as for salāt when the mosque proper is closed.

This Indonesian prototype did not have the verandah, Javanese serambi, which is such a distinctive feature of the Central Javanese mosque. There is no evidence that this formed an original part of the mosque, from which it is, in fact, separated, both architecturally and dogmatically: shoes may be worn there. It seems to have derived from a royal building in pre-Islamic Central Java. Neither it, nor the externalised mibrab, belong to the original square mosque.

Various origins have been proposed for the basic Indonesian mosque. It has been derived from: (1) the candi, a sacred Hindu or Buddhist structure which is of widespread significance in Indonesian religions (the Balinese temple with multi-tiered thatched roofs known as a meru, after the Indian sacred mountain, is an architectural example of this). The objection to (1) is that, quite apart from its possible unacceptable to Muslim teachers, the candi does not occur in those parts of Indonesia where conversions to Islam first took place. The cockfight hypothesis appears to suffer from inherent implausibility. There is, however, good reason for holding the concept of the sacred mountain as one component in the sandhoulé complex, an origin of the Indonesian mosque. It differs so profoundly from mosques elsewhere in the Islamic world, not least in Cambay [see Khambay] and other parts of Gujurát [q.v.] from which the main impetus towards conversion seems to have come.

South-East Asia lies across the sea route from the Middle East and the Indian sub-continent to China and beyond. The Malay Peninsula and Sumatra mark the area where the monsoon system of the Indian Ocean meets that of the Pacific, and constitute a natural interchange point. For two millennia or more merchants have travelled and traded through this region. After the coming of Islam many of these travellers were Muslims, but, although there were without doubt Muslim communities in the ports and harbours of the region, some of whose members may have traded in the interior, there is no evidence as to the extent of conversion to Islam among the local peoples. (Nor, incidentally, is there any evidence for mosques to serve the needs of such Muslim traders.) The first instances of such conversion comes at the end of the 7th/13th century. A hint in a Chinese source dated 683/1281 receives striking confirmation from Marco Polo who spent several months in Sumatra, on his way home from China ten years later. Of Ferlec (Perlak) he noted "the people were all idolaters, but, on account of the Saracen traders who frequent the kingdom with their ships, they have been converted to
the Law of Mahomet", adding that this was only the townspeople, those of the mountains being like wild beasts. The ruler of Samudra (Pasai), where Polo spent some months waiting for the wind to change, and who died in 699/1297, certainly died a Muslim for his tombstone, which was imported from Cambay, gives his name as Malik al-Salih. It was from this remote, in Javanese terms, area of Aceh that Islam spread to the Malay Peninsula, above all to Malacca, [q. v.], to the north coast of Java and thence to other parts of Sumatra, to the coasts of Borneo and to the sources for the much sought-after spices, by way of the ports of Surawesi and Maluku. Over a period of some three centuries, Islam followed the trade routes and with it there went the Indonesian masjid, with its tiered, overhanging roofs. More than a dozen have been identified, notably by De Graaf. What is noticeable is that it was precisely in areas which had not been strongly influenced by Indo-Javanese architecture of Hindu or Buddhist tradition that the mosque of this type developed. Its origins have to be sought in the socio-religious structures of northern Sumatra in the communal house which, as elsewhere in Indonesia, once constituted the men's house. Now without windows or its original interior divisions, in Aceh it has become the meunasah which serves as a prayer house, a meeting place, and an administrative centre as well as a Kuranic school. It had the advantage that it had never housed idols, but this does not explain how the teachers from Gudjarat and elsewhere were persuaded to permit the adoption of such an aberrant form of mosque.


I. IN CHINA.

The Chinese term is Ch'ing-chiao or Ch'ing-ching mosque, which differs from those other mosques listed so far in that its foundation is ascribed to the arrival of Muslim soldiers from Persia, rather than sailors coming by sea. Undated epigraphic evidence and long-established tradition date this mosque to the early T'ang (late Umayyad) period, but this remains inconclusive, and Leslie suggests that "until further evidence is forthcoming its is better to reject a T'ang date and query a Sung one, whilst taking for granted a Yuan [Mongol] presence". Leslie continues by providing "Desultory Notes" for numerous other cities in Eastern, Central and Northern China (49-53), before concluding that many thousands (or even tens of thousands) of Muslims, mostly of Persian and Arab origin, were resident in China during T'ang Dynasty times, though little definitive evidence exists for the number of mosques which had been established during this early period. Chinese Muslim tradition is clear, however, that most of these, Hsi-yu yen or "Westerners" were semi-permanent or permanent residents, many of whom would have intermarried freely with the indigenous Chinese population, thereby giving rise to a nascent Chinese-speaking, increasingly Sinicised Muslim population which would, by Ming times, develop into the Hui Chinese Muslim community. Certainly by T'ang times, the distinction was already being made between "foreigners" and "native-born foreigners". Shari'a law requires the establishment of congregational mosques wherever communities of more than forty adult male Muslims are gathered together; the presence of many small mosques along the Chinese coast and (to a lesser extent) in the interior may, therefore, be taken for granted by late T'ang/Sung times. Doubtless, except in the more important coastal towns such as Canton (Khanfu) and Chuan-chou (Zaitun), these mosques would have been fairly insubstantial buildings, long since altered beyond recognition or destroyed; thus, definitive proof of the extent of mosque-building in China during this early period will depend upon future archaeological excavations.

The Yuan period (ca. 678-770/1279-1366) was characterised by a substantial expansion of Islam in the central and interior parts of China, most particularly in Yunnan, where Sayyid Adil Shahs al-Din Bukhari (who conquered and subsequently admin-
istered the former Nan-ch'ao area for the Mongols) is credited with establishing two mosques in the former Nan-ch'ao area for the Mongols) is credited with establishing two mosques in the

to the north and west. Certainly, the oldest mosques in Yunnan and the north-west are likely to have been established during this period, a trend which was continued under the Ming Dynasty (ca. 771-1368-1644) which is also known as a period of Sinicisation for the Chinese Muslim community—indeed, it may be that the Chinese-speaking Hui Muslim community emerged as a separate and distinct entity (paralleling, for example, the Swahili [q.v.] in East Africa and the Mappila [q.v.] of southern India) during this period.

It is probable that the mosques of the Hui (Chinese-speaking) Muslims, which are scattered throughout China but are particularly numerous in the provinces of Kansu, Ningsia, Taishan and Yunnan, evolved in their characteristic form during this period. Certainly under the Ming, the nascent Hui community expanded greatly as a result of intermarriage, overt and covert (and, perhaps more frequently covert) missionary work, and as a result of the establishment of a transcontinental commercial venture. Wherever Hui settled in any numbers, hādil establishments (caravanserais, restaurants, inns), mosques and attendant madrasas soon followed. As Israeli notes (op. cit. in Bibli., 29), many mosques constructed during the Ming period were built in a style reminiscent of indigenous Chinese temple architecture, either eliminating the minaret altogether, or eschewing the distinctive styles associated with the mosques of Central Asia, South Asia and the Middle East in favour of Chinese-style pagodas. As a result of this architectural development, the muezzin could no longer call the faithful to prayer in the usual way, but stood inside the mosque instead, calling the adhān behind the main mosque entrance.

When prostrating themselves before the Emperor's tablets, as required, the Muslims would avoid bringing their heads into contact with the floor... and thus did they satisfy their consciences in avoiding the true adorations, and verb "to prostrate oneself", sujūdū in Arabic, with heart and mind centred on Mecca. Once the believers were inside, they put on white caps, shoes were taken off, elaborate ablutions were ritually performed, and the prayers began in Arabic, with heart and mind centred on Mecca. When prostrating themselves before the Emperor's tablets, as required, the Muslims would avoid bringing their heads into contact with the floor... and thus did they satisfy their consciences in avoiding the true significance of the rite—this prohibited worship was invalid because "it was imperfectly performed" (Israeli, op. cit., 29).

Israeli defines this combination of external Sinicisation of mosque building and internal Islamic orthodoxy as a manifestation of the dichotomy of Chinese Islam. Certainly, the functions of the mosque remained immediately recognisable in their Islamic purpose. Thus, besides the area set aside for prayer, the interior of larger Chinese mosques is generally divided between lecture hall, dormitory, conference room and the deceased Muslims for burial. Amongst the best-known and most beautifully decorated of these traditional Chinese mosques are the Niú-cháh sù (Ox Street mosque) in Peking, and the Hua-chu-chhū sù in Shanghai.

By contrast with the Sinicised Hui Chinese mosques scattered throughout "China Proper", the mosques of the periphery are often very different. Thus the mosque architecture of Sinkiang conforms closely to that of neighbouring Western Turkestan, whilst in the far north-east (Heilungkiang Province), an area formerly much influenced by Russian culture, the mosque may sometimes outwardly resemble Orthodox churches. In this context, an informative trilingual study illustrating many of the best-known mosques in China and clearly depicting the different architectural forms has recently been published by the China Islamic Association (op. cit. in Bibli., 1981).


VI. IN EASTAFRICA

In East Africa the mosque is commonly spoken of in Swahili as mshikiti, pl. msikiti, but mishire, mishire in the Comoro Islands; and cf. Swahili sijita, the act of adoration, and verb sayada to prostrate oneself", from Ar. sayada. Nineteenth-century traditional histories claim the setting up of Muslim cities on the eastern African coast in the 7th and 8th centuries.
A.D. Of this there is no earlier literary evidence, but a mosque is mentioned in the Arabic History of Kilwa named Kibah (possibly a Banatu form of kibba) as existing on that island ca. 950 A.D. In spite of recent excavations at Kilwa [q.v.] by H. N. Chittick, there has so far been no positive identification of a mosque of this period. The first reliable evidence is from inscriptions. Cerulli reports one in the Friday Mosque at Barawa, Somalia, dated 498/1104-5, while on Zanzibar Island there is the well-known Friday Mosque at Kikwamik (q.v.) which has an inscription dating its foundation at 500/1107. The inscriptions are certainly of Sirafi provenance, which does not argue that Zanzibar was much Islamicised at this period. The 4th/10th century Kitab 'Agidh al-Hind of Buzurg b. Shahriyar of Rambhumz contains, however, the tale of the conversion of an eastern African king of a place of which no identification is given; he was followed by his people. In the same period the Al-Mas'udi, who visited eastern Africa, speaks of the people and their sovereigns as pagan. By the 6th/12th century al-Idnisi says that “the people, although mixed, are actually mostly Muslum” which would accord with the epigraphical evidence. Between 1962 and March 1964 the greater number of known mosques, from mediaeval times to the 18th century, both standing and ruined, were planned and photographed by P. S. Garlake. However, an important series of foundation inscriptions of mosques at Lamu [q.v.], some twenty in all, and ranging from the 14th to the 19th century. He rightly says that “the most sensitive indicator of change and development in style and decoration is bound to be the mosque mihrab”; he distinguishes a clear and unbroken development of style and technique from the early classic mihrab with a plain architrave of the 14th and 15th centuries; a developed classic mihrab in which the plain surfaces of the architrave are broken by decoration; a neo-classic mihrab of greater elaboration, both this and the foregoing in the 16th century; a simplified classic mihrab restricted to northern Kenya, and a derived classic mihrab on the Tanzanian coast in the 18th century, in which, however, there were new developments that led to the multiform arches of a more elaborate character. The dating of some of these mihrabs derives from inscriptions, but is based to a great extent upon the evidence of imported pottery and Chinese porcelain, the latter coming to be used as a decoration by insetting it into the architrave of the mihrab.

All the 19th century Swahili settlements in eastern Africa are on the edge of the shore: Gedi, two miles from the Mida creek, is the sole exception. Some earlier mosques, however, are found on cliffs or headlands, where they may have been placed to serve as mariners’ marks. Some of them are still of special veneration for seafarers. The population in these places was on the whole small, and only at Kilwa [q.v.] and at Mogadishu [see MADISHU] was the need felt for mosques of more than modest size. Throughout the coast from Somalia to Mozambique, the only available building material of a permanent character was coralline limestone, obtained either from old raised beaches or directly from coral reefs. Mouldings, arches, and all features wherever precision was required, were of finely dressed coral blocks. A fine concrete, whose aggregate was coral rubble, was used for circular and barrel vaults. The method of burning it has survived to this day. From it also was made the plaster which in the 18th century was used to decorate not only the mihrab but also elaborately decorated tombs. There was a limited repertoire of mouldings, used also on tombs, and—more sparingly—in domestic architecture. The planning of all buildings, religious and domestic, was restricted by the span of the timber rafters, always of mangrove wood, which never exceeds 2.80 metres or approximately 9 feet. Even the vaulted buildings conform to this as to a fixed and unalterable convention. Thus even in the Great Mosque of Kilwa, with its five aisles and six bays, there is a sense of constriction rather than of spaciousness. Walls may be built of dressed coral limestone but quite commonly of coral rubble plastered over. Piers occur in mosques in Kenya and Pemba during the 14th to 16th centuries, but not in the south. After the 13th century in Tanzania, columns alone are found, some square and some octagonal. Generally, these were of dressed coral, but occasionally, as at Kaole (southern mosque) and in the northern masulal of the Great Mosque of Kilwa, wooden columns fitted into coral sockets were used. Because of the difficulty imposed by the length of the rafters, the master-builders—for only rarely can architects have been employed, and perhaps only for the Fakhr al-Din Mosque at Mogadishu—in seeking to erect a building of a particular breadth, frequently encountered the perspective of the mihrab by constructing a central arcade of pillars. This clumsy feature (which occurs quite unconnectedly in certain mediaeval European churches) appears not only in the two-aisled mosques such as those of Tongoni and Gedi but also in the four-aisled Friday Mosque of Gedi and the original North Mosque which forms part of the Great Mosque of Kilwa.

Minarets [see MANARA. 3. In East Africa] are very rare, and minbars [q.v.] have certain idiosyncratic features. In all, the mosques of the eastern African coast have a distinct regional character of their own, deriving in early times from the common use of ogival or returned-horseshoe arches, and in later times from the elaborate plaster decoration of the mihrab and its architrave. Bibliography: H. N. Chittick, Kilwa, 1975, describes the Kilwa mosques, bringing up to date P. S. Garlake, The early Islamic architecture of the East African coast, Nairobi 1966, with its numerous plates and an extensive exhaustive bibliography up to that date; G. S. P. Freeman-Grenville, Some preliminary observations of medieval mosques near Dar es Salaam, in Tanganyika Notes and Records, no. 36 (1954), is wholly superseded by the finding of better evidence for date; see also J. S. Kirkman, Men and monuments of the East African coast, London 1964, and Fort Jesus, Oxford 1974; and, for inscriptions, G. S. P. Freeman-Grenville and B. G. Martin, A preliminary handlist of the Arabic inscriptions of the eastern African coast, in JRAI (1973).

VII. In West Africa.

In Muslim West Africa, the smallest hamlet has its mosque, and the quarters of an individual town compete with one another in the construction of cultic sites. In most villages, the mosque is situated in the middle of the public square, near the tree which is the traditional place for bargaining and discussion (“palaver”); it is generally constructed in the style of a large shed, roofed with zinc plates and bamboo partitions or with banco or with moulded clay, and has the appearance, in the majority of cases, of the most attractive building in the locality, often surrounded by bushy trees. The mosque is regarded with pious respect, and is kept clean. Volunteers, often women of a certain age, accept responsibility for maintenance, making regular offerings of food and the supply of drinkable water for the faithful.

In towns, the mosque is a more substantial building
and it dominates the neighbourhood with its minaret or minarets. Sometimes, as in the case of the Murids, has three, of which the tallest, known as the "Lamp" (Fall) measures 83 m. In fact, it is the modern mosques which possess minarets; the most ancient have none, but still dominate their surroundings with cubic pillars. In small villages, the floor of the mosque is covered with matting or with fine sand which is sifting every day. In the urban setting, oriental carpets cover the floor. A palisade of bamboo or zinc plates or even a cement wall forms an enclosure within which a spacious courtyard is set out, to enable those worshippers who cannot pray at the times when the mosque is crowded to perform their religious duties. On the left side of the larger mosques, the place reserved for women is separated from that where the men pray by a metal grill.

The imam leads the prayer standing in a niche (minbar) in the kibla wall. The Great Mosque is furnished with a throne, a kind of raised dais where the imam takes his place to preach his sermon and to harangue the faithful, first in Arabic and then in the local language. All the other facilities, including lavatories and taps for ablutions, are located on the exterior. In a corner of the courtyard there is a hut for the washing of corpses.

Each imam is served by a nādib or deputy who officiates in his absence. Two or more muezzins make the call to prayer from the tops of the minarets. In the larger mosques loud-speakers have been installed, to relay either the call to prayer or the sermon of the imam. The majority of imāms receive no monthly salary. The imām of the Great Mosque of Senegal is one of the few who receives regular payment and occupies an official residence; more often, the imām and his family are accommodated in the mosque.

The architectural style reproduces especially that of the Maghrib. It is thus that the Great Mosque of Dakar, inaugurated by King Hassan II, was built under the supervision of a Moroccan architect, as was the Islamic Institute which adjoins it. However the ancient mosques of northern Senegal, including those of Halwar, Ndoum, Guédé and Diamaré, are in the Sudanese style of the mosque-institutes of the towns of Mali (Djenne, Mopti, Timbuktu, etc.) and of the land of the Sahel (cf. J. Boulegu, Les Mosquées de style soudanais au Fouta-Tooro (Senegal), in Notes africaines, 136 (Oct. 1972), 117-19). This is a style characterised by its massive buttresses exceeding the height of the roof, in a rounded, conical form, with a small cubic minaret; the whole is constructed in brick made from dried earth and covered with a facing of the same material and ochre or beige in colour. The walls are very thick. An elaborate system of ventilation maintains a freshness similar to that provided by air-conditioning.

Religious function. In West Africa, the principal function of the mosque is still religious; each quarter possesses several, and in this context a genuine rivalry prevails between quarters or between members of different brotherhoods. It is thus that the mosque of the Tijānīs is found alongside those of the Murids [see MURIDS], of the Kādirīs [see KĀDIRĪ] and of the Hamülilites [see HAMULĪL]. The faithful fill the mosques without regard for their particular affiliation. The Tijānīs organise gatherings in the mosque after morning and evening prayers to recite, in chorus, the litanies (dhikr) peculiar to their religious order. This ritual is performed around a carpet and in darkness. But on Fridays or at times of canonical festivals, great crowds of Muslims are seen streaming towards the mosques clad in their splendid bouffous or flowing robes.

Special prayers for the dead are also offered in the mosque. In this case, the bier is placed before the faithful, who pray upright without bowing or sitting. After these funeral rites, the parents of the deceased arrange a ceremony of recitation of the Qur'an "for the repose of his soul".

The veneration of which the mosque is the object inspired Cheikh El-Hadjj Malik Sy (1853-1922), founder of the ṣawiyya tijānīyya of Tivaouane, to compose a poem in Arabic consisting of forty verses in nadjī style and revealing the details of a whole system of etiquette. Cheikh Aliou Faye, the chief marabout of the Gambia, revised and embellished his master's poem, entitled his version Takḥīrat al-murid or "The way of success for the disciple". The following are a few of the verses:

Whosoever wishes to enter Paradise without punishment and without the need to give an exact account of his actions at the Resurrection, should build a mosque for God the Merciful, and he will be granted one hundred and thirty paradises in Paradise. Every believer who enters this mosque to pray will obtain a pleasant dwelling in Paradise.

A mosque may be built in any place, even in the square of a church or a a synagouge.

There it is forbidden to grow crops, to dig wells, to sew and to compose [profane] poetry.

There it is forbidden to eat garlic, leek, onion, to shave, to cause an injury to a human being, to cut the nails, to cast lice or fleas and to kill them.

To tie animals, confine the mentally ill, to allow a criminal to enter and be seated.

All mosques are of equal worth, with three exceptions: those of Mecca, Medina and Jerusalem, which are the best mosques.

Social function. Besides this predominant religious role, the mosque also performs a very important social function. It is thus, in fact, that, under the patronage of the imām, marriages are contracted between the parents of the betrothed parties. The father or guardian of the prospective bride gives her hand to the father or guardian of the suitor and receives the dowry. This function is so important that when information is sought regarding the marital status of a female person, the question is asked: "Have the men gone to the mosque for her?" (in Wolof: Ndax demnah jaka ja?). As a form of pleasantry and to tell a girl that she is nubile, the remark is made: "I shall go to see the imām about it." Parents or guardians may be accompanied to the mosque by other parents and friends who act as witnesses. The relatives of the suitor bring the dowry which they entrust to the imām; the latter gives it to the father or guardian of the prospective bride and recites the sacramental formula. In the presence of all, the imām blesses the couple. Cola, non-alcoholic drinks or delicacies are distributed.

Even though, since the promulgation of a "Family Code" in Senegal, for example, some ten years ago, marriages must be contracted before the mayor or the representative of the public authorities, it is considered that, without the mosque playing a part, the matrimonial union is not valid. Thus the imām in fact represents the local religious and municipal mosque.

Often the elders of the village hold meetings not under the traditional tree, but inside or in the courtyard of the mosque at any hour of day or night to
discuss public matters; finance for the sinking of wells, construction of a market, division of the produce of common land, preparations for the reception of distinguished guests, etc. In this case, the mosque represents a kind of national assembly where all the affairs of the village community are the object of wide and democratic debate.

Sometimes the mosque performs the role of a tribunal where disputes between members of the village are laid public and closely examined. Solutions are always formed on the basis of the Shari'a, or of local custom, or of both. These may be disputes between spouses, between two dignitaries, between two families, between herdsmen and stock-breeders, between a representative of the state and local landowners, between traditional chiefs and religious leaders. Sometimes the division of bequests is performed in the mosque under the supervision of the imam.

Some mosques provide places of lodging for strangers. It is in this way that travelling Muslims are accommodated. Furthermore, any person who is regarded as having lived a pious life and who has contributed to the building of the mosque, is buried there after his death. Such is the case of Cheikh Ahmadou Bamba Mbacke, Cheikh El-Hadji Malik Sy, Cheikh Ibrahima Niasse, Cheikh Ahmadou Anta Samb, and Bouba Kounta respectively at Touba, Tivaouane, Kaolack, Kébémer and Ndianass (Senegal).

Many other men renowned for their piety or for their work in the service of Islam are entombed within or in close proximity to the mosque.

**Economic function.** The economic function of the mosque is explained by the fact that the temporal is always closely linked with the spiritual. Thus, for example, the sums raised from legal alms (zakat) are in most cases entrusted to the imam of the mosque who, as an expert in the matter, ensures that they are distributed to those entitled to them. Sometimes cattle are led to the mosque to be slaughtered by the imam, who distributes the meat to the needy. Every Friday, a whole army of beggars is seen flocking to the mosques, attracted by the prospect of receiving charity from the wealthier believers. The same spectacle is witnessed during the major Islamic feasts of Tabaski and Kurité.

The imam received a gratuity for his services when marriage is celebrated. Even though the sum is by no means considerable, it is important for the imam who is not salaried. In the course of one Sunday afternoon he may preside over several marriage ceremonies. Furthermore, numerous mosques receive requests for readings of the Kur'an in exchange for a certain sum, the amount being left to the discretion of the customer.

Mosques which incorporate tombs receive a profitable income as a result of daily, weekly, monthly and annual pilgrimages or on the occasion of major Islamic feasts. This applies in the case of the mosque of Touba during the well-known feast of Magal, which commemorates the departure into exile (in 1895) of Cheikh Ahmadou Bamba Mbacke, founder of the brotherhood of the Murids, and of Tivaouane at the time of the Mawlid [see MAWLID].

**Cultural function.** Although the mosque in West Africa fulfils a considerable economic role, its function in the cultural sphere is more striking. In the majority of cases, the courtyard of the mosque is the setting for a Koranic school. Sometimes dozens of young children, boys and girls, are seen squatting in a half-circle before their master, who sits either on the ground, on a sheepskin rug or reclining on a couch, holding a cane. Each pupil places on his knees a tablet on which the lesson to be learned is inscribed in ink made from Arabic ink and cooked-pot cooking-pots. In the evening, after twilight and before the meal, a large fire is lit and the verses to be learned are read by the light of the flames. By this educational method, in the shadow of the mosque, many scholars arrive at the point where they can recite the entire Holy Book by heart.

The mosque also serves as a high school and university when, having memorised the Kur'an, the pupils become students and learn the other Islamic sciences: exegesis, hadith, theology, mysticism, Muslim law and even literature, history, logic, astronomy, rhetoric, etc.

It is also in the mosque that lectures are held on various subjects relating to religion, as well as educational lectures given by scholars or distinguished guests from other Muslim countries. In the mosque, throughout the month of Ramadan, marabout exeges expound and comment on the Kur'an before an audience, either to recall the teaching of the Holy Book or to instruct the faithful. On the “Night of Destiny” nobody sleeps, and reverent vigil is held in the mosque. Also in the mosque, particularly at Tivaouane, the sanctuary of Tidjânism in Senegal, the head khâfifa of the disciples of the brotherhood founded by Ahmad al-Tidjâni (1737-1815 [q.v.]) expounds and comments on the Bûrûjûrî (608-ca.695/1212-ca.1295 [q.v. in Suppl.]).

**Political function.** Finally, the mosque performs in West Africa a political function which is far from insignificant, because the region contains a very substantial percentage of Muslims. This figure is increasing as a result of large-scale conversion to Islam of followers of other religions (Christianity and animism). Islam has enjoyed a revival of activity under pressure exerted both from the interior of this zone and, to a lesser extent, from the exterior. In Senegal, for example, the quite recent appointment of M. Abdou Diouf to the post of chief magistrate has had a considerable influence in this domain, to such an extent that, unlike his predecessor, the head of state, accompanied by the presidents of the National Assembly and the Economic and Social Council, parades in the mosques which incorporate tombs in exchange for a certain sum, the amount being left to the discretion of the customer.

This account of the activity of the present President of the Republic of Senegal applies to the other Muslim Heads of State of West Africa.

The imam often uses the occasion of the Friday Prayer to draw attention in his khâbba to themes of concern to the government such as the misappropriation of public funds, corruption, juvenile delinquency, drugs, prostitution, the degradation of morals, the urgent need to combat bush-fires and desertification. After this survey of the functions of the mosque in West Africa, it may be affirmed that it performs a multifarious role in this region by virtue of its status as the supreme place of prayer.

**Bibliography:** J. M. Cuq, Les Musulmans en Afrique, Paris 1973, 103-274, gives information and bibliographies concerning religious life in West Africa; see also, in particular, J. Schacht, *Sur la diffusion des formes d'architecture religieuse musulmane à
MASDJID — AL-MASDJID AL-AKSA, literally, "the remotest sanctuary." There are three meanings to these words.
1. The words occur in Kur‘ān, XVII, 1: "Praise Him who made His servant journey in the night (asrā) from the sacred sanctuary (al-masjid al-ḥaram) to the remotest sanctuary (al-masjid al-akṣā), which we have surrounded with blessings to show him of our signs." This verse, usually considered to have been revealed during the Prophet's last year in Mecca before the Hijra, is very difficult to explain within the context of the time. There is no doubt that al-masjid al-ḥaram is the then pegan sanctuary of Mecca. But whether the event itself was a physical one and then connected with a small locality near Mecca which had two mosques, a nearer one and a farther one (A. Guillaume, Where was al-Masjid al-Aqṣā?, in Andalus, xvii [1953]), or a spiritual and mystical night-journey (asrā) and ascension (mi`rāj [q. e.]) to a celestial sanctuary; a consensus was established very early (perhaps as early as the year 15 A.H., cf. J. Horovitz, Konanische Untersuchungen, Berlin 1926, 140) that al-masjid al-akṣā meant Jerusalem. By the time of Ibn al-Hajjām’s Sīra, nearly all the elements of what was to go on to be Jerusalem’s grandest and richest mosque were in place. Such ideas in Islam were in place. Their study and the diverse and at times contradictory interpretations found in early commentaries of the Kur‘ān derive from a complex body of religious sources (references in R. Blachère, Le Coran, Paris 1949, ii, 374) which have not yet been completely unravelled.
2. The words were occasionally used in early Islamic and later Arabic sources; more specifically for the Haram al-Sharif [q. v.], the former Herodian Temple area transformed by early Islam into a restricted Muslim space.
3. The most common use of the words is for the large building located on the south side of the Haram platform and, next to the Dome of the Rock (Kubbat al-Sakhra [q. e.]), the most celebrated Islamic building in Jerusalem. Its archaeological history has been superimposed by W. Hamilton, The structural history of the Aqṣā Mosque, and his conclusions were entirely accepted by K. A. C. Creswell and incorporated in his Early Islamic architecture, Oxford 1969, 373-80. Such points of debate as do exist (H. Stern, Recherches sur la Mosquée al-Aqṣâ et ses mosaïques, in Ars Orientalis, v [1963]) deal only with the precise dating of the archaeologically-determined sequences of building, not with their character. From the 4th/10th century onward, precious descriptions by al-Mukaddasi, Nasīr-i Khusraw and, much later, Muḥammad ibn al-Din's chronicle of Jerusalem, provide a unique written documentation which has been made accessible in several books, of which the more important ones are G. Le Strange, Palestine under the Moslems, London 1890, and M. S. Marmardji, Textes géographiques arabes sur la Palestine, Paris 1951, 210-60. An easily accessible survey of drawings and plans is found in Eli Silad, Meqsid al-Akṣā, Jerusalem 1978. For inscriptions, one should consult M. van Berchem, CIA, Jerusalem, Cairo 1927, ii, 2, and S.A.S. Hussein, Inscription of the Khatif El-Mustarshir, in QDAP, ix (1942); A. G. Walls and A. Abul-Hajj, Arabic inscriptions in Jerusalem, London 1980, 24-5, for a checklist. Finally, it is possible that a unique picture of Zion in the medieval period is preserved in the 14th century A.D. manuscript known as the Chludoj Psalter, in Harvard Ukrain.
drum with its brilliant panels of an idealised garden with Umayyad and possibly Antique reminiscences, transformed the mosque into a true masterpiece of Syrian woodwork was destroyed by an arsonist in 1969 before it had been possible to study it fully. The northern porch was restored in 1217 and the eastern and western vaults re-done in 1345 and 1350. Under the later Ottomans, numerous repairs, often of dubious quality, and plasterings or repaintings altered considerably the expressiveness of what was essentially a Fātimid building with major Crusader, Ayyūbid and Mamluk details. It was only in the nineteenth-twenties and especially between 1937 and 1942 that a major and carefully supervised programme of restoration took place.

In spite of scholarly debates which will continue to grow about this or that detail, and this or that date for specific features of the building, the chronology of the monument is reasonably set. What is far more difficult to define and to explain is its function, and on that issue the debate has barely begun. As a work of art, should the nineteen-twenties and especially between 1937 and 1942 that a major and carefully supervised programme of restoration took place.
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The masjids, between the Ka'ba and the south-east of the mosque, the masākim (or masālīs) al-Ḥanbalī, to the south and east, the masākim al-Mālikī, to the west, and the masākim al-Ḥanbali. The latter has two stories; the upper one was used by the mu'ādhīhin and the muhābīthin, the lower by the imāms and his assistants. Since Wakhāri rule has been established, the Ḥanbalī imām, masākim has been given the place of honour; it is also reported that the ādal is conducted by turns by the imāms of the four rites (OM, vii, 25). The masākim al-Ḥanbalī site on the old Meccan council-chamber (dār al-nuḍūr) in which the course of centuries was several times rebuilt and used for different purposes. The masākim is marked by a row of thin brass columns connected by a wire. The lamps for lighting are fixed to this wire and in the colonnades. After the mosque, the masākim (Musalla) al-Hanbali, to the north-west of the mosque, the musallas, has for centuries been the centre of the intellectual life of the metropolis of Islam. This fact has resulted in the building of madrasas and risālas for students in or near the mosque, for example, the madrasa of Kā'īt Bey on the left as one enters through the Bāb al-Salām. Many of these mosques have however in course of time become devoted to other purposes (Burchhardt, i, 282; Snouck Hurgronje, Mekka, i, 17).

For the best off the mosque, cf. SHAYBA, BUN; Burchhardt, i, 287-91.


MASDĪDĪ (ṣ.), pl. masājjīyān, an adjective formed from masjid, but specifically concerning the Friday mosque of Basra and used to designate groups (see al-Djähīz, Hayawān, iii, 360) of adults or young people who were accustomed to meet together in that building, near the gate of the Banū Suhayl, as well as of poets, popular storytellers (kussād [see kāṭ]), and transmitters of religious, historical and literary traditions, in particular, those regarding poetic verses. The information which we possess on the masājjīyān in general comes from al-Djähīz, who seems clearly to have acquired them from his youth, part of his cultural formation and perhaps also some of the traits of his character. He was especially interested in a group which was probably composed of Basran bourgeois or, at all events, of idlers who exchanged ideas and held conversations on subjects which were probably more varied (see e.g. Bayān, i, 243) than those for which he puts forward some examples in his K. al-Bukāla'(ed. Hāfīz, 24-8; tr. Pellat, 41-8); the conversations thus reproduced are imitations of the masājjīy, but tell us to classify the persons taking part in these conversations as part of the class of misers.

Nevertheless, al-Djähīz frequented other masājjīyān: not only poets—al-Ḥāfīz (Muwattā, 116) could not appreciate their verses, and al-Marzubān (Mu'jam, 379) states that Abû 'Imrān Muḥammad b. al-Marzubān, was a masājjī, but also traditionists who themselves wrote books, since, in regard to two hadīths, he states that he did not gather them directly from the mouth of some scholar but that he had read them in some book of masājjīyān (Bayān, iii, 57-8). He mentions however (ibid., i, 220) that one tayammūm of the mosque only wanted to frequent persons amongst whom were included traditionists handing on hadīths on the authority of al-Ḥasan (M. al-Ṭārīqī [q. v.]) and ruwāt [see sawī] who were reciting the verses of al-Farāzādāk [q. v.]. It should be noted that it is concerning the transmitters of classical poetry installed at the Mirbād [q. v.], the mirhabiyān, or in the Friday mosque, that al-Djähīz observes the changes of taste among lovers of poetry which were discernable precisely in these ruwāt's audience (Bayān, iv, 23).

Bibliography: Given in the article. See also Pellat, Le milieu basrien et la formation de Ghāzī, 244-5.

(CH. PELLAT)

AL-MASH 'ALĀ 'L-KHUFFAYN (A.), literally: "passing the moistened hand over the boots", designates the right whereby Sunni Muslims may, in certain circumstances, pass the hand over their shoes instead of washing their feet as a means of preparing themselves for the saying of the ritual prayer. Al-Djurjānī (Ta'rifāt, ed. Tunis 1971, 112) proposes a definition of the masākid: "passing the moistened hand without making (water) flow" (imrār al-yad al-muhallala bi-lā tasayl), which justifies the translation by "wetting of the shoes" which is adopted by L. Bercher and G. Bousquet (see below), but the term in question nevertheless remains ambiguous. In fact, if in the verses IV, 46/43, and V, 8-9/6, of the Kur'ān, the term mash refers to ablutions which necessarily entail the use of a certain quantity of water and consequently has the sense of "to wash", as is suggested by the Lisan, it is also employed in the same verses in reference to ritual purification with sand or soil (tayammum [q. v.] and therefore no longer has the same meaning. In his translation of the Kur'ān (iii, 1115), R. Blachère points out moreover that it is quite inaccurate to render this verb by "to wipe" or "to rub", since it properly signifies, in these contexts, "to pass the hand over". Unlike the tayammum, the mash 'alā 'l-khuffayn is not envisaged by the Holy Book, and it is probable that the practice in question, although ancient, was only tolerated at a relatively late date, to take into account difficulties which could face armies in the field, and after provoking debate in the very bosom of the Median school. Ultimately it constituted, along with, especially, mut'a [q. v.], one of the most manifest signs of the rift between Sunnis and Shi'is, for the latter, like the Khāridjis, do not recognise it. The different Sunni schools now base their doctrine, in this context, on a half-dozen hadīths whose authenticity is accepted by al-Bukāra and Muslim, and on a number of other more liberal, but nevertheless for that reason more suspect traditions.

From "authentic" hadīths it emerges that the Prophet was observed to practise the mash 'alā 'l-
khuffayn. However, Djarir b. cAbd Allah al-Badjah, who was converted after the revelation of the Meccan sura al-Muddathir (V), which contains instructions relating to ablutions and to the taqaffud (see above), claimed that he himself had seen Muhammad passing the hand over his shoes; but his colleagues contested the validity of his statements and declared that the revelation of the verses in question had ipso facto put an end to the legality of this practice. This testimony, which has not been retained by al-Baglari, does not seem to have shaken the conviction of later fukahdi, any more than another more or less controversial tradition which official doctrine has retained, no doubt because it provides an additional benefit: according to Khuzayma b. Thâbit and Abû Bakra, the Prophet was reported to have permitted the Muslim to observe the mash' 'alî 'l-khuffayn for a day and a night when he is in fixed residence (mâkin), and for three days and three nights when he is travelling. According to another 'authentic' hadîth, al-Mughirà b. Shu'ba, who travelled in the company of Muhammad, bent down to take off his shoes in order to perform his ablutions, but the Prophet said to him: 'Leave them, for I put them (+ the feet) into [my boots], when they were in a state of ritual purity (jâhînîn)', and he passed his hand over his shoes. From this hadîth, the fukahdi have retained the obligation of the believer who wishes to cleanse himself of a minor defilement (hadath [q.v.]) by means of this indulgence, to wash his feet and polish his shoes before putting them on, and not to take them off in the meantime.

Regarding the legal manner of performing the mash', Ibn Abî Zayd al-Kayrawâni, of the Malikî school, describes it clearly in his Risâla al-Madam, who has taken care to indicate in his text his sources. Ibn al-Kifti, 327, and Ibn al-Kifti, 193/809 (in Muntakhûf min al-sunan al-musnada '-an Rasul Allah, ed. C. T. Bercher, Algiers, 1949, 50/51): 'The believer will place the right hand on the upper part of the shoe [for the right foot], beginning with the extremity of the toes. He will place his left hand underneath and thus make the hands glide as far as and including the pegs. He will do the same for the shoe of the left foot, putting his left hand above and his right hand underneath. But he will not let his hand touch the ground which may be under his shoe, or touch the dung of a beast of burden. He must previously raise his foot when rubbing or washing.' The author adds that, according to another opinion, 'the believer must wet the underside of the shoes, beginning with the pegs and ending with the extremities of the toes.'

The classical manual of Western Malikism, the Mughâtasr of Khalîl b. Ishâk (tr. G. H. Bousquet, Algiers 1956, i, 34-5) presents an even more detailed account of the mash' 'alî 'l-khuffayn. It envisages in fact the use of a kind of slipper (jawrîb) inside the boot proper, and prescribes that the mash' should be performed on both pieces of leather; it forbids the use of a slipper which is too large or torn, because it must be firmly fixed to the foot, cover it completely and not let water penetrate through any crevice. This author also considers cases where the mash' is invalidated, for example if the ghûf [q.v.] is obligatory, if the individual has forgotten to pass his hand over the upper part of the shoe, etc.

Bibliography: All the hadîths concerning the mash' have been conveniently assembled by Ibn al-Djârûd al-Nâsûbî (d. 1307/1919-20) in his Kitâb al-Muntakhab min al-yunân al-masnâda 'an Rasûl Allâh, ed. Cairo 1932/1963 by 'Abd Allâh Hajjîm al-Yamani al-Madâni, who has added certain incipits in his notes (37-9) more or less important collections in which they figure; the same editor has proceeded in the same fashion with the Dhâms al-fawâ'id min al-Djâms al-asil (Medina 1381/1971, i, 104-7) for the Moroccan Mucadd al-Mcadd al-Sulaymân (1309/1603-83). See also R. Strothmann, Kultus der Zaiditen, Strasbourg 1912, 21 ff.; A. Wensinck, The Muslim creed, Cambridge 1932, index, s.v. shoes; J. Schlacht, The origins of Muhammadan jurisprudence, Oxford 1950, 263-4.

MÂSHÂ ALLâH (a.), a phrase occurring in the Kur'ân (VI, 126; VII, 188; X, 50; XVIII, 37; LXXVII, 7; cf. XI, 109-10, LXXII, 8) and widely used in the Islamic lands of the Middle East with the general meaning of 'what God does, is well done'. The formula denotes that things happen according to God's will and should therefore be accepted with humility and resignation. In a cognate signification, the phrase is often used to indicate a vague, generally a great or considerable, but some times a small, number or quantity of time (Lane, Lexicon, s.v.), who refers to S. de Sacy, Relation de l'Egypte, 246, 394). One might compare ilâ mà shâ'â Allâhu "forever and ever" (Wehr, Dictionary of modern written Arabic, s.v.). The phrase is also the equivalent of the English 'God knows what', and, as signifying 'what God has willed', expresses admiration or surprise.

According to TA, in Lane, Lexicon, s.v., a Jew addressed the Prophet, objecting to his people's saying mà shâ'â Allâhu "what God has willed and I have willed", as implying the association of another being with God. The Prophet then ordered them to say mà shâ'â Allâhu gâmuâ thî'â 'what God has willed and then I have willed'.

In Konya, blue hemispheres are found, representing half an eyeball, covered with silver-thread textile with which the phrase is embroidered. Because of the decorative character of the Arabic script, the hemispheres are also worn as ornaments (K. Kris and H. Kris-Heinrich, Volkskunde im Bereich des Islam, ii, 12, 65 and pl. 7). As a charm to protect from the effect of the evil eye, the phrase is found on zár [q.v.] amulets and on amulets worn by children and domestic animals (ibid., ii, 43, 66, 67, 153, and pl. 76; F. Th. Djeloma, The Ottoman historical monumental inscription in Edirne, Leiden 1977, 137; the amulet collection of the Ethnographical Museum, Cairo; Lane, Manners and customs, ch. xi). According to L. Einnsler, Das bösse Auge, in ZDPV, xii (1889), 200 ff., there were silver amulets in Jerusalem with the formula on the obverse, the reverse bearing the invocations yâ kâfî, yâ sîfî, yâ hâfî, yâ aîmîn. In Turkey, the phrase is often found on the fronts of trucks and cars.

Bibliography: In the article, and see also M. Piamenta, Islam in everyday Arabic speech, Leiden 1979; idem, The Muslim conception of God and human welfare as reflected in everyday Arabic speech, Leiden 1983 (Ed.).

MÂSHÂ ALLâH b. Âdâhari or b. Sâriya, Jewish astrologer of Basra (although the frequent confusion between Başrî and Misrî has sometimes led to his being considered an Egyptian). His Hebrew name was perhaps Manasseh (the Fihrist, 273-4, and Ibn al-Kifti, 327, call him Mîshâ) and in Persian he was known as Yâzdânîkâst which, like Mâshâ Allâh, signifies 'that which God wills'. According to the Fihrist, the period of his activity extended from the reign of al-Mansûr (327/838-73) to that of al-Mâmûn (198-218/813-33), but the last date to be placed definitely within his lifetime is 393/998 (in Furû' al-dhâlim, which states that he knew that of the death of al-Râshîd) With Nawbakht, 'Umar b. Farrâkân al-Tabâri and al-Fazâri, he drew the horoscope favourable to the foun-
MĀSHĀʾULLAH

dation of Baghdad (3 Djumada I 145/30 July 762); this horoscope, which has been preserved (see al-Birūnī, al-Azhār al-bārīyā, ed. Sachau, Leipzig 1923, 270-1), had probably been calculated on the basis of the Pahlavi original text of the Zīdī al-Shāh. On the evidence of his Kitāb al-Kirānat, it seems to have been of pro-Iranian and anti-AbūlBāsīd sentiment; he hoped in fact that the caliphate would be overthrown in 200/815 and that power would pass to the Persians.

In the Fihrist, Ibn al-Nadīm mentions 19 works of Māshāʾallah, and al-Kīfī reproduces this list in his Taʾrīkh al-Hukūmaṭ. The generally most complete and most recent studies which mention the titles of these works and the ms. in which they are preserved are those of D. Pingree, Māshāʾallah, in Dict. of scientific biography, New York 1974, 159-62, and F. Sezgin, GAS, vi, 127-9, viii, 102-8.

Of the corpus of known works, discussion here will be limited to the following:

1. Fi ʾl-kirānat wa ʾl-shāh wa ʾl-mīlāl ("On conjunctions, religions and communities"), an astrological history of mankind, and of Islam in particular, which is known to us by means of a summary by Ibn Hibīnāt, E. S. Kennedy and D. Pingree (The astrological history of Māshāʾallah, Cambridge, Mass. 1971, 1-25) have published a facsimile of the ms., with a translation and a study of the summary of this work, which is based on a copy of the Sasanian theoretical astrology which explains the major changes which have taken place in human history by reference to conjunctions of Jupiter and Saturn, and of the Zoroastrian theory of millennia which attributes a thousand years to each planet from the time of the creation of the world (-8291), the cycle being repeated up until the figure of 12 millennia which will be reached in the year 3799 A.D. Ibn Hibīnāt’s summary also contains 16 horoscopes, probably those of Māshāʾallah himself and calculated on the basis of the Zīdī al-Shāh: Kennedy and Pingree have made use of the numerical figuring in these horoscopes, combined with the sparse information supplied by other sources (essentially al-Birūnī) to reconstruct the principal parameters employed in the Persian tables mentioned above (see also J. J. Burckhardt and B. L. van der Waerden, Das astronomische System der persischen Tafeln I, in Centaurus, xxii [1968], 1-28).

2. Fi ʾkīmāt al-khālafa ʾmaʿma-rīfāt kīyām malāt ("On the accession of caliphs and knowledge of the accession of each king"), of which the original Arabic, preserved, has been translated and studied by Kennedy and Pingree, in The astr. history, 129-43. After a general theoretical survey, the work contains horoscopes of the spring equinoxes at which the Prophet and 18 caliphs (from Abu Bakr to Hārūn al-Raḍī) acceded to power. To calculate these, Māshāʾallah also made use of the Zīdī al-Shāh.

3. Kitāb al-Mawādīl ("Book of genethliac themes"), known only through some quotations made by a disciple of the author, Abu ʾAli al-Khayyāt, and through a Latin translation edited and studied by Pingree (The astr. history, 145-74). It contains 12 natal horoscopes dating from between 36 and 542 A.D.; three of them derive from the Pentateuch of Dorotheus of Sidon (50-75 A.D.), and the other nine from an unknown Greek astrological work dating from the 6th century. He interprets the horoscopes according to the doctrine of Dorotheus, whose work he probably knew through the Pahlavi translation. The influence of this writer is also perceptible in the Super significationsibus planetarum in nativitate of Māshāʾallah, which survives only in Latin translation.


5. De scientis motus orbis or De elementis et orbitus coelestibus or De sphaera mota, preserved in Latin translation, contains a study of the Physics of Aristotle (chs. 1-7), as well as an introduction to astronomy (chs. 8-24), both of these based on Syriac sources. The astronomical source mentions Ptolemy and Theod. of Alexandria, but the planetary models described are pre-Ptolemaic Greek (they do not, in fact, employ the equant and introduce no specific apparatus for the moon and Mercury) and similar to those found in Sanskrit texts since the end of the 5th century (cf. D. Pingree, Mashaʾallah: some Sasanian and Syrian sources, in G. F. Hourani (ed.), Essays on Islamic philosophy and science, Albany 1975, 5-14).

6. Kitāb al-Amīrāt wa ʾl-riyāḍ ("Book of the rains and the winds"), ed. and tr. by G. Levi Della Vida (Un opuscolo astrologico di Māšāʾallah, in RSO, xiv [1933-4], 270-81), concerns the astrological procedure for predicting rain. A Latin version also exists.

7. Epistola de rebus eclipsium, De ratione circuli et stellarum, Liber Messehalla in radicis revolutionum, De receptione, De elementis et orbitus coelestibus, published by B. R. Goldstein (The Book on eclipses by Māšāʾallah, in Physis, vi [1964], 205-13). It is divided into 12 chapters, of which the first contains a curious reference to magnetism in a cosmological context: the ascending node, the stars and the planets exert an influence on the earth in the same manner that magnetic stone attracts iron. It is appropriate also to mention the use, in this text, of a classification of planetary conjunctions distinct from that which figures in Fi ʾl-kirānat.


The work of Māšāʾallah is that of a writer who has
little interest in astronomy, but has cultivated all the branches of astrology which he has widely pro-
mulgated and popularised; nevertheless, it has con-
siderable interest from the astronomical point of view,
on account of the sources used (Persian, Syriac and,
directly or indirectly, Greek), which throw light on a
very early period in the history of Arab-Islamic astronomy.

**Bibliography** : Given in the article. See also L. Thorne
dike, *The Latin translations of the astrological works by Mesuha
al, in Osiris, xii (1956), 49-72; F. J. Car
crodey, *Arabic astronomical and astrological sciences in Latin translation*, Berkeley-Los Angeles 1956, 23-
38; E. S. Kennedy, *The Syriac astronomical hand-
b ook Ziyi' Shakh and the astrological doctrine of "transit"
(mamarr), in JAS, lxxvii (1958), 246-62 (re-ed.
in Kennedy and others, Studies, 319-35); Kennedy,
D. Pingree and F. I. Haddad, *The Book of the reasons
behind astronomical tables by 'Ali b. Salumayn al-
Hâhmi*, New York 1981, 183, 186-7, 191, 284,
284, 321-3 (J. Samsô).

**MASHAF** [see MUSHAF]

**MASHÅKA**, Muhammad, a person of secondary
importance of the *Naheda* [q.v.] (b. Raghmâyá
20 March 1800, d. Damascus 6 July 1888). Born in the
Greek Melkite rite, he began his studies in Egypt in
astronomy, mathematics and the natural sciences.
As a silk weaver, he studied music *Rüscâ fi'ann al-mâzîk*,
ed. René Révère, in al-Mahrâj [1899], pp. 146. As an
official, a representative of Şihâb and vice-consul for
the United States, and then merchant, he took up
medicine (doctor of medicine at Cairo, 1845). In 1848
at Damascus he joined the Protestant faith. The ensu-
ing polemics can be found in *al-Dalil il'dtd al-Indjîl*,
*al-Machriq* [1899], pp. 146). As an
official, a representative of Şihâb and vice-consul for
the United States, and then merchant, he took up
medicine (doctor of medicine at Cairo, 1845). In 1848
at Damascus he joined the Protestant faith. The ensu-
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Māliki, *Riyād, ii, 502* in order to convert to the Shi'i heresy. An assembly at al-Kayrawan brought together "Sunnis and *mashrika*" (*ibid., ii, 330*), i.e. Shi'i *mashrika*. See also examples in *ibid., ii, 425*, 427, and in *Tabī, op. cit.*, 369, 383, 394.

The terms *irākī* (or abī al-*Irāk*) and *Kāfī* were, on the other hand, more often reserved for Ifṣīkīyān Ḥanafī (al-Māliki, *Riyād, i*, 181, 256, 263, 264, 277, 374, 375, 451, 452, 463, 500, *ii*, 29, 73, 207, 339; and *Tabī, op. cit.*, index s.v. *Irākīyyāt*). These last, in contradiction from the Mālikīs who made up the spear-head of opposition to the Fātimids, showed themselves as much more receptive to Shi'i propaganda, which may be a contributory cause to their disappearance from the North African scene, after having formed the majority there (*Tabī, L'emirat aghlabide, 233*), once *ṣī'a* was itself extirpated.

Above all, it was in a dual role, religious and cultural, that the *mashrika* played an outstanding part in the Muslim West. Certainly, none of their outstanding stars went beyond the Nile valley. The *mashrika* is to some extent a land of exile where only persons relatively in the second rank sought their fortune, which does not however mean that their role was any the less decisive. Let us mention, for example, that ʿIyād *q.v.* had among his masters two Mashārikīs who had visited Ceuta, Abu ʿl-Ḥasan al-Rabīʿ al-Makdisī (d. at al-Nāṣiriyya in 531/1137, ʿIyād, *Ghunna, no. 81*) and the ʿShāfiʿī Sahl b. ʿUṭğmān al-Nisābūrī (no. 89; al-Makkarī, *Naḥf*, ed. Ihsān ʿAbbās, Beirut 1968, *ii*, 67). Naturally, one cannot give here an exhaustive survey. Such a survey, which has not yet been done, would however show itself as very suggestive and open up many directions for research. The sources and a tour de force at present have not, in any case, kept note of everything. Al-Makkarī, who devotes 86 biographical notices to the *mashrika* who resided in al-Andalus (*Naḥf, iii*, 5-149), remarks that "one cannot give an exhaustive list of them, even when limiting oneself to the most outstanding ones (*ibid., iii*, 5). For his part, Ibn Baḥḵuwail provides us with over 50 names of Mashārikīs whom he had visited in Muslim Spain (al-Nīsābūrī, *Naḥf*, classified in an approximately alphabetical order at the end of each section, under the rubric waʾ- *mn al-ghuraba* ...).

Among the top figures, three are especially representative of the role played by the *mashrika* in the Muslim West, comprising two philologist *adāb* and a musician. Abū ʿAli al-Kāfī (288-356/901-67 *q.v.*) arrived in Cordova in 330/942 and was received with great pomp (al-Makkarī, *ii*, 71-2). Drawing on his rich library, and also on his memory, he spread eastern culture over a wide range, and he thus occupies the position of "the key figure in the ʿIrākī tradition in the West" (*R. Sellheim, *EF* art. s.v.*). The figure of Sāʿīd al-Baḥgādī (d. 747/1062 *q.v.*) is in a sense even more representative and of heightened relief (see R. Blachere, *Un pionnier de la literatur arabes en Espagne au Xe siecle. Sāʿīd de Bagdad*, in *Analecta*, Damascus 1975, 443-65). This was that of "a fairly picturesque Bohemian" (*op. cit.*, 445), certainly, enough of a flamboyant figure to shine at court. Having been compelled to "give up the idea of making a name for himself in *Iraq*", he took the road for Cordova, where he became "something like the type of the pioneer of oriental literary culture in Spain during the second half of the 10th century" (*465*). Ziryāb (173-243/789-857 *q.v.*) was a black musician who had first of all gravitated into the orbit of the "Aṭbaʾī court in Baghdād. Having aroused jealousies there, he also had to renounce making an impression in ʿIrāk, and, after a brief stay in al- Ḥayrāj, was compelled to set off, little by little, finding there in 20/822. His enormous influence was not just in the musical sphere. "Under the unchallenged arbitration of Ziryāb, the court and the town altered their dress, their furnishings [and] their cuisine" (E. Lévi-Provençal, *Hist. Esp. mus.*, Paris 1950, i, 272).

**Bibliography:** There is no specific bibliographical treatment for this topic. In addition to references given in the text, information can be gleaned from all the historical works, from the *adāb* literature and, above all, from the *fahākāt*. (M. Tabī)

*MASHHAD* (a.), noun of place from the verb *ghāhid* "to witness, be present at" > "be a martyr,* ghāhid*" (a post-Kūrānī semantic development which Goldzweker thought was influenced by Eastern Christian Syriac parallel usage; see *Mashudi-Studien, ii*, 387-9, Eng. tr. *ii*, 350-2). In post-Kūrānī times also, the noun *mashhad* developed from its designating any sacred place, not necessarily having a construction associated with it, but often in fact a tomb in general, the burial place of an earlier prophet, saint or forerunner of Muhammad or of any Muslim who had had pronounced over him the *ghāhadā* or profession of faith. Later, it might mean a martyrdom specifically or be used for any small building associated with any religious feature like a *mihrab* [q.v.].

The earliest Islamic commemorative structures, notes and documents, in *Ars Orientalis*, vi [1966], 9-12. Literary sources, e.g. the early geographers, mention *mashhads* of what are clearly highly varying natures (see e.g. al-Mukkaddasi, tr. A. Miquel, *La meilleure repartition*, Damascus 1963, 6 n. 15), but an early epigraphic instance of the term's usage is on the frieze of the *Mashhad al-Riḍā* (288-356/901-67), the tomb tower in Gurgan erected by the Bāwāndīl local ruler, the Ḡubābādī Muhammad b. Wādārīn, in 407-11/1016-21, where this edifice is described as a *mashhad* (see M. Van Berchem, *Die Inschriften der Grabtürme, i*, in E. Diez, *Chasasische Baudenkmäler, i*, Berlin 1918, 87-90; *RCEA*, iv, nos. 2312-13; *Kitābāt 9*, Iran and Transoxiana and Pl. XIX no. 22).

For the tomb of the caliph and First Imam of the *Shīʿa*, ʿAli, the Mashāhīd ʿAlī, see *Al-Najaf*; for that of the Third Imam, al-Husayn, the Mashāhīd *al-Ibān*; for that of the Eighth Imam, ʿAli al-Riḍā, the Mashāhīd in *Khorāsān*, see the next article.

**Bibliography:** (in addition to references given in the article): See M. Hartmann, in *ZDPV, xxiv* (1901), 63-6 and 65 n. 2; Van Berchem, *Opera minora*, ed. A Louca and Ch. Genequand, Geneva 1978, index s.v.; and the arts. *Bakrī* in *Suppl., Kubba, Mashāhīd* 1. b. 4 Tomb-mosques, and *Tubbā*.

(C. E. Bosworth)

*MASHHAD*, a city of northeastern Persia, the capital of the present province of Khorāsān [q.v.] and the location since medieval times of one of the most important shrines of the *Shīʿa* world built around the tomb of the Eighth Imam ʿAli al-Riḍā [q.v.].

1. **Geography, history and topography** to 1914. Mashhad lies 3,000 feet above sea level in 59° 35' E. long. and 16° 17' N. lat. in the valley from 10 to 25 miles broad of the Kaghaf-Rūd, also called Ab-i Mashhad, which joins the Hari Rūd [q.v.] about 100 miles S.E. of Mashhad on the Russo-Persian frontier. Mashhad lies about 4 miles south of the bank of the Han Rud, which joins the Han Rud at Mashhad, which joins the Han Rud about 100 miles S.E. of Mashhad on the Russo-Persian frontier.

2. **Description** to 1914. Mashhad lies 3,000 feet above sea level in 59° 35' E. long. and 16° 17' N. lat. in the valley from 10 to 25 miles broad of the Kaghaf-Rūd, also called Ab-i Mashhad, which joins the Hari Rūd [q.v.] about 100 miles S.E. of Mashhad on the Russo-Persian frontier. Mashhad lies about 4 miles south of the bank of the Kaghaf-Rūd, which rises in the hills which run along the valley rise to 8,000 or 9,000 feet near Mashhad. In consequence of its high situation and proximity to the mountains,
the climate of Mashhad is in the winter rather severe, in the summer, however, often tropically hot; it is regarded as healthy.

Mashhad is a double town. It may in a way be regarded as the successor of the older pre-Islamic Tūs [q.v.], and it has not infrequently been erroneously confounded with it.

The fact that Tūs is the name of both a town and a district, together with the fact that two places are always mentioned as the principal towns of this district, has given rise among the later Arab geographers to the erroneous opinion that the capital Tūs was a double town consisting of Tābarān and Nūkān; e.g. Yakūt, iii, 560, 5 (correct at iv, 824, 23) and in the Lubāb of Ibn al-Azhur quoted by Abu 'l-Fidā'ī (T'isewīn, 453). Al-Kazwīnī (Ağār al-bilād, 275, 21) next made the two towns thought to be joined together into two quarters (mahalla). This quite erroneous idea of a double town Tūs found its way into European literature generally. Sykes (JRAS [1910], 1115-16) and following him, E. Diez (Churarzaniische Baudenkmäler, Berlin 1918, i, 53-4) have rightly challenged this untenable idea. The older Arab geographers quite correctly distinguish between Tābarān and Nūkān as two quite separate towns. Nūkān, according to the express testimony of the Arabic sources, was only 1/4 parasang (farsakh) or one Arabic mile from the tomb of Hārūn al-Rashīd and ¼Alī al-Riđā (see below) and must therefore have been very close to the modern Mashhad. The ruins of Tābarān-Tūs and Mashhad are about 15 miles apart.

In Nūkān, or in the village of Sanābādah belonging to it, two distinguished figures in Islamic history were buried within one decade: the caliph Hārūn al-Raḍīḍ and the 4Alī al-Riđā b. Mūsā [q.v.].

When Hārūn al-Raḍīḍ was preparing to take the field against Khurāsān, he was stricken mortally ill in a country house at Sanabadh where he had stopped, and died in a few days (193/809). The caliph, we are told (al-Tabari, iii, 737, 13-17), realising he was about to die, had his grave dug in the garden of this country mansion and consecrated by Kur'ān readers.

About 10 years after the death of Hārūn, the caliph al-Maʾṣūm on his way from Marw spent a few days in this palace. Along with him was his son-in-law 4Alī al-Rıđā b. Mūsā, the caliph designate, the eighteenth imām of the Twelvers. The latter died suddenly here in 203/818; the actual day is uncertain (cf. Strothmann, Die Zöwiler-Shīʿa, Leipzig 1926, 171).

It was not the tomb of the caliph but that of a highly venerated imām which made Sanābādah (Nūkān) celebrated throughout the Shīʿa world, and the great town which grew up in course of time out of the little village actually became called al-Mashhad (Mashhad) which means "sepulchral shrine" (primarily of a martyr belonging to the family of the Prophet). Cf. on the conception of mashhad, masjid. I. B. 4; the previous article; and M. van Berchem in Diez, op. cit., i (Berlin 1918), 89-90. Ibn Hawkal (313) calls our sanctuary simply Mashhad, Yakūṭī (ii, 153) more accurately al-Mashhad al-Riḍāwī = the tomb-shrine of al-Riḍā; we also find the Persian name masjīd-i mukaddas = "the sanctified shrine" (e.g. in Hamd Allāh al-Muṣawfī, 157). As a place-name, Mashhad first appears in al-Mukaddasī (352), i.e. in the last third of the 11th century. About the middle of the 8th/14th century the traveller Ibn Baṭṭūṭa (iii, 77) uses the expression "town of Mashhad al-Riḍā". Towards the end of the Middle Ages, the name Nūkān, which is still found on coins in the first half of the 8th/14th century under the Ilkhanids (cf. Cordrington, A. manual of Musalar numismatics, London 1904, 189), seems to have been gradually ousted by al-Mashhad or Mashhad. At the present day, Mashhad is often more precisely known as Mashhad-i Riḍā, Mashhad-i mukaddas or al-Mashhad al-Riḍāwī (so already in Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, iii, 66). Not infrequently in literature especially in poetry, we find only Tūs mentioned, i.e. New Tūs in contrast to Old Tūs or the proper town of this name; e.g. Muhammad Mahdi al-ʿAlawi, Taḥlīl Tūs aw al-Mashhad al-Riḍāwī, Baghdād 1927, 3.

The history of Mashhad is very fully dealt with in the work of Muhammad Hasan Khan Şānī al-Dawla entitled Maš'āl al-ṣāmī (3 vols., Tehran 1931-3 A.H.). The second volume is exclusively devoted to the history and topography of Mashhad; for the period from 528/1036-7 to 1302/1885 he gives valuable historical material. On this work, cf. E. Yate, Khurasan and Sistan, 313-14, and E. G. Browne, LHP, iv, 453-6. The Maš'āl al-ṣāmī forms the chief source for the sketch of the history of the town in Yate, 314-26. Cf. also the chronological notes in Muhammad Mahdi al-ʿAlawi, op. cit., 13-16.

The importance of Sanābādah-Mashhad continually increased with the growing fame of its sanctuary and the decline of Tūs. Tūs received its death blow in 791/1389 from Mirānghā, a son of Timūr. When the Mongol noble who governed the place rebelled and attempted to make himself independent, Mirānghā was sent against him by his father. Tūs was stormed after a siege of several months, sacked and left a heap of ruins; 10,000 inhabitants were massacred (see Yate, 316; Sir Percy Sykes, in JRAS [1910], 1118 and Browne, op. cit., iii, 190). Those who escaped the holocaust settled in the shelter of the ʿAlīd sanctuary. Tūs was henceforth abandoned and Mashhad took its place as the capital of the district.

As to the political history of Mashhad, it coincides in its main lines with that of the province of Khurāsān [q.v.]. Here we shall only briefly mention a few of the more important events in the past of the town. Like all the larger towns of Persia, Mashhad frequently saw risings and the horrors of war within its walls. To protect the mausoleum of ʿAlī al-Riḍā in the reign of the Ghaznavid Maš'ūd [q.v.], the then Ghaznavid governor of Khurāsān erected defences in 528/1036-7. Again (1115) a wall was built round the whole town which afforded protection from attack for some time. In 556/1161 however, the Ghuzz [q.v.] succeeded in taking the place, but they spared the sacred area in their pillaging. We hear of a further visitation by Mongol hordes in 695/1296 in the time of Sultan Qhāżān [q.v.]. Probably the greatest benefactors of the town and especially of its sanctuary were the first Timūrid Shah Rūh (809/1406-46 [q.v.]) and his pious wife Qjavār-Shāh. With the rise of the Safavid dynasty [q.v.], a new era of prosperity began for Mashhad. The very first Shah of this family, Ismāʿīl I (907-30/1501-24 [q.v.]), established Shīʿism as the state religion and, in keeping with this, care for the sacred cities within the Persian frontier, especially Mashhad and Kūmn, became an important feature in his programme as in those of his successors. Pilgrimage to the holy tombs at these places experienced a considerable revival. In Mashhad, the royal court displayed a great deal of building activity. In this respect Tahmāsp I, Ismāʿīl I's successor (930-84/1524-76 [q.v.]), and the great Shah Abbās I (995-1037/1587-1627 [q.v.] ) were especially distinguished.

In the 10th/16th century the town suffered considerable damage by repeated raids of the Özbek (Uzbek) hordes. In 913/1507 it was taken by the troops of the Shaybānī Khan [q.v.]; it was not till
The most important political event of the 19th century for Mashhad was the rebellion of Hasan Khan Sâlîr, the prince-governor of Khurâsân, a cousin of the reigning Shah Muhammad-i 'Abbâs. For two years (1847-9) he held out against the government troops sent against him. At the time of the accession of Nâşir al-Dîn (1848), Khurâsân was actually independent when only the people of Mashhad, under pressure of famine, rebelled against Sâlîr that Husâm al-Sâlîh, who had taken the town.

In 1911 a certain Yusuf Khân of Harât declared himself independent in Mashhad under the name of Muhammad 'Abbâs, and for a period disturbed Khurâsân considerably with the help of a body of reactionaries who gathered round him. This gave the Russians a pretext for armed intervention, and on 29 March 1912, they bombarded Mashhad in gross violation of Persia's suzerain rights and many innocent people, citizens and pilgrims, were slain. This bombardment of the national sanctuary of Persia made a most painful impression in the whole Muslim world. Yusuf Khân was later captured by the Persians and put to death (cf. Browne, The press and poets of modern Persia, 124, 127, 136; Sykes, History of Persia, London 1927, ii, 426-7).

Mashhad is now the centre of eastern Persia, the capital of the province of Khurâsân which, since its eastern part was taken by the Afghans in the 18th century, is barely half its former size (cf. Le Strange, Lands, 383-4; Isl., xi, 108-9). In the middle ages it was not Tus, Mashhad's predecessor, but Na'îsâbûr (modern Persian Nâshârâp) that was the capital of this extensive and important province. A royal prince has usually been governor since the fall of the Nâdirids. Since 1845, the lucrative and influential post of Mutawallî-nesâ'î, the controller or treasurer of the sanctuary of the Imâm, has usually been combined with the governorship (cf. Yate, 322).

Like most pre-modern Persian towns, Mashhad was enclosed by a great wall built early in the 14th century and afterwards lengthened in the 17th century. This wall, which the unity of the Persian empire was broken.


The making of this canal (see Yate, 315; Mahdl al-cAlawî, 13.

The town was divided into six great and ten smaller quarters (mahalla) (see Yate, 328). The six larger bore the names of their gates; see al-Mahdl al-‘Alawî, op. cit.

The principal street which divides the whole town into two roughly equal halves, the Khijâyân, is a creation of Shâh ‘Abbâs i, who did a great deal for Mashhad (see Yate, 319; cf. the pictures in Sykes, The glory of the Shiah world, 231). This street, a fine promenade, is, being the main thoroughfare, filled all day with a throng of all classes and nationalities, including numerous pilgrims, and caravans of camels and asses; the bustle is tremendous, especially in the middle of the day.

The canal, which flowed through the Khiyaban in the middle of the day.

The capital of the province of Khurâsân which, since its eastern part was taken by the Afghans in the 18th century, is barely half its former size (cf. Le Strange, Lands, 383-4; Isl., xi, 108-9). In the middle ages it was not Tus, Mashhad's predecessor, but Na'îsâbûr (modern Persian Nâshârâp) that was the capital of this extensive and important province. A royal prince has usually been governor since the fall of the Nâdirids. Since 1845, the lucrative and influential post of Mutawallî-nesâ'î, the controller or treasurer of the sanctuary of the Imâm, has usually been combined with the governorship (cf. Yate, 322).

Like most pre-modern Persian towns, Mashhad was enclosed by a great wall built early in the 14th century and afterwards lengthened in the 17th century. This wall, which the unity of the Persian empire was broken.
MASHHAD — MASHHAD-I MISRIYAN

\[\text{Alawi, 13), contributed essentially to the rise of Mashhad; for the greater part of its inhabitants relied on it for water, although after entering the town, the canal became muddy and marshy (which was often a subject of satire; cf. 4 Abd al-Karim, Voyage, 74), and used it for drinking, washing and religious ablutions without hesitation. There were also large and deep reservoirs before the main gates. The water was saline and sulphurous and therefore had an unpleasant taste (cf. Conolly, i, 333-4; Khanhoff, 105; Curzon, i, 153).}

The Haram-i Sharif or sacred area, often called the Bast [q. v., literally "place of refuge, asylum", straddles the lower part of the main street; for a detailed consideration of the shrine, see 3. below.


2. History and topography from 1914 to the present day [see Suppl.]

3. The shrine, and Mashhad as a centre of Shi‘a learning and piety [see Suppl.]

MASHHAD ‘ALI [see AL-MASHHAD]

MASHHAD HUSAYN [see KARBALA‘]

MASHHAD-I MISRIYAN, a ruined site in Transcaspia (the modern Turkmenistan SSR), north-west of the confluence of the Atrak and its right bank tributary the Sumbar, or more exactly, on the road which runs from Čat at right angles to the road connecting Cîkîghler with the railway station of Aydin.

The ruins are surrounded by a wall of brick and a ditch and have an area of 320 acres. The old town, situated in the steppes which are now peopled by Turkomans, received its water from the Atrak about 40 miles above Čat. Near the latter place, the canal converged northwards from the river, crossed the Sumbar by a bridge and finally followed...
an embankment 6 feet high on which the bed of the
canal was 12 feet broad.

The ruins of a fine mosque can still be seen, the
gateway of which, decorated with faience, has an
inscription according to which this
building was built by
Ala° al-Dunya wa '1-Din Ghiyath al-Islam wa '1-
Muslimln Zill Allah fi 'l-
Alamin Sultan Muhammad
b. Sultan Takish Burhan Amir al-Mu'minin. The
Kh[tarak]mshah Muhammad in question reigned 596-
617/1200-20 [see KH[WARAZM-SHAHS]. On one of the
two towers (minarets?) is written:
bismilldh...
barakat un
min Allah
1
, mimmd amara bihi Abu Dja^far
Ahmad b. Abu 'l-
azz(?)
sahib al-ribdt, a
azzahu 'lldh
u
.

The identity of this Ahmad is
unknown but the title "lord of the
ribdt" which he
gives himself, confirms the fact that Mashhad-i
Misriyan was a frontier fortress
(ribdt). Near the east
gate stood another white mosque.

Tradition (Conolly) ascribes the destruction of
Misriyan to the "Kalmuk Tatars". The appearance
of the Kalmuks in these regions may be dated about
1600.

The ruins of Mashhad-i Misriyan (variants: Mesto-
rian, Mest-Debran, Mest-Dovran, Mastan) is
obscure, unless Mestorian is to be explained as
*Nestorian Christians*; it may be
recalled that during his campaign in the Col
(*J^>), to the east of the Caspian, Yazdagird II
persecuted the Christians (Hoffmann, 50; J. Labourt,
Le christianisme dans l'Empire Perse, Paris 1904, 26).

1. In Egypt. The term derives from Arabic
shariba `to drink'. The connection between the
turned wood technique and drinking was established
last century by E. W. Lane, who describes the
mashraba as a niche attached to such lattice wooden

---

**Bibliography:**

Nur al-Dm
ltr,
Mu^am al-
mustalahdt al-hadithiyya,
Damascus 1976, 98, and the
literature quoted there. (G. H. A. JUYNBOLL)

MASHRABIYYA (A.) designates a technique of
turned wood used to produce lattice-like
panels, like those which were used in the past to
adorn the windows in traditional domestic archi-
tecture.

1. (Top third) al-sahb al-malyan, "filled cross";
(lower two-thirds) kand'isikibi "Coptic church style".
windows and used to keep the water jars cool and fresh for drinking. This interpretation is confirmed by wakf [q. v.] documents, which since the 10th/16th century refer to such niches as mashraba also to the turned wood technique as mashrabiyya. Muhammad 'Ali [q. v.] is said to have prohibited the use of mashrabiyya windows, in order to replace traditional by European architecture. The mashrabiyya technique is a speciality of Cairo, where it was used with a multitude of patterns and combinations, as the collection of the Islamic Museum in Cairo shows, as well as the remains of some old houses of the Ottoman period. Each type of mashrabiyya has its own name, such as nudjumi "star-like", sakiya "like a water-wheel", madhabal "triangular", salibi sadi "cross-shaped and empty", salibi mudam "cross-shaped and filled in", kanacsisi kibd "Coptic church type", kanacsisi sad "church type and empty", ayn al-kukul "chick's eye, maymuni mudawwar "circular maymuni", maymuni nudjumi "star-like maymuni" and ma'kus "reversed".

Mashrabiyya panels are composed of small pieces of wood which are turned in various forms and are fixed together without glue or nails, but simply by being inserted into each other, thus giving the panel more resistance towards the flexibility of the wood with the change of temperature. Geometric patterns of great complexity and diversity can be obtained with the combination of the wooden pieces. The result is a transparent screen which is very decorative due to the variation of patterns and density, according to which the pieces, of various shapes, can be fixed together. The panel filters the light and the sun rays in a pleasant manner; at the same time, it allows a view to the exterior without exposing the interior to outside view. This device had an important impact on the fenestration system, since it allowed large surfaces, like a whole wall in a room, to be made in turned wood and thus offered a panorama to the inhabitants at the same time as the introduction of fresh air. This could be combined with the use of glass panels or curtains for additional protection. Mashrabiyya windows could be made of painted wood in various colours, or could simply show the natural colour of the wood. Hence Cairo’s façades in the 19th century as seen by orientalist painters and in early photographs, were characterised by the multitude of projecting mashrabiyya windows that almost touched each other on both sides of the narrow streets.

Historically, the technique of turned wood in Cairo seems to have been used first on other architectural objects before it was applied to windows. Mamluk wakf deeds, which include detailed descriptions of buildings, refer to turned wood, though not usually in connection with windows. Only in the very late Mamluk wakf deeds in the early 10th/16th century do we find, and then only sparsely, references to turned wood used on windows. It is referred to as khashab khart or sometimes as shykh al-kharrdt, i.e. "made by the turner", to distinguish it from shykh al-najdidr, which means "made by the carpenter".

Whereas Lane reports that in his time, the houses of the rich differed from those of the poor by their larger display of mashrabiyya panels, in the Mamluk period the windows of the rich had iron or bronze grills that were gilded like those of the royal palaces at the Citadel, whereas the more common ones were made of wood. Al-Makrizi, deploring the ruins of the palace of Tashirun, writes that its marble was replaced by stone, and its iron windows by wooden ones. Mamluk wakf deeds describe the windows of residences of the period as having the same system of fenestration used in the mosque architecture: the lower windows were rectangular, large and adorned with iron or bronze grills, whilst above them were...
Arched windows with stucco grills filled with coloured glass. The more common house type, or the less visible windows in a residence, were made of wood, in general without turned wood panels, according to the wa'af descriptions. Whenever this technique is mentioned in Mamluk wa'af descriptions, it usually refers to balustrades, like that which adorns the mak'kad, i.e. loggia, or the wooden lantern which surmounts the central part of a kā'a or reception hall, also found in late Mamluk mosques. *Khālad khātir* is also mentioned in connection with maghāni, also called ṣabānī, which are a pair of loggias that flank a kā'īn on both sides and which, as the name indicates, were intended for the singers and musicians, who traditionally performed behind curtains or screens.

There are three mediaeval mosques in Cairo that display magnificent examples of *mashrabiyya* technique. The mosque of al-Sāliḥ Ῥālā', built in the Fātimid period (555/1160) and restored more than once under the Mamluks, has a screen of turned wood, today at the portico but originally inside the mosque. The present one is a modern copy made after a 19th century illustration. The mausoleum of Sultan Kalāwīn (built 683-4/1284-5) also has a turned wood screen around the cenotaph, restored at the beginning of this century. Further, the mosque of al-Māridānī (739-40/1340) has its sanctuary screened by a *mashrabiyya*.

Regular reference to turned wood *mashrabiyya* in connection with windows in domestic architecture, starts after the Ottoman conquest of Egypt (925/1517) and is found in wa'af descriptions. Although windows of turned wood are a characteristic feature of the domestic type of architecture, there is one Ottoman mosque in Cairo that has a large *mashrabiyya* window, the mosque of Yūsuf Agha al-Ḥīn (1035/1625), which was erected along the shore of the Canal of Cairo. The *mashrabiyya* window must have been intended to allow the worshippers to enjoy the view of the water and the greenery.

Nowadays, after modern European architecture was definitely adopted in Cairo from the first half of the 19th century under the initiative of Muhammad 'All Pasha, *mashrabiyya* windows have disappeared from Cairo's façades. In the second half of that century, European architects introduced a kind of orientalist style in architecture and decoration which revived some traditional crafts, and turned wood became again fashionable, this time, however, with purely decorative functions. It was no more used in its original architectural context, but as decoration for European-style furniture and on small objects. With time, the *mashrabiyya* technique became a touristic craft only practiced in the bazaar, and the term *mashrabiyya* itself became equivalent to local traditional handicraft.

The type most frequently encountered consists of rectangular grilles, grilles with ogee arches and grilles of larger dimensions containing three or more panels with a verticall and stepped movement (urusi). The material most frequently used is wood, and in particular, plane (*linar* or *platanus orientalis*) which, since it could secure optimum durability, and, since it had a high and straight trunk, also came to be used for columnar porticoes (*talār*). Sometimes grilles of plaster or of coloured glass were employed (e.g. the specimen removed from the Darb-i Imām at Isfahān), as were grilles of stone or plaster and tile mosaic (e.g. the Masjidi-i Ṣayykh Lutf Allāh and the Masjidi-i Qūmā, both in situ in Isfahān).

The main decorative themes comprise vegetal, figural and animal motifs (cf. the above-mentioned grille of the Darb-i Imām); inscriptions (e.g. the large *urūfi* of the Hafidh Tan at Shāhri-Kurd); and, above all, geometric motifs.

In all the types recorded to date—rectangular, ogival, and stepped—the wooden grille is always subdivided for decorative purposes into two main parts, sc. an outer border and an inner field. The first of these, namely the border, always comprising a series of square “modules”, is obtained by the repetition of a single decorative motif all along the edge of the grille. This establishes an exact correspondence between the width and height of the grille. By contrast, the second—namely the inner field—constitutes the principal motif of the whole composition and is therefore subject to certain regulatory “laws”.

Such laws are illustrated above all by the use of rotations around precisely located axes; or of rotations of a single basic motif; or of various renderings of a given decorative theme—unless, indeed, a single part of the design is isolated. This makes it possible to obtain, with minimum artifice, a most varied range of compositions.

The geometric schemes highlighted in these various compositions consist in the main of equilateral or isosceles triangles or of squares often rotated at an angle of 45°, and, more rarely, of rectangles. The geometrical figures are above all regular polygons such as hexagons, octagons, decagons and dodeca- gons, which, with their numerous symmetrical axes, allow the creation of complex ensembles. The decorative motifs employed have very ancient origins and go back to the first centuries of Islamic art and even to the period of Near Eastern late antiquity.

This répertoire was used and elaborated for centuries, with the result that today it is possible to find identical decorative motifs in periods far removed from each other in time. With the Safawids, the decorative motif, initially simple and with a wide mesh, tends to thicken and to become more complicated with the creation of complex stellar figures or those with polygonal matrices. There is an increasing use of coloured glass, mirrors and perforated elements with a progressively increasing use of curvilinear motifs.

With the advent of the Kājārs, this love of curvilinear motifs increases apace and the decorative design changes totally. The mesh widens yet again, the geometric motifs disappear almost entirely while curvilinear motifs prevail. These include floral themes, in which large areas of coloured glass occur; their colour scheme is dominated by blue, red and green.

*Bibliography*: B. Denike, *Quelques monumens de bois sculpté au Turkestan occidental*, in *Ars Islamica*, ii (1935), 69-83; M. S. Dimand, *Dated Persian doors...*

MASHRIK (A.), the East, linked with and opposed to the West (Maghrib [s.v.]), either in general or from the strictly geographical and point of view; for the Arab world, the Maghrib embraces all the lands to the west of Egypt, and the Maghrib all those to the east. Nevertheless, the parallelism is not absolute; whilst the term Maghrib is particularly applied either to the group North-Africa-Tripolitania or to North Africa properly so-called or to its most western part, Morocco (Maghrib, al-Maghrib al-Asqal [s.v.]), the word Mashrik seems to cover the Orient in general, without reference to any one country or another (the name of one of the miḥlāfāt of Yemen, cited in Yākūt, Buldān, s.v., but not in al-Hamdānī, can only be understood, from all the evidence, in a local context).

An interesting attempt was, however, made in the 4th/10th century to take to its logical conclusion a rigorous parallelism between the two geographical groupings. In this attempt, the term Mashrik was widely used, especially in the geography of Abu-Shakr ibn Haytal and its misr, Samarkand. It should be noted that parallelism between Gharb and Shark, one which by the Djayhun river (sc. the Oxus); to the south, Mashrik-Fars-Kirman-Sind. This last, Yemen, is also described to us as having two lands, one of seacoast and one of the mountains (Aṣḥān al-takāsim, 56, 69-70, 260-1); but the parallelism with the other two great provinces is not pushed any further. To the Maghrib, made up of two groups (al-Andalus and the Maghrib properly speaking) and with two metropolitan (miṣr) of Cordova and al-Kayrawān, there corresponds the Mashrik, defined as the assemblage of lands more or less strictly under the aegis of the Sāmānids, including Šijdīstān, Khurāsān and Transoxiana (mā wārā al-nahr), this assemblage being divided into two groups separated by the Džayhun river (sc. the Oxus); to the south, Khurāsān and its misr, Naysibār and to the north, Haytal and its miṣr, Samarkand. It should be noted that al-Mukaddasī, in the introduction to his work, adds to the distinction Maghrib/Mashrik a further parallelism between Gharb and Shark, one which does not however seem to be operative in the rest of the book; for the author, Gharb embraces the ensemble Maghrib-Egypt-Shām (sc. Syria-Palestine) and Shark the ensemble Maghrib-Fārs-Kirmān-Sīnād.

Bibliography: In addition to the references given in the text, see Mukaddasī, 7, 47, 57, 260 ff. and passim. (A. Miquel)

MASHRIK AL-ADHKĀR, a term used in the Bahā’ī movement for four related concepts: 1. In Iran (loosely) to describe early morning gatherings for reading of prayers and sacred writings. 2. Generally of any house erected for the purpose of prayer. 3. Most widely, to refer to Bahā’ī temples (maṣṣābād) or "houses of worship," of which six have been built in a sparsely populated area in the heart of the country in Ashkhabād, Russian Central Asia by the expatriate Iranian Bahā’ī community there (begun 1902; com-
but which al-Djahiz and other authors mention in the context of drinks (dushdb, dddhi, etc.) which can ferment and be alcoholic (see above), as well as Abū Hilal al-Askarī, Dīwān al-mašū'i, i, 331; nabhīd al-dīhs—identical to ḍašāhī; M. Ahsan, Social life under the 'Abbasids, (1977), 111). Certain jurists of the Hanafī and Muṭa'zīlis school had a tendency to permit the consumption of some of these drinks, under certain conditions, excluding only wine made from grapes. A more limited group of the Mutāzilīs (to which al-Djahiz did not belong) even tried to legalise wine made from grapes, and it is for this reason that Ibn Kutayba, Al-ʿAḏrāʾ, ed. M. Kurd (Beirut 1982, 91), supplied the plural ḍuṣḥīdī (or other details, see Sadan, op. cit., and for ḍašāhī, see also al-Balawi, Al-ʿAlībī, ii, 80, and S. D. Goitīn, A Mediterranean society, iv, 1983, 260).

Now these tendencies count for nothing in Islamic jurisprudence at present (even among the Hanafīs), and these numerous and rich testimonies from mediaeval texts are cited only to show the difficulty, in a given historical context, of distinguishing between the "permitted" and the "forbidden", the "soft" and the alcoholic, and above all, to underline the rich variety of fermented drinks, soft or relatively so, musts and beers. The term nighbīd (q. e.), for example, most often denotes a true wine made from dates (very potent according to pre-Islamic poetry; see Sadan, op. cit.), or from various berries, but—with reference to the nighbīd consumed by the Prophet—the religious texts stress the non-alcoholic nature of this drink, which was lightly fermented (or, rather, exposed to the sun for only a few hours, according to the definitions of the texts themselves), in order to prevent any other interpretation of this term in the context of the biography of the Prophet (see Ibn Hayyān, Aḵẖād al-naḥī, Cairo 1959, 225-8; Ibn al-Diwaṭrī, Al-[Wafī], Cairo 1966, 617; cf. al-Ḍabgūrī, [Commentary on] Al-Ṣ̄ḥāmaʿī by Al-Tirmidhī, Cairo 1301).

II. Beers.

In fact, beers were well-known in the civilisation of the Islamic world. For example: 1. Mīr, see Concordance, s.v.; Dozy, Suppl., under mīr, mazr, mīzdār; S. D. Goitīn, op. cit., iv, 261 (under "beer") and cf. al-Ḥalābī, Nuzhāt al-ʿudūdī, Camb. ms. or 1256(8), fol. 218b, where the Egyptian author describes mīr as the name of this drink of the Negros living in Egypt. See also al-ʿAkhfāšī, op. cit., fol. 3a, who calls mīr by the name of nabhīd al-ʿṣarīra, "beer" of maize or of sorghum, while "beer" of wheat is called in Egypt, apūl ad-ʿAkhfāšī, ḥāṭīʿā; as for barley beer, māʿ ṣahr, see below under the heading fūkāṭī. On mazzār = "brewer", see Ibn Mawlawī, Makhāma fi khamṣīn marʿā, B.L. ms. Add. 19, 411, fol. 94a: mazzārin = "brewer" in the fem.) and implements, her receptacles and the preparation of the drink. 2. Dījaʿī, (cf. for example, Ibn Ḥadīr, Fisāl al-ʿBūrī, x, 250-9; on the revised use of this term in this century, in place of the more widespread borrowing ẖānī = modern beer), see Maṭḥūt, ii, 401-7. 3. Māʿ ṣahrīʿ and akṣīmā, see below. 4. Baca, see towards the end of the article. 5. Fūkāṭī, see Ibn Kutayba, ʿUyīn, iii, 280; Kusdājīm, Dīwān, 1313, 84; al-Ṣarī al-Raʿīzī, Dīwān, Baghdād 1981, i, 180; fūkāṭī = sparkling drink; al-Ḥusnī, Zahr, ed. al-Blīḡāwī, i, 116: fūkāṭī = producer and vendor of this drink; al-Rāghib al-Ṣalāḥī, Maḥādīrī al-ʿudūdī, Beirut 1964, ii (4), 379; P. Kahle, in ZDMG (1935), 344; Darāṭ, L’acte de wafṣ of Darb Shahr., Cairo 1963, 52; Sadan, in REI (1977), 50, 56, n. 18; Goitīn, loc. cit. The long and narrow vessels which, among their other functions, were used for the preparation or storage of this "beer", were the kīzān (sing. fūkāṭ) (see above). The term, which found its way into English as an adjective (see al-Ghuzūlī, Matāʿīsī al-budur, Cairo 1299-1300, ii, 72) is frequently mentioned and described in Arabic literature. However, Goitīn, op. cit., iv, 146, translates kīzān as "bowls", a sense which the word possesses in certain dialects. With reference to the producer/vendor of this drink (fūkāṭī), see also the popular Story of the Caliph Hārūn al-Raṣīd and the fūkāṭī fūkāṭī; B.N. Ar. ms. 3658, fol. 26b-34a. On the fūkāṭī (fūkāṭī = brewer, see also al-Nawāǧīdī, Mīrāt al-ghīzāmī, B.N. ms. Ar. 3402, fol. 36a; al-Ṣarīfī, Nuzhāt al-ʿfarī, Oxford ms. Marsh 2, fol. 46a; al-Khāfāšī, Tirāz al-madāṣūsī, Cairo 1284, 71-3; S. de Sacy, Exposé de la religion des Druzes, i, pp. ccxxxi-iii.

There existed numerous kinds of fūkāṭī: they are mentioned in culinary literature, among sauces and drinks (see the ms. mentioned below and M. Rodinson, in REI [1949], 131, whose material is based on al-Wuṣāla (see below); ar. ṣajīṭā and H. Zayyāt, in Machriḥ, xli, 25). The sense of "beer" is clearly evident when the text describes the fermentation (fūkāṭ, mar, ṣahrī) of this drink. In addition to the references given above concerning the fūkāṭī, see anon., Kanz al-faṣādaʿ, Camb. ms. Qq. 196, fol. 108b-a, 109a-b: fūkāṭī sweetened and flavoured with fruit (the more abundant mediaeval equivalent of "sandy" or almost so; it may thus be with justification that Aḥṣān, loc. cit., attempts to conclude from a very partial reference of adāb that this drink was invariably soft or even non-alcoholic; however, apūl al-Ghuzūlī, op. cit., who accurately reflects life in mediaeval Egypt, various kinds of fūkāṭī were sweetened to a considerable extent), 108b, 109a-b: māʿ ṣahrī, literally "barley water", when fermented becomes "barley beer", of which a special variety exists for the nights of the month of Ramaḍān (according to this text and according to anon., K. al-Taḥkīth, Chester Beatty ms. 4018, fol. 48a), 107a, 110a, 111a: akṣīmā = liquid, syrup, but, since one of these recipes mentions the presence of yeast among the ingredients of this drink, it must presumably be a variety of sweetened beer and not a simple syrup as it is usually translated (for the Egyptian names of this "beer", see also al-Warrāk, Kanz), K. al-Taḥkīth, ms. Oxford, Hunt. 187, which contains recipes of fūkāṭī, fol. 148b, 151b, and cf. Zayyāt, loc. cit.; anon. al-Wuṣāla, B.N. ms. 6388, fol. 27a-b: akṣīmā and fūkāṭī, 28b-29a: fūkāṭī prepared with yeast, and various kinds of fūkāṭī; cf. Rodinson, loc. cit. Certain physicians are inclined to define fūkāṭī made of barley or rice, as a relatively soft drink, when compared to real intoxicants (al-Rāzī, Manṭābī al-ghāyba, Beirut 1982, 91; who notes, on the other hand, that the fūkāṭī "goes to the head"), but for the jurists, the mediaeval experts in Islamic law, this drink brings up some difficult legal questions (see al-Tūsī, Maṣūla fi taḥrīm al-fūkāṭī, Bodl. MS. Arab.1.64, fols. 94v-97v).

The same works of culinary art also provide a wide range of recipes of which the primary ingredient is milk, but it may be assumed, judging by the method
of preparation, that in the majority of cases the references are to sauces accompanying food rather than to drinks as such (cf. also Ahsan, op. cit., 97-8, and the references given below). Without refrigeration, it was not easy to preserve milk, except with the addition of preservative elements, e.g. salt, or allowing it to curdle. In fact, ever since the pre-Islamic period the Arabs were well aware of the importance of milk as a nutritive element, with numerous terms denoting its varieties and properties and verbs and adjectives used to identify the stages of curdling (ro’ib – clotting, for example), and it is thus that numerous pages are devoted to milk in the lexical literature (specialised works, including Kitâb al-Laban wa ‘l-liba’ by Abû Zayd al-Ansârî, ed. Haffner-Cheikh, in Dix traités, as well as entire chapters in longer works; see also the references in Sadan, op. cit.). The pre-Islamic Arabs were great breeders of camels and dromedaries, and it is often to their milk that these terms apply. Muslim civilisation was familiar with the milk of all kinds of beasts (see for example the work attributed to al-Suyûtî [Sidi-Siouti], Livre de la miséricorde, Paris 1856, 19-21) and geographical literature refers to it at times (see e.g. Ibn Hawkal, tr. Kramers and Wiet, ii, 364). Ibn Kutayba (al-Âshâbî) knew that it was possible to ferment these milks, e.g. that of the camel, although it was a process which was later popularly used for fermentation a few centuries later (koumiss [see kumîs] was often produced from fermented mare’s milk, as was kefîr, generally less potent; some varieties still exist today which are even given to children to drink). This came about through the influence of the peoples of Central Asia and those from the native lands of the Mamluks; the latter also drank koumiss, in spite of the hot climate of Egypt (see Khâmîr).

As has already been mentioned, curdling, or even salting, were effective means of preserving lactic drinks, in a period when refrigeration was still unknown, and in relatively hot regions. It is thus that a land may be renowned beyond its geographical borders for the quality of its lactic products (the Syro-Palestinian region, for example, is praised for its yoghourts, etc., in a humorous work on the gastronomic art which does not however include recipes: untitled B.L. ms., Add. 19.411, fols. 4b-5a). Moreover, it is thus that certain of these drinks are still known today, for example labân (originally laban means nothing more than “milk”, but in certain dialects the distinction has arisen of halîb = milk, laban = fully or partially curdled milk), ayyân, among the Turks, and there is an Iranian equivalent, dâgh, sometimes a little more salted. Some ancient texts describe yoghourts (yoghurt) and give the recipes: Kanz, the above-mentioned Cambridge ms., fol. 132a, with instructions on how to dilute it with water, producing a drink which would resemble the above-mentioned ayyân; al-Warrâq, op. cit., fols. 5b-5a6a (see also fols. 28b-30a): types of milk and their treatment; the untitled ms. mentioned above, B.L. Add. 19.411, fol. 4b: curdled milk and various yoghourts, including that made from the milk of the buffalo. Ibn Râzîn al-Tîjdînî, ed. Ibrahim Shânûn, Fadâlat al-îkhwân (La cuisine andalou marocaine au XIIIème siècle), Rabat 1981, 147: râ’îb (explained above).

In the course of the last two centuries, Egyptian scholars and physicians have developed a genre of polemical debate in favour of and against milk and its products: All al-Dabbâgh al-îl-halabî, Ra’d al-îdâh ‘an dâgh al-îl-kîf wâ ‘l-ma’âlî, ms. Taymûrîyya, Abad 370 (relying to a treatise against certain lactic pro-

ducts); and Ahmad al-Îbâdî, Fawd al-mînân, Cairo 1315 (relying to a treatise, al-Wâdîg al-basân, in favour of fish and against milk).

IV. Literary and semiotic questions.

In works of a moral and religious nature, milk is also a literary symbol (even a semiotic value) of the purity of Islam: it was chosen by the Prophet at the time of his nocturnal travels through the heavens (isrât and mi’rât), when he was offered water, wine, milk, etc. (on this and other symbolic senses attributed to milk, see Sadan, op. cit., and, regarding the importance of milk in the eyes of the Prophet, see also Ibn Kayyîm al-Dawizîyya, al-Tîbîh al-nabawî, Beirut 1957, 299 ff.). For certain mîdjin poets, wine characterises the sedentary life of Muslim society, especially that of ‘Abbâsîd society (the relatively more affluent circles), while milk, of less worth in their eyes, characterises the pre-Islamic Arabs. This is not a case of true contradiction, but of two semiotic and literary levels. After all, this is not an objective notion (in fact, the ancient Arabs were not unaware of the existence of wine, but they did not drink it very often) but one that arises from a variety of literary elements, showing, among other topics, the different roles that the pair “milk” and “wine” play as symbols in the various genres (see Sadan, op. cit.).

V. Water as a drink.

In spite of the above-mentioned preference for milk over other drinks on the part of the Prophet, he is also credited with such remarks as “Water is the mother of all drinks”, or “the master of all drinks” (on the importance of water in Muslim legal tradition, see also al-Kulînî, al-Kâtîf, vi, 380-1; Ibn Kayyîm al-Dawizîyya, op. cit., 302 ff.; al-Urmanwî, Siyâsîas, ms. Kûpûlû, 1200, fol. 164a; al-Mâjdîsî, Bîhûr, sîr. 752-5).

Water was an element of prime importance in the life of the ancient Arabs, especially those who lived in desert regions (see E. Brûnîlîch, in Islamicâ, i, 41-76, 288-343, 454-528). The literature of medical tradi-

tions speaks of the importance of this element as a drink, and gives detailed accounts of its properties and different varieties (see e.g. Sidi-Siouti, op. cit., 38). In fact, geographical and topographical conditions made it necessary for each region to be content with a given, and often unalterable, quality of water: water from wells (âbâr), from canals, rivers, etc. [see mâ’î], a subject of frequent interest to Arab geographers (in particular the so-called “classical” ones of the 4th/10th century; al-Mukaddasî, in his Ahsan al-takdîm, often adds at the end of each description of a region a sub-chapter entitled dâgh al-âshûn hâdîh al-lîdîm which contains, among other things, information concerning the different waters of the region, their qualities, etc.). Similarly, culinary literature (fols. 13a ff. of the Kanz, Cambridge ms., and cf. al-Ghûzûlî, op. cit., ii, 74-7) also devotes special chapters to water, in its capacity as a drink. Well-organised systems of provision of water were rare, but not unknown in the mediaeval period (see e.g. R. B. Parker and R. Sabin, A practical guide to Islamic monuments in Cairo, 91). The water of certain rivers was often neither pure nor clean (al-Dîhabîzî, al-Bukhârî, ed. al-Hâdirî, 113, describes how sewage was dumped in one of the channels of the Tigris; see also E. Lévi-Provencal, Trois traités hispaniques de hîdâya, 33; idem, Séville musulmane, 70). The quality of drinking water often depended on the social condition of the consumer, in particular the money available to him to pay the water-bearing (sakkâ); see Lane, op. cit., i, 161, but cf. also a few special constructions (sâbîl, pl. sabûl, testifying to the generosity of the benefactors who built them)
MASHRUBAT — MASHRÜTIYYA 723

designed for the use of the general public. By such means, water was distributed to travellers or to the poor (al-
Tabari, iii/1, 484). The vendors of snow, which was one of the most expensive products. The
Tabari, iii/1, 484). The vendors of snow, (thalldajun)
brought to him at the time of his pilgrimage (al-
Abyuth, 3/2, 331), such as, e.g., tamarind drink (samh hind, see
above, and al-Sakat, loc. cit.) and liqueuric drink (sa'i), which are very popular; the drink made from
dried grapes (sheeb according to Lane, loc. cit., zahib or zhib in colloquial speech), gjilab (which was known
to the mediaeval world, see the above-mentioned Cambridge ms., fol. 133; al-Ghuzuli, loc. cit.; Huici
Miranda, loc. cit.). These recipes are not always based
on dried grapes and the drink is most often non-
alcoholic, but, even today, some devout Muslims abstain from consuming this drink made from dried
grapes when it is prepared by non-Muslims, since it is feared that over-long soaking of the fruit produces
alcohol. Also worthy of mention here is the boza of the
Ottomans (whence biza in the Egyptian dialect, see
Sapiro, Dictionary, defining it as biSar, but it is necessary to
distinguish this term from boza, biza "ice cream" in
some dialects of colloquial Arabic, which must rather be, i.e. biza and Turkish bis "sweet". This may
contain alcohol (see, the series Le voyage en Egypte, I.F.A.O., Cairo, passim (e.g. vol. for 1634-6, tr. and
annot. by V. Volkoff, n.d., 255 and n. 157; bous)).
But soft varieties of boza/biza are known (see E. G.
Gobert, Usages et rites alimentaires des Tunisiens, in
Archives de l’Institut Pasteur de Tunis [1904], 64; see also
43, 72, on other drinks such as biza, for which see
Beaussier, s.v. biza and Turkish bis = "sweet"); these two
drinks recall the problem of the "permitted"
and the "forbidden" explored in detail at the
beginning of the present article (e.g. the naki", mentioned
above).

In this context of continuity, we may also compare the
sabuyah of the ancient texts (afore-mentioned Cam-
bridge ms., fols. 112a-113a, and afore-mentioned
London ms. of 1634-6, fol. 26b, although the
references here are to a fairly thick liquid) with the
sohiba described by Lane, op. cit., in the 19th century
(a similar drink, prepared from the pips of melons, is
also described by R. Khawam, La cuisine arabe, 172:
bozourate).

VIII. Hot drinks.
As regards hot drinks, see the articles kahwa "coffee"
(see also on this, R. J. Hattori, Coffee and Coffeehouses,
Washington D.C. 1985) and ghan "tea", but besides
these two drinks, the lands of the Near East are
familiar with a wide variety of infusions of flowers,
leaves, etc.

Bibliography: In addition to the references given
in the article: F. A. 'Ukkaz, al-Khamr fi-l-fishr al-islimi, Dhudda 1982; Faradj Zahrän, al-Mukdrk,
ashuruk wa-akhdamuh, Cairo 1983; Ahmad 'A. T.
Raysan, al-Mukdrk, ashuruk wa-‘idakha, Cairo 1984;
Säib Al Mansur, Mushaf al-islimi min al-
Khamr, Cairo 1985; 'lzzat Hasanayn, al-Mukdrk al-
muqaddsrat, Cairo 1986. (J. SADAN)

MASHRUTIYYA [see DUSTUR].
MASHWARA (A.) or MASHURA, a common term for consultation, in particular by the ruler of his advisers, the latter being various defined. The term sometimes also appears to mean some kind of deliberative gathering or assembly.

The practice of consultative decision was known in pre-Islamic Arabia [see MAQDISI, and MALA in Suppl]. Two passages in the Kurʾān (III, 153/159, wa-aamurum fi t-amir and XXII, 36/38, wa-aamurum sharâ baynahum) are commonly cited as imposing a duty of consultation on rulers. The merit of consultation (mushdara) is manifold, and the corresponding defects of arbitrary personal rule (istidādā) are supported by a considerable body of material both in ḥadīth and adab (on ḥadīth, see WENSINCK, Concordance, iii, 212; for examples of adab, see IBN KUTAYBA, ʻUṣūn, i, 27-36; Ibn ḎAb Rabīḥi, Iḥd, Cairo 1953, ii, 46-8).

Similar recommendations are made by the Kurʾān commentators (e.g. al-Zamakhshari, Khathāh, Cairo 1373/1955, i, 152-5, i, 179; Ibn Ḏazī, Mafāṭīḥ al-ḥakīm, iii, 120). The desirability of consultation by rulers becomes a commonplace in Islamic political literature. It is urged by representatives of the scribal literature. It is urged by representatives of the scribal tradition, though generally without formally condemning consultative decision, is not uniformly so. Some authorities, in particular the jurists, urge the need to consult bureaucrats, while ʻulāma lay greater stress on the importance of consulting the ʻulāma. Ibn Taymiyya (Minḥāb al-sunnah, Būlāh 1521, ii, 86; idem, al-Siydsat-ndma, 1958; and the corresponding defects of arbitrary personal rule (istīddādā) are supported by a considerable body of material both in ḥadīth and adab (on ḥadīth, see WENSINCK, Concordance, iii, 212; for examples of adab, see IBN KUTAYBA, ʻUṣūn, i, 27-36; Ibn ḎAb Rabīḥi, Iḥd, Cairo 1953, ii, 46-8).

General bureaucrats urge the need to consult bureaucrats, while ʻulāma lay greater stress on the importance of consulting the ʻulāma. Ibn Taymiyya (Minḥāb al-sunnah, Būlāh 1521, ii, 86; idem, al-Siydsat-ndma, 1958; and the corresponding defects of arbitrary personal rule (istīddādā) are supported by a considerable body of material both in ḥadīth and adab (on ḥadīth, see WENSINCK, Concordance, iii, 212; for examples of adab, see IBN KUTAYBA, ʻUṣūn, i, 27-36; Ibn ḎAb Rabīḥi, Iḥd, Cairo 1953, ii, 46-8).

In general, bureaucrats urge the need to consult bureaucrats, while ʻulāma lay greater stress on the importance of consulting the ʻulāma. Ibn Taymiyya (Minḥāb al-sunnah, Būlāh 1521, ii, 86; idem, al-Siydsat-ndma, 1958; and the corresponding defects of arbitrary personal rule (istīddādā) are supported by a considerable body of material both in ḥadīth and adab (on ḥadīth, see WENSINCK, Concordance, iii, 212; for examples of adab, see IBN KUTAYBA, ʻUṣūn, i, 27-36; Ibn ḎAb Rabīḥi, Iḥd, Cairo 1953, ii, 46-8).

In the early Islamic centuries there seems to have been no formal procedure of consultation. As Gibb remarks: "There is, in fact, nothing in the texts to justify the suggestion that 'Umar's consultation was more than informal, or that there was at Medina any recognized consultative committee, still less a cabinet." (H. A. R. Gibb, in Le traité de droit public d'Ibn Taimiya, Beirut 1948, 168-9) goes further than most of his colleagues. Citing Kurʾān and ḥadīth, he insists that the ruler must consult not only with the ʻulāma and with his political and military officials, but also with spokesmen of the general population.

In Egypt, under the Bahri Mamlūks there appears to have existed a supreme council of high ranking amirs. The members of this council were variously known as Amir Māshura and Māshhir al-Dawla. Its head was called Raʾī al-Maṣḥūra. References to appointments to this council and to its meetings are of frequent occurrence in the Mamlūk chronicles for the Bahri period (see D. Ayalon, Studies on the structure of the Mamlūk army. III, in BSOAS, xv [1954], 69; E. Tyan, Institutions de droit public musulman, ii, Paris-Beirut 1956, 171-81; Björkman, Beiträge, 153; al-Kalḵagandi, ʻUṣūl, vi, 20, xi, 153-6; al-Makrīzī, al-Bābi, i, 26-9; idem, Ibn Ḏakir, vi, 46-8; A. M. Meyer, Subh, ii, 46-8; W. B. H. Zirinezade, Paris dilliinde Azerbaycan səzleri, Baku 1962, 248-50).
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(Lufl, Ta'rikh, 21; Yazidibechu ‘Ali, Seidbex-Name, cited in Agah Sirv Levend, Tavd dilinde gelisme ve savrnamesi, 21; Yazidibechu ‘Ali, Seidbex-Name, cited in Agah Sirv Levend, Turk dilinde gelisme ve savrnamesi; see for example Kemalpasha, 127).

References to such meetings are common in the Ottoman chronicles of the 16th, 17th and 18th centuries. Na’sima offers many accounts of military mawqewa held by the commanders as well as of civil gatherings held in Istanbul by official dignitaries. The Sultan was not normally present at such gatherings (see for example Na’sima, i, 131, 146, 155, 180, 273, 413, ii, 354, 560, iii, 54, iv, 298, 413, v, 60, 205, 281-3). Towards the end of the 18th century such gatherings become more frequent, particularly in the periods associated with the Russian and other wars, and were sometimes held in the presence of the Sultan (examples in Wäjs, i, 316-18, 221, 222, 274, Drewed, ii, 276 ff., iv, 289). A new phase began with the accession of Sultan Selim III who, at the start of his reign, on 20 Şa‘ban 1203/18 May 1789, convened a consultative assembly (mawqewet) of leading officials to discuss the problems of the Empire and the way to remedy them. Such gatherings were often held under Selim III and his successors.

The early 19th century historian Şahzadé [q.v.] makes frequent reference to such gatherings and ascribes to them a representative character and significance not mentioned by previous authors (Şahzadé, i, 66, 73-5, 159-201, 365, iv, 2-5, 201, 37 ff., 155-8, etc.). For a full treatment of these institutions see Mawqewa (diwdn-i humdyun [q.v.]).

Şahzadé’s account marks the transition from a purely traditional Islamic interpretation of mashyakha to a new approach influenced by the practice of European states, to which indeed he alludes under the polite euphemism diwdet-i mawqewa “well-organised states”. He may have been thinking of the British parliament, a description of which, by the young Ottoman diplomatist Mahmud Ra’di was available to him in Istanbul. Şahzadé notes that the holding of such mawqewet was common in these states, where they served a useful purpose. At the same time, he was naturally concerned to justify the holding of such meetings with both Islamic and Ottoman precedents [see further Murfiyya, ii].

Perhaps the earliest use of the term in a clearly western context occurs in the Turkish translation of the first volume of Carlo Botta’s History of Italy from 1789 to 1814, first printed in Cairo as Bonaparti ve Tâbki 1249/1833. This speaks of the parlemento mawqeweti established by the liberals in that country.

In the course of the 19th century, the term mashyakha or mawqewet was much used by Turkish and Arabic authors, first to describe European representative institutions, and then to justify their introduction into the Ottoman Empire. The Egyptian Rif’at Râdi al-Tahâwî, discussing the functioning of French parliamentary institutions, makes common use of the term mashyakha to describe the various consultative bodies (Tâbki, al-ibrid fi tâbkit Bânîz, ed. Mahdi Allâm et alir, Cairo n.d., ch. 3, 138-43). This importation of the term mawqewet into the Turkish language as well as in the original Arabic and provided in the first detailed and documented description, in these languages, of constitutional and representative government. The term was adopted by the young Ottoman liberal patriots of the mid-century [see Yenî OTOMANLILAR] and was much used in their writings. By 1876 it was sufficiently well-accepted in Ottoman usage to figure in the Sultan’s speech from the throne at the opening of the first Ottoman parliament (Kâ‘ide-yi Meshweret, in Dabîli Dîrîsîdî, 10), and in 1909 the speech from the throne even speaks of constitutional and consultative government (Mescerîyet ve-mawqewet), “as prescribed by the holy law as well as by both reason and tradition” (Tayyiot-i effat of 15 November 1909).

Biography: Given in the text. In general, see L. Gardet, La cité musulmane, Paris 1954, 172-5; H. Laoust, Essai sur les doctrines sociales et politiques de Taki-d-din Ahmad b. Taimiya, Cairo 1939, 301-2; Muhammad Diya‘ al-Din al-Rayyis, al-Nazariyyat al-siyasyya al-islâmîyya, Cairo 1952, 224-8. See also Mawqes, 4. A. In the Middle East and North Africa, sections i-ii, and Mawqes al-siyya, the latter work provides a bibliography.

MASHYAKHA or mashyakha, one of several plural forms of A. shaykh, literally “an elder, i.e. a distinguished person usually of an advanced age [q.v.]”. In its classical usage, mawqewa also served as an abstract noun denoting a shaykh’s position or authority (e.g. in mas’hakhat al-íslám, the authority of the shaykh al-íslám [q.v.]).

In the Muslim West mashyakha was used to designate the collective of urban elders and notables often wielding considerable political influence in the cities. Such groups of dignitaries sometimes acted as virtual advisory councils to local rulers, hence mawqewa also carried the sense of “a municipal council”.

This was so in Muslim Spain (D. Wasserstein, The rise and fall of the Party-Kings, Princeton 1985, 142-45) and, according to clues offered by Ibn Kâlidun, in North Africa as well (ref. in Dozy, Suppl., s.v. sha‘yj, Mukaddima, ed. Quatremère, ii, 269; tr. Rosenthal, ii, 305).

During Bonaparte’s Egyptian expedition, the word acquired a new meaning. Seeking an Arabic expression for “republic”, Bonaparte’s orientalist experts came to use mashyakha. This was apparently an intended allusion to the Directorio of which were governing France at the time; endeavouring to simplify an idea novel to their audience, the translators chose to refer to the persons making up the governing body (“the elders”) rather than to the abstract principle underlying it. The French administration employed the term extensively in its proclamations to the Egyptians—issued “on behalf of al-mawqewa al-faransaawiya”—using it interchangeably with diwan, the common Ottoman word for the notion [see gümûşviyya]. Mashyakha then became a popular name for “republic” in Arabic writings as well, in which it was considerably more common during the first half of the 19th century than either diwan or diwaniyya; the latter term was introduced by al-Tahtawî [q.v.] in the 1830s.

The choice of a word with established connotations to express a new idea was bound to produce some confusion. To full historians of Arabic thus understood “republic” to mean “government by elders”, erroneously identifying the foreign notion with a more familiar concept (e.g. Nikûla Türk, Müdîkhatı.)
AL-MASÍH, the Messiah; in Arabic (where the formal noun mashyakha in the sense of "council, government") mashyakhat al-bilad ("city council"), mashyakhat al-bilad ("the country's government"), mashyakhat Bārīt ("the Paris Commune") etc.—further attested to the vagueness of the term and, perhaps, of some of the concepts it was chosen to express.

In the second half of the 19th century, mashyakha in the sense of "political authority" gradually gave ground to ḫumānīya, although some writers continued to vindicate the older usage until the 1870s. Thenceforth, mashyakha lost this meaning, retaining only the loose import of an institution of elders at large or a sheikhdom.

**Bibliography:** For the classical usage, see Lane, Lexicon, s.v. ḫalkāhnādi, ṣūḥ ḫalq al-qāna, s.v. in index (ed. Muhammad Kandil al-Balāṭ), 425. For its use in French proclamations, see examples in Ahmad Husayn al-Sāwī, Fāḍir al-ṣīḥaṭ fī Mṣr, Cairo 1975, pls. 43, 48, 49, 70, 89, 97A-90. See further A. Ayalon, Language and change in the Arab Middle East, Oxford 1987, ch. vii. (A. Ayalon)

**AL-MASÍH AL-DJURDJANI, ʿĪsā b. Yahyā Abū Sahih, Christian physician born in Dūrjiān, and one of the teachers of Ibn Sinā, who dedicated some of his works to him.**

He studied in Baghdad, and then taught in Khurāsān and later in Khārāzam. He had no social connection with Judaism, but performed religious worship alone in his house (al-Bayhaki, Taʿṣīr, 95). In 401/1010, together with a number of other scholars who had settled in Khārāzam—among them al-Birūnī—he was summoned by al-Muḥammad b. Ḥanzāna [q. v.] to this city under the suspicion of heresy. In the company of Ibn Sinā he succeeded in fleeing to Mazandarān, but met his death in a sandstorm. So far, none of his works, in large part preserved, has been edited. The most important, existing in numerous manuscripts, is the K. al-Maʿa ("hundred [treatises]"), a comprehensive medical encyclopedia, arranged in a hundred sections, probably the oldest work of its kind and perhaps the model for Ibn Sinā's Kānān. An edition of this work is most desirable. A very much smaller work, the K. b. iṣlaḥ al-kullī, is devoted in 19 chapters to the precautions one must take before using the general fundamentals of medicine. The third work to be mentioned here is the K. Iṣlaḥ ḫimat Allāh taʿāla fi ḫahl al-insān, dealing with the physiology of the human organs and their meaning and purpose as intended by God. Ibn Abī Ṣaybān (i, 328,2) says explicitly that this work is based on Galen's [see ṣīratīn] K. fi manāḥiʾ al-ʿādīʾ, and its structure and contents are in congruence with those of the Arabic Galen-Übersetzungen, and also in congruence with the Syrian and Arabic Galen-Übersetzungen (AKM, xvii/2), no. 49. Already the title of al-Masīh al-Dūrijānī work reflects Galen's teleological way of thinking: in the latter's work just mentioned, the single chapters deal with "God's wisdom with regard to the perfect creation of the hands" and of the other organs (see Bergstrasser, loc. cit.). Al-Masīh indeed was "a philosopher for whom medicine was dominant" (al-Bayhaki, Taʿṣīr, 95); with some exaggeration, Niẓāmī ʿArūfī even calls him, together with Ibn Sinā, "successor of Aristotle in philosophy, which includes all sciences" (Cahār maqāla, 118, 8-9). His special investigations, which are smaller in extent, deal with smallpox, the pulse, and also with matters of geometry, psychology and the interpretation of dreams, and contain also an extract from the K. al-Miṣgīšī. A work on the plague he dedicated to his patron, the Kh. al-Maṣrāwīḥa b. ʿAbdī Abū Maʿmūn b. Maʿmūn.

Al-Masīh's knowledge of theoretical and practical
It was thus with the object of holding these hostile tribes in check that the thumping heir of al-Mahdi, Abu 'l-Kāsim Muhammad, the future al-Kālim bi-Amr Allāh [p. v.], took the decision to found Masīla at the time of the expedition which he conducted in the Zāb and then in the region of Tāhārt in 315/927-8, on territory occupied by the most troublesome tribe, that of the Kamālān. He entrusted the task to his officer ʿAli b. Hamdān, ordering him to station himself there with his troops, ʿAdīsā elements and slaves, and instructing the Kamālān to join with his army before going to establish themselves in the region of al-Mahdīyya on the route leading to al-Kayrawān. Called Muḥammadīyya after its founder, the new town was soon to bear the name of Masīla on account of its position on the edge of a water-course, the Wādī Sahr, currently the Wādī Koṣb.

It soon supplanted Tobna as regional capital of the Zāb and became, under the rule of Ibn Hamdān, in addition to its importance as a military base, a prosperous city and the seat of a powerful principality within the Fāṭimid realm. The father of ʿAli, Hamdūn, also known as Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Andalusī, scion of a Djūδâm family of Yemen, had counted among the most valued Arab "auxiliaries" (awlīyāʾ) of the Fāṭimid cause, those who had been loyal from the outset. Sent to the canton of Elīvra in Muslim Spain and then to the region of Bougie, he had rapidly distinguished himself in the entourage of the sovereign, along with other Yemenis, notably the Kalībās, acting as a counterweight to rebellious Kutāmī elements and to certain elements of the Mudar Arab aristocracy who had remained loyal to the Aghlabīs. But it was with the foundation of Masīla that he reinforced his rôle in supporting the cause of his master, the Fāṭimid sovereign, al-Mahdī bi-'Abd Allāh. He rapidly distinguished himself in the entourage of the sovereign, along with other Yemenis, notably the Kalībās, acting as a counterweight to rebellious Kutāmī elements and to certain elements of the Mudar Arab aristocracy who had remained loyal to the Aghlabīs.

As early as the ancient period, in Roman and subsequently Byzantine Africa, a line of fortresses (lima), including the powerful stronghold of Lambes (Lambaeas), sealed this gateway to the Sahara at the western limit of the Zāb, where the renowned Third Augustan Legion was stationed on desert guard for a considerable period of time. Intended as a military base, Masīla was founded not far from the ancient Zābī, to the west of Lambaesī, inheriting from the latter the rôle of giving protection against the Berber tribes always eager to pillage the prosperous Irfīkiyyan regions, sc. the Birzāl, Muzāṭā, Kamālān and other Huwwara clans. The threat that they posed became still more serious since the Irfīkiyyan realm had come just under the control of the Shiʿī ʿAlīds, who were just as accursed, from the point of view of the Khāridī doctrine which the tribes professed, toward the summit of the Aglabīs. Furthermore, the "auxiliaries" of these new masters of the coveted land of Irfīkiyya were none other than the Kutāmān, long-standing enemies of the Zānātā clan of which they had taken advantage.
to fall back towards Hođna and to entrench himself in the mountains of Koyana, it was from Maslla that the Fāṭimid Imam al-Mansūr [q.v.] conducted the campaign against the rebels and ultimately crushed them in Muḥarram 336/August 947.

Henceforward, Maslla became, in addition to its strategic rôle, one of the most important provincial capitals of the realm and underwent rapid development, while, in the mountain range of Ṭitter, the amīr of the powerful neighbouring Sanhājā, Zirṭ b. Manūd, founded Agūr, an impregnable fortress intended to reinforce Fāṭimid control over the troublesome Zanātā. Maslla inspired its foundation and assisted its development.

Bordered, on the one hand, by Zanātā, on the other, by Sanhājā, who had recently become supporters of the ʿĀlīd cause on the side of the Kutāmā, Djaʿfar began to rule, within the limits of his prerogative, as a veritable suzerain, thus acting in rivalry to Zirī, and to raise Maslla to the status of a principality. Endowing it with castles and palaces and lavishising there large sums of money, he succeeded in making himself a conspicuous personality and even maintained a literary court frequented by numerous poets and scholars. The eminnet Ibn Ḥāṣā [q.v.], who spent some time there and sang the praises of Djaʿfar and his family, did not hesitate, in moulding the Žāb, to compare it to Ṭrāk. Moreover, the administrative status accorded to Maslla by the Fāṭimid monarch, which endowed Djaʿfar with almost unlimited authority over his territory, was that of istīlāf1, which conferred upon the governor of a province the right to exercise, like a viceroy, full powers and thus to maintain a high degree of military, judicial, financial and religious control. Djaʿfar was enabled to administer his territory “with trustworthiness” (biʿl-amdanā) without first being obliged to pay a fixed sum to the State Treasury (damān). The process of autonomous administration then being developed in the provincial organisation of the realm thus authorised him to deduct from the annual revenues of the Žāb, which were considerable, all his public expenses before paying the Žāb. The Žāb thus paid only the surplus as tax. Such a favourable status and organisation of the realm thus authorised him to mean-im to assert their domination over the region.

As a result of their struggles with the Žanātā, which was already its rival, the predominance of Aššīr was greatly reinforced with the designation of Bulūğlīn as viceroy of Maslla, when the latter finally left the al-Muḥammadīn control over the Ṣanḥājīn, when the latter finally left the region of the Žāb and Hođna. The presence at the court of Maslla of Umayyad agents, and the sentiments of allegiance to the Andalusian monarchy flouted by the Žanātā with the blessing of Djaʿfar, greatly worsened his relations with his sovereign. Not hesitating to defy his anger, Djaʿfar espoused the cause of the Žanātā in their contentions with his rival, the amīr of the Sanhājā, then embarked upon open rebellion against al-Muʿizz. Subsequently, he proclaimed his allegiance to the Umayyads of al-Ḥakam II and made haste to abandon Maslla with his family, arriving at Cordova in 360/971.

With the defection of the Banū Hamdūn, Maslla began to lose its importance to the advantage of Aššīr, already its rival. The predominance of Aššīr was confirmed with the designation of Bulūğlīn as vicerey of al-Muʿizz in Barbary, when the latter finally left the region for Egypt, to which the seat of the caliphate was transferred.

The first Sanhājā dynasties, supremacy over the Žāb and its regional capital Maslla became the object of the struggle in which they were continually embroiled with one of the components of the Žanātā clan, the powerful tribe of the Maghārīn commanded by Zirī b. ʿĀlīy. In the course of this struggle during the reign of Bādīs, distinction was achieved by his uncle Hammād who conceived the idea of founding, a score of kilometres to the northeast of Maslla, a new town, al-_KERNEL [see KALʿAT BĀNĪ HAMMĀD], destined to supplant the former in its role of provincial capital and military base capable of controlling the Žanātā tribes.

There then began for Maslla a long period of decline. Abandoned, to the advantage of its neighbour during the first half of the 5th/11th century, it conduced to it its status as the major city of the Žāb, where the Kalʿa became in its turn the seat of a principality founded by the powerful branch of the Sanhājā, the Banū Hammād. Then with the Ḥillālīn invasion, the regions of the Žāb and Hođna were, like Irīkiya, devastated by nomadic Arab tribes, the Ṭahhābi, Ṣarīḥ, Zaghāba and other elements of Sulaym. Maslla was ravaged, as was the Kalʿa. However, it outlived both the latter and Aššīr, which was laid to ruin under the empire of the Almohads, to the advantage of a new provincial capital, Bougie [see BAYA]. Then, despite the destruction caused by the Banū Ghanīya in revolt against the Almohads, it regained during the 6th/12th century a little of its lost glory. With the establishment of the Almoravid, scholar such as Abū ʿAlī al-ʿĀsīlī or Ahmad b. Harb. But Maslla was to suffer again under the Ḥafsids as a result of their struggles with the ʿAbd al- ʿWādīdīs [q.v.]. The Dāwīdiyya attempted in the meantime to assert their domination over the region. It regained for the last time some political importance and reputation with scholars such as Ahmad al-ʿĀsīlī, a disciple of Ibn ʿArabī, and especially as a result of the rôle played there in the mid-8th/14th century by the renowned Ibn Khalīdūn and his brother Yāḥyā in the service of the ʿAbd al-Walīd sultan Abū Hammū. Finally, with the ascendancy of nomadic Arab tribes over the Žāb and Hođna, during the 9th/15th century Maslla definitely lost its status as a major city, becoming nothing more than an undistinguished locality eking out a meagre existence through manufacturing and agriculture.


MAŞİR, a technical term of fiscal practice in the hydraulic civilisation of early Islamic Ṭrāk, doubtless going back to earlier periods there. It is defined by al-Khārazmi in his Maḥāfīl al-ʿulāmī, 70, as “a chain or cable which is fastened right across a river and which prevents boats from getting past”, and mentioned by Ibn Rusta in Waj al-ʿAdil 213, as a barrier across the Tigris at Hamwān near Dayr al-ʿĀkul [q.v.] consisting of a cable stretched
between two ships at each side of the river, preventing ships passing by night (and thus evading the tolls of a body of officials attached to the shurta [q.v.]) or shurta (')['ashdb al-sayydra wa 'l-ma^dsir). The levied by the official traffic and toll house regulators, massartu mussaru dary", "to fix a borderline", ma^dsiriyyun, police guard of Baghdad, called ma^dsiryyin, who collected tolls from river traffic on the Tigris.


MA^SIRA, an island to the north of a gulf of the same name, lying parallel to the eastern coast of Arabia. It is a member of the "Kuria-Muria" group. Some of the passengers and crew took to two boats, one of which was lost at sea. The islanders have long derived their livelihood from the sea. Large numbers of turtles provided both food and tortoise shell for export; dried fish and shark fins were also traded for rice and dates from the coast of the island meant that lumps of valuable metal for trial. Those found guilty were then returned to the island, and shot at the scene of their crime. A monument recording the execution of the murderers was erected nearby, and so too was a memorial slab in honour of the victims of the outrage. These events were very important in helping to establish the control of the Sultan of Masḳat over Ma^ṣira. The inauguration of air routes across the Middle East in the 1930s began to give the island a new significance. During the Second World War, the British Royal Air Force and the United States' Air Force used the island as a base for operations in the South-west Pacific. The British Broadcasting Corporation maintains a radio-relay station on the island. A severe and prolonged hurricane struck Ma^ṣira in June 1977, causing considerable loss of life and destroying most of the buildings there.

Bibliography: References to Ma^ṣira are scattered and often fragmentary. There is also a degree of repetition involved in some of the works cited here. Admiralty (Great Britain) Hydrographic Department, Red Sea and Gulf of Aden pilot, London 1955 and later; H. J. Carter, A geographical description of certain parts of the southeast coast of Arabia, to which is appended a short essay on the comparative geography of the Middle East and the islands of this coast, in ISAS, iii/2 (1841), 224-317; J. R. Povah, Gazetteer of Arabia, Calcutta 1887; J. G. Lorimer, Gazetteer of the Persian
MASJUMI (Maqdisi Syiro Indonesia, "Consultative Council of Indonesian Muslims"), the name of two different Indonesian Islamic organisations: (a) during the Japanese occupation of Indonesia 1942-5, and (b) in independent Indonesia. (a) During the Japanese occupation. The Japanese Military Government, during the first stage of its occupation of Indonesia after 1 March 1942, tried to mobilise the Islamic groups for its anti-Western political and military aims. Most of the Islamic leaders had, in different degrees, opposed actively Dutch rule and a number of Islamic nationalist organisations had been established in pre-war Indonesia, with the Majelis Islam A'la Indonesia (MIAI, "Supreme Indonesian Islamic Council") in 1937 as their coordinating organ.

In November 1943, Masjumi was founded more or less as the successor to MIAI. Membership was open only to those organisations which had been granted legal status by the Japanese authorities. These were, at that time, the traditionalist-oriented Nahdatul Ulama (NU, "Renaissance of the Scholars"), and the modernist social organisation Muhammadiyah, joined later by two smaller organisations of Islamic associations in Java and Madura, guiding and guarding the activities of these associations in order to improve cultural life and thus enable the Muslim community to help and contribute their efforts for establishing the Commonwealth of Greater Asia under the leadership of Dai Nippon, "in accordance with God's commandments" (cf. van Nieuwenhuize, 135; Soebagio, 67). Masjumi's pro-Japanese stand resulted in a certain estrangement with the more radical Islamic organisations which were still waiting for their legalisation, with the associations of Arab Muslims, and with the religiously "neutral" nationalists whose activities were severely restricted.

Masjumi was not a merger, but "constituted a working agreement between Muhammadiyah and Nahdatul Ulama" (Benda, 152). It may be presumed that the interest of the Japanese authorities originated in the personal influence and respect which most leaders of Muhammadiyah and NU exercised on the populace, mainly in the villages, as religious teachers. Winning their support would mean for the Japanese a guarantee for a certain degree of quiescence and stability among the people. As a consequence of this policy, the traditional power balance in the Muslim society shifted from the jurisdictional and administrative representatives, the penghulu, who had obtained some support from the Dutch administration, to the Muslim teachers and scholars. On 1 August 1944, the Shimabu was reorganised, its new leading personnel taken mostly from Masjumi. Thus Masjumi functioned practically as part of the government and was linked to its goals more than before.

As go-betweens, the religious leaders had to explain the Japanese policy to the people, endeavouring to gain their support in spite of all kinds of increasing shortages and suffering; at the same time, they were responsible to the military administration, especially in cases of turmoil or revolt.

On 7 September 1944, the Japanese government had announced its plan to prepare Indonesia for independence. Now, Masjumi's political agitation received new momentum. During a rally sponsored by Masjumi and held in Jakarta on 12-14 October, a statement was adopted which stressed the task to prepare the Indonesian Muslim community so as to "be ready and able to receive freedom for Indonesia, and freedom for the religion of Islam" (cf. also W. Hasjim, 341). Independence was understood as an opportunity to establish characteristics on Islamic principles, without restrictions imposed by a foreign or non-Islamic power.

The growing militancy in the country finally led to the formation of a military branch of Masjumi, the Barisan Hizbullah ("The Front of God's Party"), in December 1944. Already in September 1943, Masjumi had urged the Japanese, although in vain, to establish a Muslim volunteer corps, after the "secular" nationalists had made a similar plea and were allowed to form Peta (Pembela Tanah Air, "Defenders of the Home Country"). Hizbullah's aim was defined as to realise the solidarity of the Indonesian Muslim community, to stand and fight together with Japan, in the path of God (fit sabih Allah), and to realise Indonesian independence, all in accordance with the tenets of Islam. In addition, personal membership could be granted to those ulama? and kiyai (religious leaders) who had obtained the consent of the Office for Religious Affairs (Shimabu), established by the Japanese in March 1942 and since 1 October 1943 under Indonesian leadership. The aim and purpose of Masjumi was defined as sponsoring and coordinating the relations between the different Islamic associations in Java and Madura, guiding and guarding the activities of these associations in order to improve cultural life and thus enable the Muslim community to help and contribute their efforts for establishing the Commonwealth of Greater Asia under the leadership of Dai Nippon, "in accordance with God's commandments" (cf. van Nieuwenhuize, 159; van Djik, 73). Japanese officers were in charge of the military training, whereas religious instruction was given by Indonesian Islamic teachers, preferably members of Masjumi.

After January 1945, Masjumi broadened its field of activity and started to infiltrate into the "Neighbourhood Associations", a "grass roots control apparatus to the Dysea Hakoka" ("People's Service Association in Java"), which was under direct Japanese control and staffed with priyayi. This move, although apparently profitable for Masjumi, indicated that it had passed its climax as the favourite of the Japanese. These felt that Masjumi's agitation against the "infidel" (Western) imperialists became more and more ambiguous and could include the Japanese occupiers as well. The Japanese, therefore, began to deal with the different nationalist groups on more equal terms. This encouraged non-Masjumi Muslims to appeal for a larger basis of the Islamic movement. Finally, Masjumi lost its political monopoly among the Muslims, although its leaders remained the most eminent spokesmen of the Muslim community.

With the re-emergence of the "secular" nationalists, a fierce contest for ideological leadership in the national movement was inaugurated. This contest dominated the discussions in the "Study Committee for the Efforts to Prepare Independence" (Badan
MASJUMI

Penyelidikan Usaha Persiapan Kemerdekaan), established by the Japanese on 1 March 1945, of whose 62 members only six were from Masjumi. After Soekarno, as a representative of the “secular” nationalists, had presented his concept of Pancasila (“Five Pillars”) on 1 June, in which not Islam but more generally the belief in One Divinity (keithahan) should be the religious element in the state ideology, the Masjumi members led by Wahid Hasjim agreed to this principle on 22 June, after it was amended with the “seven words”: dengan kewajiban menjalankan Syari’at Islam bagi penelusup penelusukan (“with the obligation for its adherents to practice the Islamic Law”), and some other Islamic provisions. This “compromise”, later known as the “Jakarta Charter”, stimulated the acceptance of other religions considered to be monotheistic in the state, but it made it also obligatory for the state to force Muslims into obedience to the shari’ah.

In the last weeks before Indonesia’s independence, Masjumi as a political force speedily declined. Its aim to maintain the identification of nationalist and Islamic goals proved to be unrealistic. Opposition against the “Jakarta Charter” and its “seven words” were not only voiced by non-Muslims but also by Muslims, especially those coming from the Outer Islands. Some considered the shari’ah as a foreign juridical concept with only particular applicability, and they therefore favoured traditional or adat law as an inclusive Indonesian basis for legislation and ideology. Thus, when after the Proclamation of Independence issued by the “secularists”, and not Masjumi, on 17 August 1945, the draft of the Constitution was discussed, their repeated efforts to maintain, or include, Islamic precepts, were finally refuted, and even the “seven words” of the “Jakarta Charter” were dropped. Masjumi as an organisation vanished together with its former protectors.

In Indonesia, the office of “unity” and leadership, and a desire to form an inclusive Indonesian basis for legislation and ideology. Thus, when after the Proclamation of Independence issued by the “secularists”, and not Masjumi, on 17 August 1945, the draft of the Constitution was discussed, their repeated efforts to maintain, or include, Islamic precepts, were finally refuted, and even the “seven words” of the “Jakarta Charter” were dropped. Masjumi as an organisation vanished together with its former protectors.

(b) In independent Indonesia, the office of “unity” and leadership, and a desire to form an inclusive Indonesian basis for legislation and ideology. Thus, when after the Proclamation of Independence issued by the “secularists”, and not Masjumi, on 17 August 1945, the draft of the Constitution was discussed, their repeated efforts to maintain, or include, Islamic precepts, were finally refuted, and even the “seven words” of the “Jakarta Charter” were dropped. Masjumi as an organisation vanished together with its former protectors.

After the secession of PSII, there were three main groups within Masjumi (Ward, 10). The first one may be styled as “religious socialist”, and indeed, they were occasionally political partners of Sultan Sjahrir’s Socialist Party. Its members were mainly the above-mentioned intellectuals like Dr. Soekiman, Moh. Natsir, Mohammed Roem, Sjafruddin Prawiranegara, Jusuf Wibisono and others. After 1948 especially, they sometimes took over leading positions in government activities, including the negotiations with the Dutch which finally led to the recognition of Indonesia’s sovereignty in 1949. Another group left in Masjumi after 1947 were the traditionalist ulama related to NU under the leadership of K.H. Wahid Hasjim. Their participation in the government was usually focused on the Ministry of Religious Affairs, founded in January 1946.

The third group of Masjumi members, and the smallest one, was that of the “radical fundamentalists”. They represented the militant wing of the modernist movement, being more illiberal and anti-Western than the moderates of the first group. Isa Anshary, chairperson of Masjumi’s branch in West Java, became their spokesman. They became the most outspoken advocates of an “Islamic state”.

A serious blow to the integrity of Masjumi was launched in 1948 by S.H. Koesoemadi. A Masjumi leader in West Java, denounced the Renville Agreement of January 1948 between the Indonesians and for the Muslims added to the difficulties of this task.

Under the leadership of Masjumi, a women’s organisation was founded to promote knowledge and political awareness, as religious awareness, and to strengthen their feeling of responsibility at home and in society. Besides this women’s organisation, Masjumi established also an Islamic Youth Movement, an Islamic Labour Union, an Islamic Farmers’ Union, and it was closely related to the Islamic Students Organisation HMI (Himpunan Mahasiswa Indonesia), established in 1947.

Although the original Islamic goals were not achieved in the Republic proclaimed in August 1945, the leaders of Masjumi called for a general mobilisation of the Muslims to defend it against the returning Allies. Internally, it intensified its strike for controlling the state. There has been much discussion whether the aim of Masjumi at this time was to erect the Islamic State (Negara Islam), or whether its intention was to develop an Islamic society in the state which implemented the Islamic law, without changing formally the constitution or abrogating Pancasila. Both tendencies had their protagonists. Social responsibility, sometimes even expressed in socialist terms, was a constant factor in Masjumi’s working programs. In some areas with a strong feudal system, Masjumi presented itself as a forerunner of social renewal, or even social or Islamic revolution (H. Feith and L. Castles, Indonesian modernist thought 1945-1963, Ithaca and London 1970, 55 ff.).

After 1946, Masjumi became more and more dominated by intellectuals who had received a modernist or western education. Some of them had been expelled by PSII before the war and were, more or less, affiliated with organisations like Muhammadiyah, Persatuan Islam, and others. This led to internal conflict which finally caused the exodus of former adherents of PSII and the re-foundation of this party in 1947. A similar exodus, although less spectacular, had already taken place in 1946 when the traditionalist “Movement for Islamic Education” (Pergerakan Tarbiyah Islamiyyah Perti) of Central Sumatra, declared itself as a political party.

Under the leadership of Masjumi, a women’s organisation was founded to promote knowledge and political awareness, as religious awareness, and to strengthen their feeling of responsibility at home and in society. Besides this women’s organisation, Masjumi established also an Islamic Youth Movement, an Islamic Labour Union, an Islamic Farmers’ Union, and it was closely related to the Islamic Students Organisation HMI (Himpunan Mahasiswa Indonesia), established in 1947.
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the Dutch, which called for a withdrawal of Republican troops from West Java. He let himself be declared ... quoted by Ward, 14). They were viewed, moreover, with suspicion by the military leaders who, although outspoken felt a growing •ulamad• jumi. The TW-oriented Imam (Head of State) of the provisional leaders of Masjumi, although disagreeing with the Republican troops from West Java, which called for a withdrawal of the Dutch, which called for a withdrawal of Republican troops from West Java. He let himself be declared ... quoted by Ward, 14). They were viewed, moreover, with suspicion by the military leaders who, although outspoken felt a growing •ulamad• jumi. The TW-oriented Imam (Head of State) of the provisional leaders of Masjumi, although disagreeing with the Republican troops from West Java, which called for a withdrawal of

In the meantime, a new crisis developed in Masjumi. The NU-oriented •ulamad• felt a growing decrease of their influence. In both the Natsir and Soekiman cabinets of 1950 and 1951, only the portfolio of Religious Affairs was entrusted to a representative of NU. When in the Wilopo cabinet of 1952, Faqih Usman from Muhammadiyah was appointed as Minister of Religious Affairs, the time had come for NU to separate from Masjumi and establish itself as a political party on its own (H. Feith, Decline of constitutional democracy, 233-7).

With two great rival Islamic parties, the political atmosphere in Indonesia changed considerably. The cabinet presided over by Ali Sastroamidjojo (PNI) from July 1953 to July 1955 was supported by NU, whereas Masjumi opposed it as being too much compromising with the communists.

The uncompromising attitude against the Communists had been a characteristic of Masjumi since its very beginning. This led to conflicts with Soekarno, for whom Communism was one of the most powerful and therefore indispensable anti-imperialist ideological forces. In combining it with his understanding of nationalism, he outlined the ideology of his Partai Nasional Indonesia (PNI). A compromising attitude among some of Masjumi's leaders with the PNI had, however, already been apparent before the succession of NU, when Soekiman succeeded Natsir as Prime Minister, leading a Masjumi-PNI cabinet. Soekiman, being a Javanese, tried to counteract a PNI-PKI co-operation by strengthening ties with NU. On the other side, Natsir was more linked to the •radical fundamentalist• wing in his own party, and to the Socialist Party which was also strictly anti-Communist and opposing PNI.

After Soekarno's speech in Amuntai in January 1953 in which he attacked the concept of a Negara Islam and praised Pancasila as a guarantee for freedom of religious practice and civil rights of every single Indonesian, the different basic convictions of Masjumi leaders and their cultural and ideological roots became more apparent. Isa Anshary and his team stressed that their conception was based on divine revelation and therefore not open to compromise like the human-made concepts of Christians, secularists and others. He questioned the religious sincerity of Soekarno and those Muslims who were in favour of Pancasila as understood by the •religious neutral• nationalists, and he accused them of being hypocrites or unbelievers.

Natsir, like Soekiman, took a much more moderate position in this matter. He felt that the voters would reveal their aspirations in the coming elections and stressed that the people should be well prepared to cast their votes for the •right• party. Therefore he urged the start of new efforts in the fields of Islamic education and self-awareness.

During the election campaign in 1954-5, the voices heard from Masjumi and launched through its party organ Suara Masjumi, the daily newspaper Abadi and other media, became more and more adapted to the language of the radical fundamentalists. This was partly due to other Islamic revolts, besides the Darul Islam in West Java, which were making their way into South Sulawesi since 1953. Both provinces had a strong Islamic, and generally pro-Masjumi, population. They justified their revolt by pointing to, among other grievances, the neglect by the central government of the development of their provinces, and the growing influence of atheistic Communism in the state. If Masjumi wanted to obtain the votes of these groups, it had to show clearly its opposition to the incriminating trends and its struggle for Islamic goals.

The other Islamic parties taking part in the campaign had formed an Islamic anti-Masjumi bloc. Thus Masjumi became isolated; it was denounced as being extremist and even in sympathy with the Darul Islam, and therefore distorting the national brotherhood based on the Pancasila which had even been accepted by the PKI in 1954.

In the Parliamentary elections on 29 September 1955, Masjumi gained 20.9% of the votes. It was thus the second largest party, after PNI with 22.3%. Next were NU with 18.4% and PKI with 16.4%. There were no major differences in the elections to the Konstituante (cf. H. Feith, Elections, 57 ff.). All Islamic parties together gained 43.7% of the valid votes. During the years after the elections, Masjumi remained in opposition to the governments through a short initial period of co-operation. But in the debates in the Konstituante which started working on 10 November 1956 in Bandung and which had to draft the final Indonesian Constitution replacing those from 1945, 1949 and 1950, Masjumi was joined by NU and the other Islamic parties in its struggle for a constitution which would base state and society on the principles of Islam. Against this Islamic bloc, a Pancasila bloc formed itself from the other parties. Regarding the basic question, Pancasila or Islam, none was strong enough to reach the two-thirds majority needed for any decision. This deadlock encouraged Soekarno finally to dissolve the Konstituante on 5 July 1959 and to decree a return to the 1945 Constitution, together with the proclamation of Guided Democracy. In these years, after the elections, Masjumi experienced its political decline. This was partly due to its futile position, in that it still claimed to defend the interests of the Muslims or 90% of the Indonesian population and thus refrained from defining its role as constructive partner in the midst of Indonesia's pluralism of ideologies and religions. But more decisive for its decline than these failures was the involvement of some of its leaders like Moh. Natsir and Sjafruddin Prawiranegara in new regional uprisings which had broken out in North Sulawesi and in West Sumatra in 1957. This again led to serious clashes in Masjumi between the •regionalists• and the •Javanese• wing led by Soekiman, who was in favour of Soekarno's centralisation policy. Others like Moh. Roem feared that another split in Masjumi could only serve the Communists and their growing influence on Soekarno, and thus endanger Masjumi's political role. He therefore urged the maintenance of the unity of the umma. But finally, some leaders like Soekiman left Masjumi in early 1960 and joined PSI. Muhammadiya, too, terminated its affiliation as a •special member•. Thus the remaining faithful had to bear the consequences of Masjumi's image as •a party of separation and rebellion• (A. Sanson, quoted by Ward, 14). They were viewed, moreover, with suspicion by the military leaders who, although outspoken
anti-Communist themselves, had to fight the rebels. On 17 August 1960, Soekarno announced his decree that Masjumi, together with the Socialist Party (PSI), were to be dissolved because both parties refused to condemn their party members who were active in the regional rebellions.


**MASKANA, Greek Ma'kavrj**, from the Syriac Malkenô (cf. Pauly-Wissowa, xiv/1, col. 2963), a small town, now a village, in the northern part of Syria. The name is mentioned by Stephanus of Byzantium in regard to the war of Septimius Severus against the Parthians in 224 A.D. The region has been populated since the Bronze Age, as is attested by the Khybar, a barracks for gendarmes, a large khân and the residence of the head of the telegraph service. (Palmyrena, 89). At this time, camels browsed below the settled part. There was in the valley an ancient canal whose branches received, when the waters were high, water from the Euphrates for irrigating the cultivated lands.

Under the French mandate, the *kada* of Maskana, the second in the region of the province of Aleppo in 1923, was made up of 80% lands administered by the office of the head of the telegraph service, following the system of tenant farming; 15% lands with the system of métayage; and 5% small landowners. In this *kada*, situated on the periphery of the province,
and only linked with Aleppo in 1922 by a single track impracticable for cars which went along the telegraph line, hence lacking any means for transport or communications, the price of land was markedly less than that in other kada's. There were two classes of lands in this region. Those alongside the Euphrates, called hauer, with a covering of alluvium left by the river at periods of high water, were irrigated for both summer and winter crops. Yields were 15 to 30 for one measure for corn and barley, whilst maize and lentils were grown in the highlands. There were two classes of lands in this region. Those alongside the Euphrates, called kadd's.

In 1945 the village had 430 inhabitants. At the present time, the modern road network allows in this region, thanks to road bridges at al-Rakká, Dayr al-Zor [q. v.] and Mayyadin, the transportation of sheep in two-level lorries to Aleppo without any need to halt at Maskana.


Miskana is also the name of a village of Syria situated in a zone of cultivated land on the road linking Aleppo with Damascus, near al-Karà and in the kadd of Hims; in 1945 it had 900 inhabitants.


MASKAT (lat. 23° 28' N., long. 58° 36' E.), Eng. Muscat, Fr. Mascate, a port on the Golf of Oman and since the end of the 18th century notionally the capital of what came to be called the Sultanate of Muscat and Oman, since 1970 the Sultanate of Oman. 'Umání sources often write the name as Maskad, and even as Maska/Muska with a double s, a change in accordance with local dialectal pronunciation.

1. Geographical situation and demography.

The site of the town is a constricted one, in a cove where the mountains come almost down to the sea, with the Portuguese Fort Mirání at the western end of the cove and a second Portuguese fortress, that of Qalú, one of the two off-shore islets. The town itself is on a gravel plain, but until modern times, access to Maskat by land has always been difficult, and communication with it has more often been by sea. In effect, it is the cul-de-sac of the Bātina coastal plain, and the nearby port of Mafrâţ [q. v.] is in many ways the more favoured centre. But the natural mountain defences plus a line of fortifications have given Maskat a strategic significance, despite the limited space for settlement and the unattractive climate, with its high temperature and humidity.

The 19th century travellers and visitors commented unfavourably on the town's squalor and its narrow streets. Lorimer, in his Gazetteer, estimated the town's permanent population at 8,000, of which 3,000 lived within the town and the rest in the suburbs, whereas he estimated that of Mafrâţ at 14,000, reflecting the latter's superior commercial role. After a period of steep decline, the population of Maskat has been reliably estimated in 1970 at 6,000, mainly detribalised 'Umání Arabs or foreigners, including Bahraynís, Balúc, Persians and Hadaríms (southern Arabian tribesmen) and a lowest stratum of the bājísíra, slaves and ex-slaves from Africa. In the 19th century there was also a small Jewish population. But the most significant element was that of the Banians, Hindu merchants and middlemen, who had certainly been there since Portuguese times; see C. H. Allen, op. cit. in Bibl. Their quarter was in the east of the town, where they had their temples, traditionally since the 17th century.

2. History.

Maskat's real rise to prominence goes back to the Hurmuz period of the late 15th century, just before the arrival of the Portuguese; up to the 12th century, the main emporium of the 'Umání coast has been Suẖár [q. v.], and the town of Maskat's main importance was as the last watering place on the Arabian coast for ships trading with India (see the mediaeval Arabic sources, notably al-Mukaddasí, 93; Ibn al-Fakhî, 11; Yâkût, iv, 529; Ibn al-Mugjâwîr, ed. Lâlîgên, ii, 284; the merchant Sulaymân, Aghâr al-Sin wa 'l-Hind, ed. and tr. J. Sauvaget, Paris 1948, §§ 13-14). Now, in the later 15th century, Maskat grew at the expense of Kalhát [q. v.], apparently under the patronage of the Hurmuzi ruling family, and Ibn Mäджîd [q. v.] stresses that his home port had become the main centre of the 'Umání coast for trade with India (see G. R. Tibbetts, in Arabian studies, i, 87-101), the export trade in horses, bred in eastern Arabia as far away as al-Ḥasá, being especially important (see S. Digby, War horse and elephant in the Delhi Sultanate, Oxford 1971; Serjeant, op. cit. in Bibl., 27; J. Aubin, in Mare Luso-Indicum, ii, 112).

On 2 September 1507 Afonso d'Albuquerque arrived at Maskat after subduing Kalhát and destroying Kurayyát, seizing and sacking the town and massacring its population, perhaps amounting to 7,000 at that time, three days later. The Portuguese soon realised Maskat's strategic value, and it came to play an important part in their control of the Gulf,
above all after their loss of Hurmuz in 1622; previous
to that, the Portuguese operated as nominal vassals ... grown up at
nearby points, such as the oil port of Mma al-Fahl and
at the commercial centre of Matrah, with its moder-

who established a trade mission there (the Nawwab's
agreement (kawl-in-dma)
fear that Maskat might follow Tfpu Sultan into the
of Mysore,
rivals. Maskat's main trade was at this time directed
built in 1587-8 as a reply to Turkish corsair raids.
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nised port of Mina Kabus. Since the Sultan's real capital is Salāla, Maskat proper remains only a notionall capital, devoid of almost all functions and in effect a mere trading port.

Bibliography: The Bibl. of A. Grohman in his *El* art. contains detailed references to the classical and mediaeval Arabic geographical and historical sources on Maskat; see also that to *umān.*


Travellers' accounts are useful adjuncts, and D. G. Hogarth, *The penetration of Arabia,* New York 1904, still contains useful material. A valuable summary of their descriptions can be found in R. Bidwell, *Bibliographical notes on European accounts of Mascat 1500-1900,* in *Arabian Studies,* iv, 123-59. To his list of references may be added the account and drawings of E. Kaempfer discussed in G. Weinberg, *Muscat* in *Omdn* (ed. E. Engelbert Kaempfer's report and engravings, in *J. Oman Studies,* v (1979), 95-101; and C. G. Miles, *The countries and tribes of the Persian Gulf,* London 1919, where descriptions of Masqat (1966 repr., 462-9) really describe the period when he was living there (1872-86). Collections of photographs also provide interesting details, notably the Fuad Dababs Collection in Harvard University Semitic Museum, and W. D. Peyton, *Old Oman,* London 1983. This last contains a map which seems to derive from the unpublished *Mascat City planning survey* of 1972, a useful source for the state of the town before the impact of modern development; a description of that period may also be found in I. Skeet, *Mascat and Oman: the end of an era,* London 1974.

For the history of Maskat, the following sources are the most useful. E. de Barros, *Correia and Albuquerque.* The structural crisis in the European-Asian trade in the early seventeenth century, Thickness of material from British Office archives is in Lorimer's *Gazetteer,* whilst J. B. Kelly, *Water and tribal settlement in South-East Arabia,* London 1977, and his forthcoming *The Imamate of Oman* provide further information on the Maskat setting.

MÁSKH (a.) "metamorphosis", that is, according to *LA,* s.v., "transformation of an exterior form (judha) into a more ugly form"; the product of the metamorphosis is itself called *masik/misik* or *masikh/masikth.*

Belief in the fact that, as a result of supernatural intervention—divine punishment in the majority of cases—humans have been transformed into animals, statues or even into stars was as widespread, before Islam, among the Arabs as among the peoples of Antiquity whose mythologies are known to us. The growth of the belief in the punishment inflicted by God has led to the survival of this belief under Islam, not only among a populace conscious of ancestral tradition, but also in religious doctrine, since numerous Kur'ānic verses justify it: "You know of those among you who have broken the Sabbath; We have said to them: 'Be abject monkeys'" (II, 61/65; cf. VII, 166); "Those whom Allah has cursed, those on whom His wrath has fallen, those whom He has turned to the monkeys and the pigs" (V, 65/60); "If We wished, We would have transformed them where they stood" (XXXVI, 67). The verb *masikha* occurs only in the last-mentioned verse, which concerns deviants in general, whereas the others are applied to the Banū Isrā'il. Al-Dāhīz (*Hayānīn,* iv, 39) explains that God has chosen monkeys and pigs because they are uglier and more antipathetic than other animals, and adds (iv, 39) that if monkeys only are mentioned in II, 61/65 and VII, 166, it is because the punishment in question is more severe.

Jews are also the subject of the principal hadith relating to *masik* (apud al-Damārī, *Ḥṣāyiʿ al-bayānasīn,* i, 573, s.v. *dabb*; cf. ii, 192, s.v. *kād*; see also al-Kurūibli, *al-Dā'hīz* in *Ḥṣāyiʿ al-bayānasīn,* ii, 439-40). Seeing somebody eating the flesh of the lizard, the Prophet of the Al Bū Saʿīd, Bathurst, *op. cit.,* remains the main study until the end of the Yaʿārība period, while Anne Kroell, *Louis XIV, la Perse et Mascat,* Paris 1977, adds material from Foreign Office archives. Then comes a lucana, for which A. A. Amin, *British interests in the Persian Gulf,* London 1967, provides some background to the end of the 18th century and for which Mrs P. Risco's forthcoming thesis (Toronto University) should help fill the gap (son vid.).
said, "A nation of the Banū Isrā‘il has been transformed, and I fear lest this creature is a part of it; I do not eat this meat, but I do not forbid it". This text is absolutely characteristic because, while referring to the growth of traditions concerning punishments inflicted on the impious (cf. al-Damiri, i, 386, s.v. ḥimzir, where God changes to swim some Jews who have molested Jesus), it relates to an animal which is never mentioned in the Kur'ān and is corrobated by various anecdotes. In particular, al-Dājjāz (Ḥayawan, vi, 77) describes how a faḍāḥ, also seeing a person transformed into the form of the lizard, says to him: "Know that you have eaten a ḥakīk of the Banū Isrā‘il". The popular belief is in fact that two Israelite tribes have been transformed, one into lizards which have remained on dry land, the other into eels (dīrir) which have gone to live in the sea; the reason for this transformation is not indicated, and it is simply stated that it is likely because the foot of the lizard resembles a man's hand. Ibn Kutayba (Mukhtalif, 10, 362-3; tr. Q. Lecomte, §§15, 300 c) refutes the interpretation of the proverb a sāk min dabb ‘more irreverent than a lizard’, according to which a Jew showing disrespect towards his parents had been transformed (al-Maydānī, Mudjma‘al-almājāl, i, 509-10, proposes a different explanation). According to another ancient legend, all dishonest tax collectors were transformed (al-Dājjāz, Ḥayawan, vi, 80), and there is reference to one of them who changed into a lizard (Ḥayawan, vi, 81, 155); of two others, one became a hyena and the other a wolf (Ḥayawan, vi, 80, 148), while Canopus (Suhayl), Ḥayawan, iv, 69, vi, 81, 155; Tarbī, §41; Ibn Kutayba, Mukhtalif, 10, tr. Lecomte, §15) is none other than the fourth metamorphosed tax-collector. As for Venus (al-Zuhara), she was a prostitute who ascended into the sky by virtue of her knowledge of the greatest name of God (bi-smī lāh al-a‘sam) which Hārūt [q.e.] and Mārūt had communicated to her (al-Samarkandi, Bustān al-‘arfīn, Kāzān 1298/1880, 131) and was transformed into a comet (Ḥayawan, iv, 69; Tarbī, §41 and index; Ibn Kutayba, Mukhtalif, 10 – § 15).

The story of ʿIsā [q.e.] and Nā‘īla, turned to stone in the Ka‘bah, is well known, but it was noted that the Kur‘ān (XI, 83/81) does not say that the wife of Lot ‘became a pillar of salt’ (Genesis, xix, 26); al-Dājjāz (Ḥayawan, vi, 70) makes the comment in this context that the Aḥl al-Kītāb refer to no case of the metamorphosis of an human being into a pig or a monkey and simply state that this guilty woman was changed into a pillar of stone (sic). There are also encountered in the pre-Islamic period some individual instances of transformation into animals, but, after Islam, divine punishment does not seem frequently to take this form. There are however Shi‘ī legends according to which ʿUmar b. al-Khaṭṭāb wanders in the guise of an owl, and the murderer of Husayn b. ʿAlī, Ṣ̲hînir, “runs about incessantly in search of water, transformed into a dog with four eyes; he observes at least one spring which he never reaches, because at Karbalā‘ he forbade the family of Husayn to approach the water” (H. Massé Croyances et coutumes persanes, Paris 1938, 185). On the other hand, the Ira- persanes, Jews who have molested Jesus), it relates to an animal mentioned in the ancient Arab world. For example, it is stated, without undue emphasis, that the mouse (farr [q.e. in Suppl.] has for its ancestor a miller’s wife (Ḥayawan, i, 297) and that the shrimp (or the lobster, ʿirjāna) was a dressmaker who stole thread: this is why the creature has threads, to remind her of the crime that she committed (Ḥayawan, i, 297; Ibn Kutayba, Mukhtalif, 364 – § 300 c); the snake (hāyya) had the form of a camel but, as a punishment (Ḥayawan, i, 297), God compelled it to crawl on the ground. According to popular belief, the dog is also the result of a metamorphosis (Ḥayawan, i, 222, 295, 297, 308, vi, 79), but in i, 297-8, al-Dājjāz conjectures that the wolf would be the more likely case! Ibn ʿAbḥās (apud Ibn Kutayba, Mukhtalif, 167 – § 172 a) comes close to believing in this metamorphosis; he has elsewhere handed down a tradition according to which the elephant, the hare, the spider, the eel and, naturally, the mouse, the monkey and the pig, are humans transformed (Ḥayawan, i, 309).

Obliged by the Kur‘ān to accept the reality of maskh, jurists and theologians ponder the real meaning of such transformation and pose the question as to whether it is effected gradually or at a single stroke, whether it has led to the creation of new animal species and, consequently, whether the animals that are the result of it have survived and become numerous, in other words, whether the monkeys, pigs and lizards that we see today are their descendants and theirs alone. Al-Dājjāz (Ḥayawan, i, 309) adds this secondary question, which he refrains from answering: ‘Do they recognise one another and do they know what has brought about their origin?’.

To the first question, the author of K. al-Ḥayawān (iv, 70), one of whose most original ideas is the influence exerted by the soil and the climate on the somatic and psychological characters of living beings, replies by conveying, without however associating himself with it explicitly, the opinion of certain of the Dāhriyya [q.e.] who accept the concept of gradual modifications capable of leading ultimately to a total transformation; conversely, there are others who do not deny the existence of collective divine punishments such as ḥithf or engulfment (of Sodom and Gomorrah in particular), poisonous wind and flood, but do not recognise maskh. On the part of the Muʿtazila, al-Nazzām accepts the phenomenon and considers that it falls within the category of divine miracles, while Abū Bakr al-ʿAṣam and Ḥighām b. al-Hakam reject it and accept only kalb, modification (apud Ḥayawan, iv, 73). According to al-Baydawi (on II, 61/65; cf. al-Damiri, ii, 183, s.v. kirn), Mudjavīd [q.e.] interpreted in a limited fashion the verse relating to the maskh of the Banū Isrā‘il, stating that they were not metamorphosed, but that their heart was transformed and their spirit rendered similar to that of monkeys; he was, however, the only one to hold this opinion.

As to the question of whether the monkeys and pigs of which the Kur‘ān speaks and the above-mentioned animals in general derive exclusively from metamorphosis and were thus, originally, humans, or whether such species existed before the event in question, the answers are by no means unanimous, since points of view vary perceptibly, even though in II, 61/65, the words kirnā and ḡanāzar are defined by the article, which would seem to allow no freedom of interpretation. For some (Ḥayawan, iv, 68), the Kur‘ān refers only to individual cases designed simply to impress minds and teach a lesson. For others, on the contrary, the lizards, pigs and monkeys, as well as the eels, dogs, cats, etc., are all derived from the descendants of those who have been transformed. It is thus that, for example, Ibn Kutayba, in referring to verse V,
was a natural source of inspiration for the writers of fabulous tales. In the Thousand and one nights (see N. Elisseeff, Thèmes et motifs des Mille et Une Nuits, Beirut 1949, 274-81), it is generally by means of sprinkling with water that humans are changed into animals (cow, calf, gazelle, dog, mule, monkey, bird, ass, bear) or that metamorphosed beings are returned to their initial form. Culpits are sometimes petrified (ibid., 151), like Isaäf and Naßla, and rocks which present a vaguely human appearance are invariably considered to represent men who have suffered divine offerance (as, for example, the rocks of Hämämm Maskhûthin in eastern Algeria).

It may be noted finally that the metamorphoses of insects, well-known to the authors of zoological works, are not designated by the term maskh (a detailed example is to be found in al-Damiri, s.v. did). Bibliography: Given in the article.

**MASLAHA**, the concept in Islam of the public interest or welfare.

Maslaha (pl. maslîkh) is the abstract noun of the verb salaha (or salala), “to repair or improve”. Strictly speaking, maslaha, like manafa'a, means “utility” and its antonyms are madarra and masfada (“injury”); but generally speaking, maslaha denotes “welfare” and is used by jurists to mean “general good” or “public interest”. Anything which helps to avert masdah or furthers human welfare is equated with maslaha. As a legal concept, maslaha must be distinguished from istislah, a method of legal reasoning through which maslaha is considered a basis for legal decisions (see istislah and istislah). In this article, maslaha will be dealt with as a concept and as a legal principle.

The first important case in which the notion of public welfare (al-kharaj and naf) was invoked as a basis for legal decision was the land of southern Trak (al-Sawad), which the caliph 'Umar decreed should become state-land and a land tax (al-kharaj) was imposed on it. Earlier, the practice of the Prophet in such a situation varied from dividing the land among the participants in qiyas as, in the case of the land taken from the Banü Qurayyâ, to turning it into state-land as in the case of Khaybar (Abû Yusuf, Kithâ al-Kharajât, 51). Some of the Companions, like al-Zubayr and Bilal, urged 'Umar to divide the Sawad among the warriors, but others, like 'Uthmân, 'Ali and 'Abd Allah, suggested that it should become state-land. After consultation with several other Companions, the caliph came to the conclusion that the interests of the community as a whole would be better served if the Sawad were brought under state control rather than divided. “If it were divided among the warriors”, the caliph 'Umar asked, “what would be the position of the believers as a whole and their descendants?” Retention of the land under state control would, he argued, bring about greater welfare and utility for the believers (al-kharaj li-umum al-Muslimin ... [and] 'umum al-naf) li-umum al-Muslimin (Abû Yusuf, 27). Though 'Umar did not use the word maslaha per se, its notion was clearly implied in the words kharaj (“welfare”) and 'umum al-naf (“public utility”). Supported by the opinion of leading Companions, he issued instructions to the land of al-Sawad and required its people to pay the kharaj (Abû Yusuf, 23-7; Yahyâ b. Adam, Kitâb al-Kharajât, 17-21; M. Khadduri, War and peace in the law of Islam, 181-3). 'Umar’s decision on the basis of public interest may be said to have influenced other caliphs to make similar decisions, e.g. concerning the compilation of the Qur’an. But these cases, though often cited as precedents, did not
establish maslaha as a principle or source of law. It was indirectly used through the derivative sources of kiyyāt and istislah (al-Shāhibī, al-Fīṣāṣīm, ii, 285; al-Mustasfī, 179/795) in respect of having been the first jurist to make decisions directly on the basis of maslaha through the use of istislah or al-maslaha al-mursala. Although no reference to maslaha or istislah is to be found in Mālik’s writings, his disciples cited cases in which maslaha as a concept of law had been used by him. Both al-Shāhibī in the Risāla and Sahānūn in al-Muḍawwana cite the sale of dried dates for dried dates “in case of the sale of fresh dates having become a definite concept of law on the basis of which jurists could make legal decisions. Other jurists, called legal reasoning, however, istislah was developed later and used by jurists who claimed that Mālik was the first to initiate the use of it (al-Shāhibī, al-Fīṣāṣīm, ii, 281-316). No clear evidence, however, has yet come to light indicating that Mālik had used maslaha as a concept of law. Dūwānī (d. 478/1085) is mentioned as the first to call attention to it (al-Shāhibī, op. cit., 282), and other jurists have made their contribution before it suddenly appeared as a mature concept in the writings of Abū Hāmid al-Ghazālī (d. 1013). Al-Ghazālī states that in the narrow sense, maslaha may be defined as the furthering of the maḥrūm, and in a broad sense it is the ultimate purpose of the Shariʿa, consisting of the maintenance of religion, life, offspring, reason and property. “Anything which furthers these aims,” he adds, “is maslaha, and anything which runs contrary to them is maḥrūm” (al-Mustasfī, i, 139-40). Considering istislah and istislah as imaginary (i.e. subjective) legal methods, he confirms the use of kiyyāt as a positive method of legal reasoning on the grounds that the achievement of maslaha is a necessity (fi rubūt al-darūrāt) and develops the doctrine of necessity (darūrāt) as a means by which to realise the ultimate purpose of the Shariʿa. Al-maslaha, he maintains, consists of three categories: al-darūrāt (“necessities”), al-matāṣūdāt (“disabilities”) and al-istislahāt (“improvements”). In order to make a decision on the basis of the second and third categories, the jurists must find a textual reference by means of kiyyāt; but the first category—the darūrāt—constitutes itself a basis for legal decision without resort to kiyyāt or any other method, on the grounds that the maslaha of that description is the ultimate purpose of the Shariʿa. Thus by al-Ghazālī’s time, maslaha had become a definite concept of law on the basis of which jurists could make legal decisions. Other jurists called legal reasoning istislah, but al-Ghazālī rejected istislah. If such a method is needed, kiyyāt can adequately provide it. In the case of darūrāt, he argued, no dependence on a textual reference is needed. Thus maslaha of the highest rank itself becomes a source of the Shariʿa. Al-Ghazālī cites an example of the case of unknown who shield themselves with a group of Muslim captives. He maintains that the killing of innocent Muslims, though not allowed by the Shariʿa, would allow the unbelievers to gain mastery over the dār al-Islām and kill both the Muslims and the prisoners. Since minimising killing and the preservation of the community as a whole is closer to the purpose of the Shariʿa, a decision to strike at the enemy shielded with Muslims can be justified on the strength of maslaha. (Secrets its protection is a necessity (i.e. a necessity) and an implied purpose of the Shariʿa (op. cit., i, 141). But al-Ghazālī warns against the use of cases other than darūrāt, such as if a few men in a ship, afraid of sinking or starvation, should kill one of them to save the rest. It was, however, not a Mālikī or Shāhibī jurist who went further in the use of maslaha, but the Ḥanbālī jurist Naḍim al-Dīn al-Tawfī (d. 716/1316). In principle, he agreed with al-Ghazālī on the use of maslaha as a basis for legal decisions irrespective of others sources. He also argued that the other sources of the Shariʿa recognised maslaha as the ultimate purpose of the Divine Legislator. Al-Ghazālī restricted its use to other than the cases of necessity. Shariʿa’s basis, Tawfī seems to have said nothing innovative save that he universalised the principle to all cases of public interest. But when he then further by holding that, even if the principle of maslaha contradicts a primary source, it should override on the grounds that the Shariʿa itself was laid down to protect maslaha as the ultimate purpose of the Divine Legislator (for the text of al-Tawfī’s treatise on maslaha, see the appendix in Mustāfī Zayd, al-Maslaha fi l-taṣfīr al-ʾislāmī, 7-48). Although he cites textual references from the Kurʾān and Tradition in support of his argument, the principal textual evidence is the tradition lā darūr wa-l-darūr ("no injury should be imposed nor an injury to be inflicted as a penalty for another injury"). From this and other citations, he asserted that the principle of maslaha as a method of legal reasoning, however, if such a method is needed, kiyyāt must be overruled by an injury to be inflicted as a penalty for another injury”). From this and other citations, he asserted that the principle of maslaha as a method of legal reasoning, however, if such a method is needed, kiyyāt must be overruled by an injury to be inflicted as a penalty for another injury”.

The principle of riṣāʿat al-maslaha, though ably defended by some of its adherents, like the Mālikī jurist Abū Ḥaṣākh al-Shāhibī (d. 790/1388) and others, found no great supporters in an age in which ʿidāḥah was discouraged and tribal prevailed, mainly because it stressed dependence on evidence that cannot be clearly identified by kiyyāt or other derivative sources. In the modern age, however, under the impact of Western legal thought, the concept of maslaha has become the subject of an increasing interest among jurists who have sought legal reforms in order to meet the needs of the modern conditions of Islamic society. Although ʿAbd al-Razzāk al-Sanḥūrī (d. 1968) and others to provide for modern civil codes based partly on the Shariʿa, but mainly on Western law.
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MASLAMA b. ABD AL-MALIK b. MARWĀN, son of the caliph 'Abd al-Malik and one of the most imposing Umaiyyād generals, whose siege of Constantinople 98/716-18 earned him lasting fame.Like his uncle Muhammad b. Marwān [q. v.], whom he succeeded in Asia Minor in many respects, he was, as the son of a Abbasid of the ‘Abd al-Walid dynasty, excluded from the succession to the caliphate. His date of birth is unknown. He died on Muharram 121/24 December 738.

Starting in 86/705, the last year of his father's reign, Maslama led the regular summer campaigns (jādān), sometimes prolonged over the winter, into the Byzantine territories of Asia Minor, often accompanied by al-‘Abbās b. al-Walid [q. v.] and other sons of his half-brother, the caliph al-Walid. The range of these campaigns stretched from the region of Malatya in the east to Amasya in the north and to Pergamon in the west. Among his early conquests, those of Ṭūwāna (Tyana) and ‘Ammuriyya (Amorium) in 89/707 and 90/708 are best known. In 91/710 he succeeded Muhammad b. Marwān in the governorship of Armenia and Adharbaydjan, which he reconstructed and fortified. In the summer of 108/726 which he reconstructed and fortified the town and station a permanent Syrian garrison in it, whereby he became the founder of Islamic Darband. In 114/732 he retired from the political stage, and seems to have passed the remaining years of his life in northern Syria, where he possessed large estates, especially in the region between Harrân and Rakka.


MASLAMA b. MUKHALLAD b. AL-SĀMIṬ AL-AMSÂRĪ, Abī Ma‘ān or Sa‘īd or ‘Umar), companion of the Prophet who took part in the conquest of Egypt and remained in the country with the Muslim forces. He was appointed governor of the coastal province of al-Abwāb (Darband) in the summer of 709/724, which he reconstructed and fortified the town and station a permanent Syrian garrison in it, whereby he became the founder of Islamic Darband. In 114/732 he retired from the political stage, and seems to have passed the remaining years of his life in northern Syria, where he possessed large estates, especially in the region between Harrân and Rakka.

MAŞMUDA

MAŞMUDA (the broken plural Masamida is also found), one of the principal Berber ethnic groups forming a branch of the Baraxis.

The Masmuda elements mentioned by al-Bakri in the neighbourhood of Bône, the post-Islamic Masmuda seem to have lived exclusively in the western extremity of the Magrib; and as far back as one goes in the history of the interior of Morocco, we find them forming with the Şanâhdja [q.v.], another group of Baraxis Berbers, the main stock of the Berber population of this country. Indeed, from the first Arab conquest in the 1st/7th century to the importation of the Hilâli by the Almohad sultan Ya’kûb al-Mansûr in 586/1190, it was the Masmuda who inhabited the great region of plains, plateaux and mountains, which stretches from the Mediterranean to the Anti-Atlas to the west of a line from north-east Wargha and of Azammur. To the north and to the south it was bounded by the land of the Dukkala; the only parts of this territory which were not occupied by them were three small Şanâhdja enclaves: the Şanâhdja of Tangier, of the valley of the Warga and of Azammûr. To the north and to the south west it was bounded by the land of the Şanâhdja. To the north were the Şanâhdja of the region of Taza and of those of Warga; in the centre, the Zanâga or Şanâhdja of the Central Atlas, to which should be added the Zanîna of Fâza; to the south, the Haskûra, the Lamta [q.v.] and the Gâzûla [see gazûla].

It was from the presence of this Masmuda block, extending continuously from Sus to the Mediterranean, that eastern Morocco generally must have received the name of Şus, a name found for example in Yâkût (s.v. Şus) who distinguishes a Hither Şus (capital Tangier) and a Farther Şus (capital Şarqalata) separated from the other by two months’ journey. It is also to this racial unity that are due the legends according to which all the northwestern corner of Morocco was once inhabited by the people of Şus (ahl Şû).

Before the coming of the Hilâli Arabs, the Masmuda peoples were divided into three groups:
1. In the north, from the Mediterranean to the Sabû and Warga, the Qumâra [q.v.]
2. In the centre from the Sabû to the Wadi Umm Rabî‘, the Baraghwâta [see baraghwâta]
3. In the south, from the Wadi Umm Rabî‘ to the Anti-Atlas, the Masmuda in the strict sense of the word.

Like the majority of the Baraxis, who in this respect are a contrast to the Butr, who are inclined to be nomads, the Masmuda were all settled; for, in one passage, Ibn Khaldûn mentions two nomad tribes, the Lâkha and the Zaggan, as forming part of the Masmuda confederation of the Hâha, he also points out that they were tribes of the Lamta, i.e. of the nomadic Şanâhdja, who finally became incorporated in the Dhawû Hassan, Ma‘kîli Arab nomads [see ma‘îli] of Şus. Ibn Khaldûn further makes special mention of the fortresses and fortified villages (mâṣ’il wa-bûsîn) of the Masmuda who lived in the mountains of Daran or the Great Atlas. Arab historians and geographers mention the many little towns (karya) in the plains occupied by the Dukkala or the Baraghwâta, a pastoral and agricultural people; but these were gradually ruined and destroyed in the course of the fighting which went on without interruption in their country from the establishment of the Zanàga or the Central Atlas by the Aghzur, and in the plains of the Aghzur, the Almoravid and Almohad conquests, repeated campaigns against the heretical Baraghwâta, the Hilâli occupation, the struggle between the Almohads and the Marçûnîs, the rivalry between the Marçûnîs kingdom of Fas and that of Marrakûsh and lastly the wars with the Portuguese. Exterminated as heretics, dispossessed of their lands and driven from them by the Arab or Zanàta nomads brought into their territory, transported to a distance (region of Fas) by the Waṭqâsîd sultans, for whose taste they showed too little hostility to the Portuguese, the central Masmuda, the original inhabitants of the Aghzur, of Tâmasnà and of the land of the Dukkala, finally disappeared; their place was taken by nomads, Hilâli Arabs (in the north, in Habût and Aghzûr, the Rîvi; in the south, the Djûsham, Sufûyan, Khûl and Banû Djâbir) and the Berbers (Zanàta Hawwârâ; in the 10th/16th century the coming to power of the Sa‘îdis dynasty brought about the immigration of Ma‘kîl Arab tribes to the same region: 3. Abûdî, Abîmar, Rabûâ, Barâbîb, Udûyâ, Awîdî Dulâyûn, Zu‘ayr, etc.

From the 10th/16th century onwards, as a result of the occupation of their central plains by the Arabs, Hilâli then Ma‘kîli, the Masmuda only survived in the mountainous regions which formed the northern and southern extremes of their old domains.

The Masmuda of the north (or Masamda al-Sâhibî: “M. of the shore” of al-Bayân) were chiefly represented by the Gümûrâ group. But, alongside of them, we find two small groups having the same racial origin:

1. The Masmuda of the Straits, settled between the district of Ceuta, which belonged to the Gümûrâ and that of Tangier, a Şanâhdja country. It was they who gave their name to the fortified port of Kaşr Masmûda, also called Kaşr al-Ma‘dâzâ, the modern al-Kasr al-Aşghîr. Their presence here is attested in the 10th/16th century, for it was written here against them that Hâ-Mîm, the prophet of the Gümûrâ, was slain; al-Bakri (5th/11th century) knew them in the same area corresponding to that of the modern Andjra.

2. Al-Bakri mentions another group of Masmûda (tribe of the Aşsâda) settled in the land lying between al-Kasr al-Kabîr and Wazzân; there is still a small Masmûda community between these two towns.

The Masmûda of the south, who inhabited the lands between the Wâdi Umm Rabî‘ and the Anti-Atlas, were divided into two groups: those of the plain and those of the mountain.

1. The Southern Masmûda of the plain lived to the north of the Great Atlas. The chief tribes were the Dukkala; the Banû Mâgîr (around Safi); the Gümûrâ; the Raqrâga and the Hâha (to the south of the lower course of the Tansift). The chief town in this region was Safi [see asfî], for the town of Amazmûr [q.v.] and the ribût of Tî [q.v.] were in the enclave of Şanâhdja; beside the port of Safi, we must also mention that of Kûz (the Aqoz of the Portuguese) at the mouth of the Tansift, which gave Aghmât access to the sea and had a ribût, and that of Aqamûl (the Mogador of the Portuguese) which served the district of Şus. Besides these three centres, there were, as in Tâmasnà, a large number of fortified little towns (karya) many of which survived down to the 10th/16th century; the Portuguese chroniclers, Leo Africanus and Marmol have preserved for us many names of these places which have now disappeared, their very memory being lost; the local hagiographic collections, and notably the Kibîj al-Targahawûf of al-Taldîlî (7th/13th century), have preserved a good deal of valuable historical and ethnographic data on this subject. At the present day, all the country to the north of this region is arabicised and if the old Berber element has not com-
pletely disappeared, it is at least overwhelmed by Arabs, of whom the majority seem to be of Maqṣūl origin. The Ḥāhā alone, between Mosgador and Agadir, have remained almost intact and have retained the use of the Berber language.

b. The Southern Maṣmūda of the moun-
tains occupied the Great Atlas (Djebel Darara), the massif of Sirwā (anc. Sirwān) and the Anti-Atlas or mountains of the Nagṣa (Berber, Ḥān Gist).

In the Great Atlas, the Maṣmūda extended to the east as far as the upper course of the Tanāṣif (a pass called Tizi-Teblew). From east to west, the following were the chief groups; the Glāwsā; the Ḥaylānsā (or Aylānsā), the Warīka and the Ḥazradjā, near Aghmāt; the Aṣṣāndān, including the Masfīwā, the Māqṣūl and the Durgṣānā of Bar Ḍugṣānī; the Ḥintāntā, including the Ghayyghayā; the people of Tin-Mallāf, on the upper course of the river of Naffis; the Sawdā or Zawdā, in the lower valley of the Assīl al-Māl, the Gaddmīwā and lastly in the west, the Gāfīsī, the chief tribe of which was the Saksāwā or Saksīwā.

The massif of Sirwā and the high valley of the Wādī Sūs were inhabited by the Banū Wāwazqī and the Saktānā. The northeastern part of the Anti-Atlas was occupied by the Ḥarghā.

Further to the south, the Sūs, properly so-called, was inhabited by heterogeneous elements of Maṣmūda origin, Ḥaṣṣāfīn al-Ṭurq bi-n-Nāṣir as Maṣmūdā. Describing the road leading from Tarūndant to Aghmāt, al-Idrīsī mentions between Tarūndant and the land of the Ḥarghā, four tribes the names of which, corrupted by the copyists, are unfortunately hardly identifiable.

Besides these highlanders, who were strictly Maṣmūdā, we must mention the Ḥaskūrā (or Ḥaskūrān) of the Anti-Atlas. These were highlanders of Ṣāḥāḏī origin, brethren of the Lāmāt and Gażūlā, who led a nomadic existence to the south of the Great Atlas and the Anti-Atlas. The Ḥaskūrā were settled in the high valley of Ṭanāṣif and the Wādī al-ʿAbīd, on the two slopes of the mountain range which links the Great Atlas, the home of the Maṣmūda, with the Central Atlas, the home of the Zanāṯā (= Ṣāḥāḏī) of Tādīlā; their main tribes were the Ṣāḥāḏī, the Muḥrūn, the Garnānā, the Ġhūḏḏāmī, the Fatwāqā, the Maṭṭāwā, the Huṭlānā, and the Ḥantīfā, who, according as they lived on one slope or the other, belonged to the Ḥaskūrāt al-Kībīla (H. of the south) or to the Ḥaskūrāt al-Dīlī (H. of the north (< zīlī)). Ibn Khalīlūn, who calls attention to the Ṣāḥāḏīs origin of the Ḥaskūrā, adds, that as a result of their taking up the Almohad cause, it became customary to associate them with the Maṣmūda tribes, but that they never enjoyed the same privileges as these latter.

History. In 62/682, ʿUbkā b. Naⱽāf [q.v.] marched against the Maṣmūda of the Atlas with whom he fought several battles. On one occasion, he was surrounded in the mountains and owed his safety solely to the help given him by a body of Ṣāḥāḏī. In the same year, he attacked and took the town of Naffis which was occupied by ʿRūm and Berbers professing Christianity. Thence he went to Iglī, a town of Sūs which he also took. Legend adds that he even thrust his way to the Atlantic where he rode his horse into the water, calling God to witness that there were no more lands for him to conquer.

This first submission of the Maṣmūda does not however seem to have lasted after the departure of ʿUbkā. In 88/707, Māsā b. Naⱽāshīr had to reconquer Maṣmūda by his person and in the following year, he sent his son to the conquest of Sūs and the land of the Maṣmūda.

In 1147/392 ʿUbayd Allāḥ b. al-Habbāb was appointed governor of the Mağrib; he appointed his son Ismāʿīl as assistant to the governor of Morocco and gave him particular charge of the district of Sūs. In 1173/752, the same ʿUbayd Allāḥ sent Ḥābīl, grandson of ʿUbkā, to make an expedition into Sūs against the Maṣmūda and the Ṣāḥāḏīyya (Massūfā). Later the latter's son ʿAbd al-Rāḥmān al-Fīhīr (d. 127/745) becoming semi-independent governor of the Mağrib occupied Iglī and built a camp there, the remains of which could still be seen in al-Bakrī's time.

It is to the same governor that is attributed the making of the wells which supply the road from Tāmdālt to Awadhīn [q.v.] via Waddān, through the modern Mauritanian.

The land of the Maṣmūda then disappears from history till the 3rd/9th century. The conquests of Idrīs I did not extend in the south beyond Tāmāsānā and Tādīlā. But in 213/828 Idrīs II made an expedition against the town of Naffis; on his death in 213/828, his son ʿAbd (or ʿUbayd) Allāḥ obtained as his share of the kingdom, Aghmāt, Naffis, the lands of the Maṣmūda and of the Lamātā or Sūs. Al-Bakrī records that some of his descendants ruled as lords of Naffis and among the Banū Lamāt, not far from Iglī. Other Idrīsīs, descendants of Yābāb y. Idrīs, were at this time lords of Darā al-ʿAmīr. With the death of ʿAbd (or Idrīs) power in the 4th/10th century, the Maṣmūda again became independent and were ruled by elected chiefs or inghārīn (sing. ānghār [q.v.], Arabic šayyāb [q.v.]); al-Bakrī tells us that those of Aghmāt were appointed by the people for a term of one year. When at the end of the 4th/10th century, Zanātā principalities became established in Morocco (at Fāṣ, Shālīlā and Tādīlā), Maghrāwā established themselves at Aghmāt; but all we know of them is that they were attacked by the Almoravids.

In 449/1057, after receiving the submission of Sūs and of the Maṣmūda (Zawdā, Šaḥṣifwa, Gaddmīwā, Raghāra and Hāhā), the Almoravid chief ʿAbd Allāḥ b. Yā-Sīn took Aghmāt, the last Maghrawa ruler of which, Lagūṭ b. ʿAlī, fled to Tādīlā. His wife, the famous Zaynab, who was one of the Naftāzī, finally became the wife of ʿUbayd b. Tāghīfīn, whom she initiated into the fine art of diplomacy.

From 449/1057, Aghmāt was the capital of the Almoravids till 454/1062, when Yūsfūl b. Tāghīfīn founded Marrākush [q.v.]. In 466/1074 the same ruler, having divided his empire among several governors, gave his son Tamīm the governorship of Marrākush, Aghmāt, of the Maṣmūda and of Sūs, then of Tādīlā and Tāmāsānā. The Maṣmūda seem to have remained subject to the Almoravids till the rebellion in 515/1121 provoked by the meḥdir Ibn Tūmār [q.v.] of the tribe of Ḥarḥa, who, supported by ʿUmār Intī, šayyāk of the Ḥintītā, and by ʿAbd al-Muʿmin [q.v.], brought about the foundation of the Almohad dynasty. The history of the Maṣmūda is henceforth involved with that of the dynasty which they brought to power and which was to last till 1269. The Maṣmūda, together with the Almohad dynasty, thus contributed to the rise of the Ḥafsīsids, who ruled over Ifrīqiya from 625/1228 to 982/1574, through the descendants of Abū Hafs Ṣamīʿ Intī, šayyāk of the Ḥintītā.

During the first half of the 7th/13th century, the power of the Almohads, routed by the Christians of Spain at the battle of Hīnān al-ʿUkbā (Las Navas de Tolosa) in 609/1212 and vigorously attacked in Morocco by several Castilian and Aragonese kings, the Maṣmūda of the Atlas, indifferent to the fate of the dynasty, took advantage of its plight to regain
their independence. It was the tribes of the Hintáta and the Háscura, which in 621/1224 at the proclamation of al-Ádil assumed the leadership in the movement; frequently allied with the Hílái of the Atlas and the Hashánt, we find them fighting in all the civil wars and supporting various pretenders to the throne. When in 667/1269, the Máríns had definitely crushed the Almohads, the Masmúda retained a certain amount of independence and lived more or less in submission to the central power, ruled by chiefs chosen from the great local families: Awlád Yání among the Hintáta; Awlád Sa’d Áláb among the Gadmíwa; among the Saksása, Úmar b. Haddá was an independent chief who went so far as to claim the Berber title agéllad (= king). In Sús, the Banú Yáddar (Idder) founded an independent principality which lasted from 652/1254 till about 740/1340. As to the Háscura, the power among them was exercised by the Banu Khahtáb.

Down to the 9th/15th century, except during the first half of the reign of the Almohad dynasty of which they had been the principal supporters, the Masmúda of the Atlas were hardly ever under the direct rule of the Moroccan government; only the tribes of the plains, Dúkkála and Hásbía, in a position of inferiority as a result of their geographical situation, were able to offer less resistance and had to submit. The latter dynasties, Sa’díd and ʿAlawi, were no better able to subdue the Masmúda of the highlands; but instead of gathering round local chiefs with temporal power, the latter now placed themselves under the leadership of holy men with religious prestige.

In the beginning of the 10th/16th century, the land of the Masmúda was in a state of anarchy. Some agéllád of the tribe of the Hintáta held the lands of Marrakush; the most famous was ʿAbú Shantuf; to the south of Tansift, the 8th/14th century saw the rise of the warlike group of the Ragragá; in the 9th/15th century, the power of the mystic al-Dżazúl (q.v.) spread among the Hásbía. In the adjoining country of Dará, the Sa’díd dynasty was rising, which, after occupying Sús, imposed its domination on the whole of Morocco. But it did not, however, succeed in subjecting completely the highlanders of the Atlas. The powerful ʿAbd al-Mánṣúr himself had to fight against a pretender who had proclaimed himself king of the Saksása. After the death of al-Mánṣúr, the Atlas and Sús were all under the authority of local religious leaders of whom the most important were to be found among the Hásbía and in Tázarwált (family of Ábd al-Músá). It was the ʿAlawíd Sultan Mawláy Rásghíd who restored Sús and the Atlas to the Moroccan empire. The only episode to note is the constitution in Tázarwált, by a marabout Sayyid (Sül) Hishám of a kind of independent kingdom, the capital of which was Tíghám and which lasted from the end of the 18th century till 1886.

Henceforth, the Masmúda disappear from history. The Atlas remained more or less independent, according to the degree of power of the ruling sovereigns, but all the important events in the region took place among the Hásbía or in Sús (q.v.). The French occupation found the old Masmúda grouped, since the death of the ʿAlawíd Sultan Mawláy al-Hasán, into three bodies each under the authority of a local family: the Gláwa in the east, the Guñáfa in the centre, ad the Muğga in the west. The name Masmúda, still preserved in the north of Morocco in the name of a little tribe of al-Kayr al-Kabír, seems to have completely disappeared in the south, where the former Masmúda peoples, continuing to talk Berber, bear the name of Talláh (French Ouled) (q.v.). It may even be asked if the name Masamúda, which is found so often in the Arab historians, the Banu Yáddar and the Háscura, is not also among the peoples to whom they apply it; it is, indeed, suggestive that it is not found in the long lists of ethnics given in the Kitáb al-Ansáb, published in the Documents inédits d'histoire almohade.

Social structure. The Masmúda of the Atlas lead a settled life, living by a little agriculture and breeding a poor type of cattle; they live in villages or hamlets of stone houses with clay roofs. Ibn Khatdún notes the existence among them of numerous little strongholds and fortified villages (mašúk wa-husun), the ancestors of the modern argens and agardís (q.v.). There were none towns among the mountains; Tin Mallal, famous for the mosque where Ibn Túmart was buried, was never a town. Before the Almoravide ruler Yusuf b. Tádhíf founded Marrákúsh in 45/1062, built moreover in the plains out of reach of the highlanders, whom it was to control, the only urban centres in the district were situated at the foot of the Atlas on its lowest slopes. The principal towns were in the north, the double town of Aghámá (q.v.) and that of Naffí in the river of the same name; in the south, in Sús, Iglí and Tarídánt; as places of less importance we may mention in the north, Shíshawá (mod. Shishawa), Alfan and Tamurar; in the east, among the Hásbía, and in the borders of Sús, Tádnáat. The great trade-routes which traversed the region started from Aghámá for the port of Kúz (at the north of the Tansíf), Fás (via Tádlá), Sidjámása (through the land of the Hazradja and the Háscura), and Sús (via Naffí, the land of the Banú Mágús and Iglí; no doubt using the pass now called Tízí n-Test). Al-Bakrí particularly mentions the industry and application and the thirst for gain, characteristic of the Masmúda of the Atlas of Sús. The principal products of the country were fruits (nuts and almonds), honey and oil of argan (q.v.), a tree peculiar to the country, of which there were regular forests among the Hásbía. The Masmúda could cast and work iron and also copper, which they exported in the form of ingots or "loaves" (tanguit); they also worked and chased silver jewellery. In Sús also the cultivation of the sugar-cane enabled sugar to be made.

From the intellectual point of view, the Masmúda seem to occupy a place of first rank among the Berbers. Each of their three principal groups has produced a "reforming prophet", the author of sacred works in the Berber language: Há-Mim of the Cúmára; Sálih b. Taríf of the Beraghwái; Ibn Túmart of the Masmúda of the Atlas. It may also be noted that Sús is one of those few districts in which books were written in Berber down to a quite recent date (cf. H. Basset, Essai sur la littérature des Berbères, 73-81).

Religious life. The Masmúda were converted to Islam in the 1st/7th century by Ukhá b. Naffí, who left his comrade Shíkár among them to teach the new religion. The latter died among them and was buried on the banks of the Tansíf where his tomb is still venerated. The place is now called Ribát Sayyíd Shíkár near the confluence with the river of the Shisháwa. The Mosque of the town of Aghámá of the Haylána was founded at the beginning of the 2nd/8th century in 85/704. Ibn Khatdún describes the Masmúda of the Atlas as being attached to Islam from the first conquest, in which they differed from their brethren of the north, the Baraghwái and the Cúmára, who remained
faithful to their heretical beliefs. At the beginning of the 2nd/8th century, several of them became vassals of the Abbasids, others of the Samanids, and yet others of the Ghurids. The descendants of the saint Sallam Ahmad ibn Musa concentrated in the south of Sus, in Tazarwalt where Tadili's hagiographic collection, entitled Kitab al-

aym b. Mukarrin in the time of the caliph Ray by Nusayri, was addressed "to the masmughan of Dunb awand, Mardin-djah, to the people of Dunb awand, of Khurram of Luriz (Luridj) and of Shririz". This gives us an idea of the extent of the sway of the masmughan. His possessions included the country round Mount Damawand and stretched down the plains as far as the east of Ray. The district of Dunbawand (* Dubawand, [the land occupied by] the * Duban clan?) did not form part of Tabaristan. The Arabs mention it along with Ray (al-Tabari, i, 2653-6; al-Mukaddasi, 209; Ibn al-Fakih, 275-7), but as we have seen, at the time of the conquest, Ray and Dunbawand were under different dynasties. The old capital of Dunbawand may have been at Mandan, where, according to Ibn al-Fakih, Armaicl had built a wonderful house of teak and ebony, which in the reign of Harun al-Rashid was taken to pieces and transported to Baghdad. In the Arab period there were two towns in Dunbawand, sc. Wima and Adhur. The former was the capital of the district but also by the Sanhadja of the adjoining plains south full of wonder-working saints. Later, the tribe of the Ragraga, settled on the lands now occupied by the Shayadima, was the cradle of a movement at once religious and warlike, the details of which are little-known but the memory still alive. In the first half of the 11th/17th century, religious activity seems to be concentrated in the south of Sus, in Tazarwalt where the descendants of the saint Sallam Ahmad ibn Musa carved themselves out an independent marabout principality.


(M. S. COLIN)

MASMUGHAN, ("great one of the Magians") a Zoroastrian dynasty which the Arabs found in the region of Dunbawand (Damawand) as early as the north of Ray.

The origins of the Masmughans. The dynasty seems to have been an old, though not particularly celebrated, one, as is shown by the legends recorded by Ibn al-Fakih, 275-7, and in the Biruni, Asfar, 227. The title of masmughan is said to have been conferred by Faridun upon Armaicl, Bwarsap's former cook (Zohak), who had been able to save half the young men destined to perish as food for the tyrant's serpents. Armaicl (according to Yakut, ii, 606, a Nataacan, a native of the Zab) showed to Faridun in the mountains of Daylam and Shririz, a whole nation of these refugees, which caused Faridun to exclaim "we are the descendants of the house of Khurram the just" (hasti nasr* wa la nisnat*) promising an annual payment of 200,000 dinars. The charter given by Nu'aym was addressed "to the masmughan of Dunbawand, Mardin-djah, to the people of Dunbawand, of Khurram of Luriz (Luridj) and of Shririz". This gives us an idea of the extent of the sway of the masmughan. His possessions included the country round Mount Damawand and stretched down the plains as far as the east of Ray. The district of Dunbawand (* Dubawand, [the land occupied by] the * Duban clan?) did not form part of Tabaristan. The Arabs mention it along with Ray (al-Tabari, i, 2653-6; al-Mukaddasi, 209; Ibn al-Fakih, 275-7), but as we have seen, at the time of the conquest, Ray and Dunbawand were under different dynasties. The old capital of Dunbawand may have been at Mandan, where, according to Ibn al-Fakih, Armaicl had built a wonderful house of teak and ebony, which in the reign of Harun al-Rashid was taken to pieces and transported to Baghdad. In the Arab period there were two towns in Dunbawand, sc. Wima and Adhur. The former was the capital of the district but also by the Sanhadja of the adjoining plains south full of wonder-working saints. Later, the tribe of the Ragraga, settled on the lands now occupied by the Shayadima, was the cradle of a movement at once religious and warlike, the details of which are little-known but the memory still alive. In the first half of the 11th/17th century, religious activity seems to be concentrated in the south of Sus, in Tazarwalt where the descendants of the saint Sallam Ahmad ibn Musa carved themselves out an independent marabout principality.


(M. S. COLIN)
are very contradictory, as is shown by their very detailed analysis in Vasmer, op. cit., in Bibl. After the defeat of the ıspahbads, the Arsabs conquered the masmughan and captured him and his daughters Baktataraya (?2) and Smyr (? or Shākil). Of these princesses, one was the wife of al-Mahdī b. al-Mansūr and the other the umm wa'ad al-Mīl b. Rāyta. According to a story in Ibn al-Fakih, 314, Khālid b. Barmak (Vasmer, op. cit., 100, that he was exiled to Ray, and there from al-Mahdī ordered him to be beheaded.

After the death of the masmughan, the people of these mountain regions lapsed into barbarism (hāzewiyah) and became like wild beasts (al-Tabari, iii, 136). According to Ibn al-Fakih (276), however, the descendants of the masmughan (= Armidil?) were still well-known.

Spiegel’s and Marquart’s hypotheses. Yākūt, i, 244, interprets masmughan as kabir al-madidjus “the great one of the magi” (mas ‘great’, N.W. Ira- nian form). Spiegel thought of connecting this dynasty with the prince-priests of Ray, whose existence is known from a well-known passage in the Avesta (Yazna, i, 18, Darmesteter, i, 170; cf. Jackson, Zoroaster, 202-5). In spite of Marquart’s criticisms, who says it is impossible to quote the authority of Avestan traditions which relate to much earlier state of affairs, Spiegel’s suggestion is still of interest. We have certain to deal with vague memories and not with actual facts. In the time of the Arab conquest, the descendants of Sahrām Cōhūn were ruling in Ray, but the Arabs (al-Tabari, i, 263-6) installed there a certain al-Zaynabī, son of Kūla and father of al-Farrukhān. It remains to be seen if this family of Zaynabī “whom the Arabs call al-Zaynabī” (al-Baladhuri, 317) is connected with Dunbawand. Their stronghold in Ray was called ʿArin (?), which resembles the name of the mountain al-ʿArayn from which the last masmughan came down (cf. the note by de Goeje and de Jong, 228). Masrūh wanted to connect the masmughans of the Bawandid dynasty, the eponymous ancestor of which Baw, a descendant of Kāwūs, brother of Khusrū Ī, is said to have lived in the time of the later Sāsānids [see BAWAND]. This Baw was a man of piety, and after the fall of Yazdārgard III had retired to his father’s fire-temple. Marquart regards him as a ‘magus’ and identifies him with the father of the Christian martyr Anastasius, who bore this name (βαύς) and was a ‘master of Magian lore’. Lastly, he quotes the fact that the Bawandids appeared in 167/783-4 only after the disappearance of the masmughans (after 141), as if to continue their line. Unfortunately, several details of the ingenious argument are not accurate: our sources (Ibn Isfandiyar; Zahir al-Dīn, 204-5) give not the slightest suggestion that Baw belonged to the priestly caste. According to Ibn Isfandiyar (tr. Browne, 98), his grandfather’s temple was at Kūsān, which Rabino, Marzandarān and Astarābād, 160, locates a little distance west of Aṣafrah i.e. quite remote from Dunbawand. The passage in al-Tabari, iii, 1294, which Marquart quotes to prove the occurrence of the name Masmughan among the Bawandids refers to the cousin of Māzyār of the Kārinid dynasty [q.v.], which is quite different from the Bawandids (cf. below). The Kārinid masmughan. It is curious that neither Ibn Isfandiyar nor Zahir al-Dīn speaks of the dynasty of the masmughan of Dunbawand, perhaps because they do not include this region in Tabaristan proper. On the other hand, they mention a masmughan (masmughān, Vognar) Wandād Hurmūz [i.e. of Miyan-du-rūd] (Zahir al-Dīn, 42), says that this canton was near the Šāri between the rivers Kalārūd and Mihrābān and that on the east it adjoined Karatuğan; Miyan-du-rūd is thus quite close to where Rabino puts Kūsān (!). This masmughan Wallāsh (Ibn Isfandiyar, 101; Zahir al-Dīn, 42) lived in the time of Dāmāspīd Farrukhān the Great (709-227) and married to the elder branch of the Kārinids descended from Zāmrī b. Sūkhī. (It is unclear why Justi, Iranische Namenbuch, 430, takes this Wallāsh to be the son of the last masmughan of Dunbawand). The Kārinid Wandād Hurmūz (of the younger line, descended from Kārīn, brother of Zāmrī) in his rising against the caliph (al-Mahdī, 158-69/775-85) had combined with the ıspahbads Šarwīn (772-97) and the masmughan Wallāsh of Miyan-du-rūd. This latter (Ibn Isfandiyar, 126; Zahir al-Dīn, 155) seems to have been one of the successors of the masmughan Wallāsh mentioned above.

Under 224/838 al-Tabari (iii, 1294) mentions a cousin of the Kārinid Māzyār, who was called Shāhrīyār b. al-Masmughān. According to this, al-Masmughān would be identical with Wandād Umūmid, uncle of Māzyār (cf. Justi, 430). On the other hand, under the year 250/864, al-Tabari, iii, 1294, mentions a Masmughān (sic) among the allies of the ʿAlīd Hasan b. Zayd. Ibn Isfandiyar, 165, calls him Masmughān b. Wandād-Umūmid. One must either suppose there is an error in al-Tabari’s genealogy or admit that the title of masmughān was borne both by Wandād-Umūmid and his son, but the form of the designation of the latter; (mas- without the article) would rather show that the title had become a simple proper name (Browne was thus wrong in translating “the masmughān”). To sum up then. Alongside of the masmughāns of Dunbawand, we have the masmughāns of Miyan-du-rūd. These masrūhs, if we may rely on Zahir al-Dīn, belonged to the Zāmrīrid branch of the dynasty of Sūkhūr (Sāsānīd governor of Tabaristan descended from Kārīn, who was called šahīd al-Dīn, 42), of the famous smith Kāwā (see KĀWĀN). Later we find the title (or proper name?) of masmughān recurring in the younger branch of the line of Sūkhūr (the Kārinid branch), which occupied a position in Tabaristan subordinate to the Bawandid ıspahbads (Zahir al-Dīn, 154, 14).

Bibliography: Tabārī, i, 2656; iii, 130, 136 (1294, 1529); Birīnī, al-Āḏār al-bāḥšiy, 101, tr. 109, 227, 215; Kitāb al-ʿUyūn wa l-ḥaddāt, ed. de Goeje and de Jong, 228; Ibn al-Athūr, iii, 18; v, 304, 386-7; Ibn Isfandiyar, index; Yākūt, i, 243-4 (Ustūnāwān); ii, 606-10 (Dunbawand); Zahir al-Dīn, index; F. Spiegel, Eranische Alterthumskunde, 1871, iii, 563; idem, Uber d. Vaterland des Aseta, in ZDMG, xxxv (1881), 629-45; F. Justi, Iranische Namenbuch, 199 and 430 (tables); J. Marquart, Beitrag zu den ZDMG, xlix (1895), 681; idem, Ertracht, 127; R. Vasmer, Die Eroberung Tabaristans ..., zur Zeit des Charifent al-Mansūr, in Islamica, iii (1927), 86-150; see also KĀRĪNĪS.

(V. Minorsky)

Masraḥ Defter, the household account book of high-level Ottoman administrators such as viziers or governors, or of palace personnel such as waterbearers. The account book covered, for time periods of a month up to several years, detailed monthly inventories of household economic transactions. These entries are often organised under subject headings such as kitchen, clothing, or food expenses,
purchases of household goods from merchants and artisans, salaries of household members, or gifts given and received during religious holidays. Each entry of the inventory usually contains a description of the transaction, the price, quantity and the names of the people involved in the transaction. No systematic study of these books, hundreds of which are to be found in the Topkapı and Ottoman State archives, has yet been undertaken.

(F. Müge Göçek)

**MAŞRAF DEFTERI — MASRAH**

Primarily an artistic and literary phenomenon of the last two centuries, the Arab theatre has its roots in local performances of passion plays [see TA’ZIYA], marionette and shadow plays [see KARAGOZ], mimicry and other popular farces, and was affected by the then-contemporary (rather than the classical) foreign theatre as well. Although some popular open-air plays in Arabic have occasionally been presented publicly since the 12th/18th century, if not earlier, an Arabic theatre in the modern sense of this term has been in existence only since the mid-19th century. It was in 1847-53 that Mârûn al-Nakkâsh [q.v.], under the impact of the Italian theatre, wrote and produced several plays, chiefly adapted from Molière, before sailing for Italy. His production of the locale, the names of the dramatis personae and certain elements of the plot, in order to increase the appeal; with the same intent, the language combined the literary with the vernacular, and both vocal and instrumental music was added. To moderate possible opposition from religious circles, men and boys acted the female parts (later on, non-Muslim—and afterwards, Muslim—women joined theatre troupes). These features, which remained characteristic for some time, were introduced into Egypt by Syrian-Lebanese immigrant actors, who soon rendered Egyptian (and, most particularly, Cairo) the centre of Arab theatrical activity. Performances continued in Syria as well, and gradually spread to other Arab lands in the Middle East and North Africa. Most troupes were made up of amateurs, e.g. students, or at most, of semi-professionals; gradually, however, the number of the professional actors increased, although they had to await the establishment of semi-independent states, following World War I, in order to benefit from the public funds which were vital for their unhampered activity.

These developments were paralleled by playwriting. At first, most plays were written by people of other professions. Mârûn al-Nakkâsh was a clerk and merchant; his successors were journalists or, even more often, troupe directors, stage managers or actors. Only much later did the writing of plays become a full-time profession. Adaptations, mostly from the French, came first, as al-Nakkâsh’s literary output indicates. An even more prolific writer was Muhammad Uthman Dialâl (1829-98) of Egypt, who adapted into Arabic French tragedies and comedies, introducing appropriate changes, chiefly in the latter; in general, the former were performed in literary Arabic, the latter in the vernacular. Increased education and changes in taste led to more literal translations (although adaptations did not disappear for some time). One typical translator was the Beirut-born Nagib al-Haddad (1867-99), who wrote in Egypt. Although he changed the names of the plays and some of the characters and added music, al-Haddad usually remained faithful to the originals (mostly translated from the French); his works served as a model for the strictly literal translators which soon followed. These generally translated from French or English and represented a lesser extent, from Italian and other languages. There followed an impressive number of original playwrights, whose output continued simultaneously with active translation work (and, initially at least, adaptations). These cover the entire gamut of dramatic writing, contributing to the répertoire of farces, historical plays, melodramas, dramas, tragedies, comedies, political and symbolic plays, as well as works pertaining to the theatre of the absurd. One of the best known of these playwrights, who successfully tried his hand at several of these genres, is Tawfik al-Hakim (born in 1902), one of Egypt’s prominent 20th century men-of-letters.

There was evident interaction between dramatic output and the further development of the troupes. While the musical theatre dominated and attracted crowds, the acting, the stage-directing and theatrical criticism achieved gradual professionalisation: the number of theatre halls increased, and troupes performed an increasing variety of plays to a steadily growing public of diverse interests and tastes. Of all the troupe directors and actors in Egypt after World War I, perhaps the ones with the most impact were Diûrîj Abyâd [q.v. in Suppl.] who, having studied acting in the Paris Conservatoire, promoted semi-professional theatrical activity. Performances of the national theatre [q.v.], premiered at the National Theatre in Cairo (1899-1901), promoter of the often tear-jerking melodrama with social background; and Nagib al-Rihamî (1891-1949), nicknamed ‘The Oriental Molière’, whose comedies amused the crowds while criticising the social mores of his time. Numerous other troupes have joined these during the Inter-War period and since World War II, particularly in Egypt, Lebanon, Syria and Iraq, less so in Jordan, and hardly at all in the Arab Persian. Most are ephemeral unless supported by public funds, while usually means government allocations. Obviously, schools for the dramatic arts and theatre halls are dependent on such funds. All this has, again, led to a certain politicisation of the Arab theatre, differing from one country to the other. This process has been evident from the early days of the Arab theatre, e.g. in the plays of Ya’qub ‘Abd al-Nâdkâra [q.v.] in the Egypt of the 1870s; since World War II, however, it has acquired an obvious social content, often fully committed and starkly realistic. Theatrical criticism, too, has become increasingly outspoken, with critics generally vying among each other in their caustic remarks on playwriting, acting and stage-directing. They readily find an outlet not only in journals specially devoted to theatrical criticism (see Bibliography, below, for examples), but in many Arabic dailies and periodicals as well. All this is yet another indication of the great interest in the theatre throughout much of the Arab East.

**Bibliography:** Few bibliographies are devoted exclusively to the Arab theatre, e.g. Salâh Djawad al-Tu’ma, Bibliyugrafiyyat al-adab al-‘Arabi al-masrahi al-hadith, 1945-1965, Baghdad 1969; or al-Nâsir al-masrahiyya al-mufradât fi masârî wal-Kâhirâ mundhû nashâîhattdal-dn, in al-Kâtîb al-‘Arabi, xlv (April 1969), 60-83. For a list of plays in Arabic (both original and translated), see Dâr al-Kutub, Kâtîma ‘an al-tamhîliyya wal-‘Arabiyya wa l-mu’arrab, Cairo 1960. Bibliographies concerning the Arab countries or modern Arabic literature are relevant, in part, as are some bibliographies of the theatre, like N.B. East (ed.), *African theatre: a checklist of critical materials*, Nairobi 1970, 15-19 (for Egypt) and the Maghrib. Several of the books
mentioned below also comprise useful bibliographical lists. Source materials, as well as memoirs (but not autobiographies), such as the Shi' a 'alim, Abu Bakr b. Ahmad, in al-
Din'ar (Beirut), vii (1875), 521; al-Tamthil al-'Arabi, in al-
Hilal (Cairo), xiv (1 Dec. 1905), 141-9; xv (1
Nov. 1906), 117-8; al-Tamthil al-'Arabi: majdah wa-
mustakbalahu, ibid., xxxii (1924), 481-4, 638-41,
751-3 (a referendum); Shahriyyat al-masrah, in al-
Hilal, viii (1935), 427 (reprinted as a booklet, Beirut
1936); N. Bar-
sid, al-Shaykh Salmam Hidjd, al-Masrah aw al-marzah, in al-
Kitdb, vii (Jan. 1952), 94-8; Landau, Abu Nadddra: an Egyptian Jewish nationalist, in J. Bonjean,
Une renaissance egyptienne, Cairo 1959; Fatima Rushdi,
Mudhakkirat, Muktataf (Cairo), i-ii (1947), 65-75;
also al-Hildl, xxxii (1924), 481-8; ibid., vi (1947),
407-12; Brockelman, S III, 236-81 and index; U. Rizzitano, Il teatro arabo in Egitto: opere
teatrali di Taufiq al-Hakim, in OM, xxii/6 (June
1943), 246-7; Zakii Tulaymii, al-Rshiya al-
tamthilya wa-la-mi'dha al-'Arabi, in al-Kiib (Cairo,
Nov. 1945), 101-8; idem, Kafta al-dhakhara al-
tamthil bi-al-shark, in ibid. (Feb. 1946), 58-71;
also al-Masrah al-misri fi 'am , in ibid. (July 1946),
481-8; ibid., Drama in Egypt, in M. L. Roy Choudhury (ed.), Egypt in 1945, Calcutta 1946, 207-17;
C. Alexander, Theatre in Egypt, in Theatre Arts (New
York), xxx (June 1946), 367; Rushdi Kamil,
Shahriyyat al-masrah, in al-Kiib al-Misri (Cairo, in
Dec. 1946), 139-40; 4'Abd al-Rahman Sldki
Shahriyyat al-masrah, in ibid., xv (Dec. 1946),
540-4; J. M. Lavat, 41( at-ayr'ii al-
Ahbab (the theatre of the Arabs), in Banah (Tel-
Aviv), xviii (Jan. 1946), 48-53; xviii (June
1946), 65-75; xix (Sep. 1946), 48-60; 1 (Jan.
1947), 107-15; 4'Abd al-Tayy'ir'4`al-
Aravii bi-4'Ursat- Isra'el'4`al-ha-
ara(hina, Hebrew, The Arab theatre in Palestine
during the past year), in ibid., ii (Dec. 1947),
43; Salih Dhdhun, al-Firka al-misriyya fi 'am , in
al-Kiib (July 1947), 1418-22; M. Jacobs, Nqub al-
Rihani, in La Vie teatrali di Taufiq al-Hakim, in
Machriq, ii (1948), 87-9; G. R. Ormventi, In The
teatrali di Taufiq al-Hakim, in Machriq, ii (1948),
192-207; Mahmud Haykal, al-Adab al-kasiyya wa-
1-
shar al-masrah fi Mr j
min a'kab (1919) i1a kiyim al-harb al-
khitra, Cairo 1951; Abdel M. Ramadan, Egypt's
theatre is international, in United Nations' World
vienna, v (March 1951), 17-18; Jeanette Tagher, Les
de bdtas du théâtre moderne en Egypte, in Cahiers d'Histoire
Egyptienne (Cairo), srie I, 1-2 (1949), 192-207;
Abdul Nsir, 4'Abd al-kasayiula 'am al-
shar al-masrah fi Mr j min a'kab (1919) i1a kiyim al-harb al-
khitra, Cairo 1951; Abdel M. Ramadan, Egypt's
theatre is international, in United Nations' World
vienna, v (March 1951), 17-18; Jeanette Tagher, Les
de bdtas du théâtre moderne en Egypte, in Cahiers d'Histoire
Egyptienne (Cairo), srie I, 1-2 (1949), 192-207;
Abdul Nsir, 4'Abd al-kasayiula 'am al-
shar al-masrah fi Mr j min a'kab (1919) i1a kiyim al-harb al-
khitra, Cairo 1951; Abdel M. Ramadan, Egypt's
theatre is international, in United Nations' World
vienna, v (March 1951), 17-18; Jeanette Tagher, Les
de bdtas du théâtre moderne en Egypte, in Cahiers d'Histoire
Egyptienne (Cairo), srie I, 1-2 (1949), 192-207;

...

2. In North Africa

Tunisia. — The first attempt at introducing theatre into Tunisia dates back to the early years of the 20th century. It owed much to the initiative of a fine actor known as the master, continued in his footsteps. In 1909, he formed his own troupe, with which that of ‘All al-Khazin was soon to be a serious competitor.

In the period following the First World War, groups of amateur performers proliferated in all the major towns. They toured the country, playing Egyptian tragedies and dramas in literary Arabic, as well as comedy and farce in colloquial language. But it was the popular entertainment which appealed most to the public. Nevertheless, the Egyptian influence remained apparent, especially in the more serious genre as a result of the tours which the major troupes of Cairo made periodically in the Maghrib, visiting Tunis in particular: Dāwūd Abyad in 1921, Yusūf Wāhbi in 1927, Fātimah Rūg启迪 in 1932 and ‘Abd al-Riḥānī in 1937.

In a theatre quite openly dependent on foreign material, a play such as al-Sudd ("The Dam") by Mahmūd al-Mas‘ādī takes on the nature of an original experiment. This transparently symbolic drama evokes the failure of a person engaged in an enterprise which is beyond him and which ultimately testifies in favour of the man and of his destiny. The action is stark, the scene set at the foot of a mountain. Two persons arrive, Ghayān and Maymūnā, leading a heavily-laden mule. The man decides to construct a dam, but he encounters enormous difficulties. Barely begun, the work is stopped, the scaffolding soon abandoned. To add to his misfortune, the man is swept away by a storm with his work unfinished, while his consort rushes headlong towards the plain exclaiming: "The Land, it is the Land that I discover!" Written ca. 1940 in a very pure prose style, intended to be read rather than performed, al-Sudd, on its publication in 1955, came to be regarded as a kind of masterpiece by Tunisian and Egyptian scholars and French Arabists.

However, dramatic production after 1940 seldom strayed from the beaten tracks. Authors were not concerned with presenting scenes that were new, true and pertinent to the human condition. Whether engaged in serious or in comic vein, they made strenuous efforts to achieve pathos or, on the other hand, contented themselves with facile gaiety. Innovations were rare, and performances of mediocre quality. For their part, the majority of actors were young amateurs whose enthusiasm did not compensate for their lack of training. Moreover, the absence of producers and technicians meant poor preparation and clumsy performances. The emergence of the professional troupes, which came about in the 1950s, was due to the achievements of the Tunisian theatre. At this stage, Tunisian theatre seemed doomed to failure. It was certainly in a state of stagnation.

It was not until the years following Independence that significant efforts were made at various levels with a view to reviving the theatre. Writers, mostly of dual Arab and French culture, generally occupying posts in public administration which guaranteed their material security, sought to lay the ground-work for a new dramatic movement. The example set by the foreign plays which were frequently produced in Tunis encouraged them to give freer rein to the imagination. In this process of renovation, producers, hitherto an unknown breed, played a role of the highest importance. The greatest of them was undoubtedly the Egyptian Zaki Tula Mayer, a man of expertise and experience, who for a long time enjoyed a well-deserved reputation in artistic circles of the Near East and the Maghrib.

When he arrived in Tunis in 1956, eight competing
companies of amateur comic actors shared between them the patronage of a sparse and eclectic public. Actors variously performed Egyptian plays in literary Arabic, or texts of European works, comedies and farces in the colloquial style of the locality, normally concluding the show with singing, dance and music. There were among them some talented individuals, whom Tulaymat chose in order to form a company of quality. He strove to make the scenery more authentic, the performance of actors more natural; he required his casts to rehearse thoroughly, to work in a spirit of team collaboration, to present well-constructed, living productions in which the element of convention is mingled with fantasy. The training which he gave bore fruit. In fact, when Zakî Tulaymat left Tunisia in 1961, the theatre experienced a new era of prosperity through the efforts of some of his young successors, including 'Ali Ben 'Ayad.

The latter was then director of the Municipal Theatre of Tunis. Both a man of grand aspiration and a man of the people, he was active in all spheres of artistic pursuit, with imagination and zeal as well as with realism. He adopted a dramatic technique which consisted in transposing the themes of works borrowed from the foreign répertoire to ancient or contemporary Arab-Islamic society, with the appropriate bayt, costumes and decorations. Thus, for example, his Caligula (1961) is set in the Middle Ages, at the court of a Maghribi sultan surrounded by his viziers, amirs and Arab retainers. There is nothing in common with the historical character nor with the protagonist of Camps' play, whom the Tunisian dramatist takes as the symbol of a sovereign ruling in bloody tyranny over his people. Ben 'Ayad applied similar treatment to a series of foreign works which he presented in Tunis and at the international cultural centre of Hammamet before performing them before the heterogeneous audiences of provincial towns and rural villages: Measure for Measure and Othello by Shakespeare, L'Evocateur by Molière, En attendant Godot (1955), La Derniere bande (1965), etc.

For his part, Fattah Wall devoted his life to the theatre and the drama, and was active in all spheres of artistic and literary activity. The net result is that these productions earned him renown both in Tunisia and abroad, especially in Paris, at the Théâtre des Nations.

At the same time, other younger dramatists who favoured strong characters, violent emotions and local colour, attempted to find new sources of inspiration in drawing their themes from Arab-Islamic history. They preferred the ages of glamour, retaining the facts but moulding them according to their imagination, developing the classical ideals of love, faith, honour and valour. The heroes, princes, military chieftains or simple warriors are obliged to risk their lives for the glory of Islam and the love of the homeland. Thus for example, Ahmad Khayr al-Din dramatised the epic of the Berber queen al-Kahina, who, at the end of the 1st/7th century offered fierce resistance to the Arab army of Hasan b. al-Nu'mân before finally collapsing under his onslaught (al-Kâhîna). For his part, Fattâh Wâli devoted his Pearl of Sicily (Ghauhar al-Sikilli) to the exploits of the Muslims who, embarking from Sousse in 210/827 under the command of Asad b. al-Furat, flung themselves into the conquest of Christian Sicily. Nor is romance absent from these pseudo-historical tableaux. 'Abd al-Razzak al-Bahrakha brings alive on stage the famous couple Ibn Zaydûn and Wallâda, with a nostalgic evocation of the Cordova of the 5th/11th century (Wâlâyda wa-Ibn Zaydûn). In this category of plays of heroic or historical pretensions, Murâd III (1966) by Habib Boulares (Bu l-Arîs) is reminiscent of Caligula by 'Ali Ben 'Ayad, but the epic grandeur of the subjects creates an atmosphere of heroic legend capable of capturing the imagination of the spectators. Ultimately, the characters are of quite elementary simplicity, entirely good or totally evil, clad in their symbolic guises.

Alongside this serious theatre, the comic genre has made a worthy contribution. In the relaxed atmosphere of the period 1960-70, numerous humorists provided comedies, farces or simple entertainments of circumstance, introducing hilarious, pathetic or cynical characters. It was during this time that Ahmad Khayr al-Din enjoyed his greatest popular success with the creation of the character of Hâdí Klîfî, distant cousin of the Egyptian Kîch Kîch Bey. All such plays, a little simplistic but well-constructed, have delighted popular audiences. It may be added that the theatre, in the past twenty-five years to interest all classes of society in theatre in its most diverse forms have succeeded well. In the context of decentralisation, provincial drama companies have evolved, so that today every town boasts its own troupe of comic actors, whose active members contribute both to improvement in standards of production and to the opening up of the theatre to new audiences. On the other hand, theatre has made its presence felt in the school, the academy and the university, and every years competitions are organised to reward the best young dramatists. Thus a new spirit is alive in theatrical life. Attendance at dramatic performances, formerly the preserve of a narrow circle of intellectuals, has become within a few years a social event shared by the scholar, the artisan and the peasant. It is beyond doubt this fact which, more than the number and quality of works, best characterises the rebirth of theatre in Tunisia.

Algeria. — It was only in the years following the First World War that Arab theatre appeared for the first time in Algeria. In 1921, the Egyptian troupe led by Djûrûd Abyad, after performing in Tunis, presented in Algiers two historical dramas by Nadjib al-Haddâd written in classical Arabic: Salâd al-Dîn al-Ayyûbî ("Saladin the Ayyûbî") and Thdrât al-Arâb ("Vengeance of the Arabs"). Although encountering only limited success before a public generally ignorant of the literary language, these performances made the Algerian élite aware of the existence of a militant and didactic Arabic theatre. Drawing on this experience a few months later, a handful of young intellectuals, for the most part former madîwan students, formed a cultural association, al-Mu'addiba ("The Educating [Society]") one of whose leaders, Tahir 'Ali Sharîf, organised the performance in the capital of three plays in literary Arabic which had the purpose of awakening the national sentiment of his compatriots and educating them concerning the horrendous consequences of social scourges such as alcoholism: al-Qâfiq bâ'd al-anâ' ("Recovery after the trial", 1921), Khâdîjat al-dhurâ ("Perfidy of Love," 1923) and Pâdî (1924). Another company, that of al-Tamthîl al-Isrâîlî ("The Arab Theatre"), founded in 1921, had as its leading personality a former student of arabic literature.
literature, Muhammad al-Manshali. This company performed in Algiers two plays in literary Arabic borrowed from the Egyptian repertoire: Fi sabih al-waqta (“‘For the homeland’,” 1922) and Fitiha al-Andalus (“The conquest of Andalusia,”” 1923). This attempt at the introduction of dramatic art was hindered by two apparently unsurmountable obstacles: on the one hand, it encountered the incomprehension of a public barely familiar with Arabic literature; on the other hand, it incurred the disapproval of the bourgeois élite, which had little taste for performances whose themes seemed incompatible with the principles of Arab-Islamic ethics.

Taught by this experience, some young enthusiasts performed during the same period plays which would be universally accessible, drawing their themes from contemporary life and from popular traditions. They shared their predecessors’ concern with moral and social, even political issues, and their simplistic philosophy, but they were at pains to express them in the daily patois of their fellow-citizens. During the interwar period, three names are pre-eminent: 4Allalu, Ksentini and Bachtarzi. With quite dissimilar gifts, all three gained reputations in comedy and in song, perpetuating in the theatre the tradition of popular poetry whose rhythms lend themselves particularly to musing on commonplace, profaning degrees, the tastes and the spirit of their time.

In many respects, 4Allalu is a pioneering figure. Born in Algiers in 1902, he first participated as a singer in public concerts whose a musical society, al-Mutrihiyya, organised during the evenings of Ramadan. Later he began performing in local cinemas, at Bab el Oued in particular, short sketches in the style of farces dramatising domestic situations. Enriched by this experience and confident of his methods, he formed in 1925 his own drama company, the Zahia troupe, and composed satirical, romantic comedies and comic ballets, written entirely in dialect, which he presented successfully in Algiers and the surrounding region, between 1926 and 1931: "Djeha" (Djeha, 1926), "The marriage of Bou-Akline" (Abu ‘l-Hasan, 1926), "Abou-Hassan or the sleeper awakened" (Abu ‘l-Hasan, 1927), "The Fisherman and the Genie" (1928), "Antar el-Hachachi" (‘Antar al-Hachayihi, 1930), El-Khaliia oues-Ssayyad (El-Khalifa ou ‘l-sayyad, "The Caliph and the Fisherman," 1931) and Hallaj Guernata (Hallak Qarnatai, "The Barber of Granada," 1931). However, his company, the beneficiary of neither public nor private aid, was not a commercial success and 4Allalu soon found himself beset by serious financial difficulties. As director, he led an exhausting life and consequently his health suffered. Disillusioned, in 1932 he decided to renounce all his theatrical activities.

4Allalu had no pretensions to originality, and little interest in novelty. Three of his productions were adaptations of very well known stories from the Thousand and one nights: Abu-Hassan or the sleeper awakened, The Fisherman and the genie and El-Khaliia oues-Ssayyad. His Djeha does indeed contain numerous humorous episodes traditionally attributed to the popular character of the same name, but the general theme is borrowed, via Le Medicine malgré lui, from a medieval fable, Le vilain mire, which depicts the triumph of a cunning woman. In The Marriage of Bou-Akline there are numerous echoes both of Arab folklore and of the French tradition of farce humour. 4Allalu does not venture to follow Molère in the direction of comedy of character. His figures confine themselves to stereotyped theatrical roles; they never become authentic human beings. Nevertheless, he excels in devising plots and situations which automatically arouse laughter: in Djeha, the hero is soundly beaten by the emir, the sultan before admitting that he is indeed the famous physician capable of curing the son of the sovereign. Similarly, the wife of Bou-Akline, finding the door closed on returning from an assignation with her lover, simulates suicide by throwing a great stone into the garden well; later, when everyone believes her dead, she appears before her husband who, terrified, imagines himself confronted by the ghost of his wife. Thus, the plays of 4Allalu appear to be a compromise between farce and comedy of intrigue. Invariably, the audience is held in suspense by theatrical sensations or amused by the disguises: Abu ‘l-Hasan, a nonentity dressed as a caliph and flaunting the trappings of his temporary authority; Hârin al-Raghîd and his vizier Qa’far disguised as merchants, etc.

Furthermore, 4Allalu is a skillful writer, deploying many witticisms, puns, amusing expressions: he gives to the hero of his first play, Djeha, the name of a popular character in the Arab world and to his wife that of Hila ("Stratagem, trick"); the aged retainer of Bou-Akline, Mekidech (Mheidâgh) is the homonym of another fictitious character whose adventures have amused the long evenings of his audience. The marriage of Bou-Akline"

In addition, he endows them with a popular, vivid, colourful style of language. As well as their demeanour and their gestures, their speeches provoke laughter. Their verbal comedy is constituted partly by aphorisms, maxims and proverb in current Algerian usage, partly by the repetition of exclamations habitually employed by the people to express joy, surprise or sadness (wiil wiil, "Alas for me!"; ya sâ‘di, "Just my luck!"). The borrowings from the spoken language and the verbal novelties are evidently designed to make the audience share the gaiety of the actors. In sum, there is no profundity, but the revelation, through laughter, of a good humour free from vulgarity, a joyous, irrepressible, infectious enthusiasm. This cheerful mood makes everything acceptable: Djeha and his wife Hila are arrant rogues, Bou-Akline is not entirely honest, and no more so is Abu ‘l-Hasan. It would be folly to object and to attach any importance to their actions or their concerns. 4Allalu has succeeded in the gamble of turning quasi-serious issues into the material of farce, without any pretension of displaying to the audience the illusion of reality. His principal achievement has been the definitive establishment in Algeria of a theatre of essentially popular inspiration and expression, adapted to the taste of his contemporaries.

The second actor-writer who has contributed significantly to the growth of the theatre in Algeria during the 1930s is incontestably Rashid Ksentini, whose works are published in the lengthy article devoted to him, s.v. al-Kasanthini.

The third motive force of Algerian theatre between the two World Wars is Bachtarzi (Muhyi ‘l-Dîn Bâsh
Tarzi), who was born and died in Algiers (1896-1985). When he came to prominence in the 1930s, he was already a veteran of the stage where he had acquired a fine reputation as a singer and an actor. Initially, he confined himself to repeating the principal successes of his predecessors in a slightly amended version. His players merged with those of Allalı and Ksentini, and the company thus formed comprised Algerian actors (al-Mansılı, Bash Djarrab, Dahmın and Hamel) and French ones (Louis Chaprot, Georges Baudry and Georges Hertz), who were joined by comic actresses such as Khalilah and Marie Soussan, the last named being Jewish. On the other hand, Bachtarzi created a répertoire: to the comedies, farces and sketches of his predecessors he added his own works, the first composed in collaboration with Ksentini, Chaprot and Hamel, and some seventy plays in all, all written in colloquial speech and several containing scenes where the actors express themselves in French. Among those which delighted the Algerian audience are the following: *Paqo (Fakı, "That's no good!"); El Bouzerii fel Askaria (al-Bərzənī, ", the Mozabite...""); *The Bouzarian at the barricades," 1934); *Alenniş (Allalı "I'm fine", "From self-respect", 1934); *Beni oui-oui (1935); Syndicat des chomeurs (1935); Le Mariage par téléphone (1936); El-Khedbatne (al-Kabdabinn, "The Trasors", 1937); El Keđabëin (al-Kedabbin, "The Lies", 1938); El Mechetna (al-Maşqah, "The Lies", 1940); and Sliman Elouk (Sliman al-lakk, "Sliman wax.") 1942, the two last-named being adaptations of, respectively, L'Aire and Le Malade imaginaire by Molière.

Bachtarzi was indeed a performer, but he was also above all an impresario of performances. He was also a writer conscious of the rôle which the theatre had to play in the evolution of Algerian society. Eager to encourage the broadest public to discover new horizons, he organised tours throughout Algeria and in Morocco, France and Belgium, playing to the significant Algerian communities present in these countries. However, his situation was precarious, as may be judged from the account in his Mémoires: in 1954, his troupe gave 61 performances in 44 localities; the following year it appeared in 55 urban centres; in 1956 and in 1937, the number of towns visited was respectively 59 and 89. Audiences varied between 150 and 2,000 in Algiers, Constantine, Oran and Tlemcen. Successes were inconsistent and receipts poor.

Such signs are a due to understanding the difficulties faced by the new guiding spirit of Algerian theatre encountering a society which remained backward and an administration uneasy about the theatre encountering a society which remained backward and an administration uneasy about the theatre. In this play, and dramatic tirades, he denounces the danger posed to the Algerian community by the relaxation of morals, the adoption of a poorly understood modernism and the revival of social evils: unemployment, alcoholism, prostitution and usury. With the same zeal, he condemns the disunity of his compatriots, the compromises of elected administrators, religiousibusy bodies and hypocrites. In this mood, he readily employs terms of ideological connotation (bakıd, "political rights"); *tit śhār, "union; "titşiftāt, "accord; "tezatun, "homeland; umma, "nation"), henceforward to become part of the normal vocabulary of every Algerian of any degree of education, and evidence of a willingness to take political and cultural initiatives in accordance with the social ferment dominating the country from the year 1930 onward. Inevitably, the irreverent spirit of Bachtarzi aroused serious hostility. His plays were banned or subjected to censorship. His career declined and he was only able to ensure the survival of his company by compromising with the authorities. However, he was appointed during the Second World War to entertain the Muslim soldiers receiving treatment in military hospitals.

The year 1947 marked the revival of Algerian theatre with the formation at the Algiers Opera of an Arab troupe and the appointment of Bachtarzi as its director. This initiative created conditions of a degree of professionalism and of greater stability. In fact, the players henceforward had facilities for rehearsing at leisure before every performance; they were guaranteed at least one performance per week; and finally they received a regular income as a result of a municipal subsidy. This company initially comprised about a score of actors, actresses, singers and musicians, most of them quite young: Mustapha Kateb, Muhammad Towri, Muhammad Hašţāb, Djālal Sāssīnī, Ridā Falākī, "Ayād Roudched, Kālḫum, Dalålī and Laylā Hākim. Most often, they played comedy in the colloquial language, but they also on occasion performed serious plays such as Hannibal, a historical drama by Tawfīk al-Madānī (1952). They remained active until the dissolution of the troupe in 1956.

Meanwhile, numerous troupes of players made their appearance in Algeria. Four of them were based in Algiers: *Les fervents du théâtre arabe algérien*, which was managed by Muhammad Tāhir Pūdālā; *Fikra al-fann al-samlīli* ("The Company of Dramatic Art") whose main guiding spirit was Mustapha Gribī; *Masrah al-gazārī" ("The Algerian Theatre") of Mustapha Kateb and *Masrah al-ghad* ("Theatre of Tomorrow") of Ridā Falākī, the two last-named being former members of Bachtarzi's team. Other dramatic activists made their appearance in the provinces: Ahmad Ridā Hūlī at Constantine, Hasan Derdour at Bone, Mūsā Khaddawi at Bīda, etc. While Falākī specialized in producing children's programmes for Radio Algeria, the others composed comedies, farces, entertainments, romances, plays full of enthusiasm and fantasy, mostly written in dialect, but with a rapidly increasing number in classical Arabic. It seems that the impression made by Egyptian productions performed by the major companies of Cairo in the course of their tours of Algeria encouraged the activists of the Algerian theatre to give more scope to the literary language.

In the same period, companies of actors were formed in the major cities with the encouragement of organizers of the association of reformist *ulama* and of the M.T.L.D. (Mouvement pour le triomphe des libertés démocratiques). The former presented, on the occasion of the celebration of religious feasts or of the annual distribution of prizes in private Arab schools, small dramas of cultural instruction intended to glorify Islam and the Arabic language. The latter were clearly oriented towards political and social action. For example, the play *Ainak and Rouibah*, performed in Algiers in the 1950s, dramatises the career of a young Algerian who "joins the party of the struggle for liberty" and evokes "the most noble cause". Such a committed theatre naturally had recourse to history with the object of exalting national sentiment: Hamīn al-Kāhina, Barbarossa and Šalāb Bey, each of these characters being seen as a champion of
patriotism. On the other hand, in numerous plays a conspiracy is forged against the sovereign to put an end to "the servitude of the people" and to "deliver" them from tyranny. These transparent allusions enable the audience to make straightforward comparisons and offer as a desirable prospect "the punishment of the despot" and "the revenge of the oppressed". The performance normally ends with the singing of patriotic anthems (anašīd wažanjiyya). It need hardly be stressed that all these performances took place in private places, before a limited audience of militants and sympathisers. After the rebellion of 1954, the Arab theatre virtually ceased to exist in Algeria. Some of its guiding spirits, members of the F.L.N., took refuge in Tunisia where they occasionally performed propaganda pieces.

The years following 1962 saw considerable changes taking effect in the theatre. At the Algiers Opera, renamed the Algerian National Theatre, there were efforts, under the guidance of Mustapha Kateb, to renew theatrical presentation and communication with the public by introducing aesthetic and ideological preoccupations. In this spirit numerous national companies were invited to perform, from Black Africa, Eastern Bloc countries, Asia and Central America. The actors performed in their own languages and boasted of the benefits accruing to the people as a result of revolution in their countries. On the other hand, the influence of foreign works such as those of Bertold Brecht and Sean O'Casey, but it must be admitted that neither the satire on rural and clerical society of the latter, nor the parables employed by the former to illustrate his communist principles, genuinely interested the public, which was thoroughly bored by these spec-

Combination of style is the norm: drama, melodrama, comedy in each of its different elements. Plays rarely display a unity of tone. Written in dialectal prose—"the use of literary Arabic is exceptional)—they reflect familiar modes of conversation. This is nevertheless a good style of theatre, and it would be a mistake to attribute to it a literary quality which it does not have and which it does not claim. The con-

After 1965, Algiers no longer held a monopoly over theatrical life. While, in the context of cultural decen-

dralisation, five regional theatres were progressively established in Constantine, Oran, Sid Bel Abbass, ʿAnnaba and Bejaia, groups of amateurs proliferated in the provinces. In 1970, seventy such groups were counted as regularly attending the annual festival of Mostaganem. Their members gave dramatic treat-

ment to topics of contemporary interest: agrarian reform, socialist development of commerce, emigra-

tion, education of the young and the position of women in Algerian society. This last problem formed the subject of lengthy public debates at the conclusion of plays devoted to it whose the troupe Théâtre et culture performed in Algiers in 1970. Similarly, Le groupe théâtral de l'action culturelle des travailleurs scored a major success both in Algeria and among expatriate com-

munities in France with the performance in 1972 and 1973 of a dual Arabic and dialect version of Charles Dru and Jamal el-Khoury (al-

Khôba, "Breath") by Abdelkader ʿAlālū and El Agra (al-

Agra, "The Sterling") by Zahir Bouzrar (1972-4).

The intentions of other authors are not displayed so openly, but they are no less evident. Such for example is the case of Slimān Benaiissa who, in Boualem zid el-
analysis and taking the measure of the human condition.

Morocco.—As in Algeria, it was not until after the First World War that theatre made its appearance in Morocco. In 1923, an Egyptian troupe led by Fez al-Din al-Masri made a tour of the country during which its most notable production was Salâth al-Din al-Ayyûbi, a historical drama in literary Arabic by Nadîb al-Haddâd, which Dürûd Abyâd had performed two years earlier before Muslim audiences in Algiers. This event inspired several young intellectuals of Fez to present similar spectacles to their contemporaries. They formed a company whose principal organisers were Muhammad al-Durrî, Mahdî al-Mnâïî and Ibn Shaykh. The first wrote about a dozen plays on themes dealing with the political and social scene: he denounced the protectorate régime, extolled national sentiment and stressed the poverty and ignorance which were the lot of the popular masses. Soon arrested, he died prematurely. His successors, who shared the same ideas, embraced political theatre with increased vigour. In 1929, there were enough of them to justify the holding at Fez of a contest to find the best dramatic actor. The winner was a student of the university of al-Karawîyîn who celebrated in literary Arabic the virtues of education in the cause of progress and of the struggle for the liberation of the country.

From 1934 onward, the theatre reflected the demands of the Comité d'action marocaine of `Allâd al-Fâsî which, in particular, sought the reform of Arab education, freedom of the press and the repeal of the dahîr of 16 May 1930 codifying traditional Berber law. In the wake of violent public demonstrations at Fez and Meknès in 1934 and 1937, public meetings were forbidden. This measure had a severe impact on the theatre which took refuge in semi-secrecy. Henceforward, groups of players performed only in private sessions on the occasion of family celebrations. Short, humorous and sometimes satirical plays were shown, featuring known characters or current events, and these were much enjoyed by the audience. The state of limbo to which this theatre of controversy was reduced, banned or legalised according to changing circumstances, persisted until Independence.

The years following 1956 were marked by an intense intellectual ferment, to which the theatre contributed a major part. In the chief cities of the country, numerous amateur companies mounted spectacles combining all elements: evocations of the recent past and of ancient history, borrowings from Arab folklore or from foreign literature. To this scintillating period belong several remarkable works, including Les Fourberies de Scapin, adapted from Molière's Les Fourberies de Scapin, which achieved a huge success both in Morocco and in France, where it was awarded a prize at the Paris Festival of the Nations in 1956. The public authorities encouraged initiatives aimed at popularising the theatre and took various measures with the purpose of putting its activities on a sound footing. It was thus that there was established in 1959 a centre for drama studies designed to train actors and theatre technicians. At the same time, a national company was founded, bringing together the best actors of the time: al-Tayyib al-Šiddîkî, Ahmad al-Tayyib al-Šaldh al-Din al-Ayyûbi, Abd al-Šamad Dînîû and Bashîr Skîrîd; finally, financial support was henceforward offered to groups of amateurs who were invited to participate in the annual festival of dramatic art. This official attempt at imposing structure on the theatre was only a partial failure. It encountered difficulties which twenty years later were still not fully surmounted and which had as much to do with the conflicting ambitions of men of the theatre, their personal concepts of dramatic art and the use of the means laid at their disposal, as with the refusal of the public to buy into a process which would integrate them in a bureaucratic system. The combination of these various factors soon put an end to an experiment which had barely begun. In 1962, the centre for drama studies closed its doors. Soon afterwards, the national company broke up and fragmented into several competing groups, while amateur actors were as desirous of support as they had been in the past.

The theatre born immediately after Morocco's accession to independence produced diverse works of very inconsistent quality. The different comic genres continued to enjoy popular approval: sketches, farces, comedies based on mime and gesture, humorous and satirical playlets featuring traditional types such as the naive and miserly Berber, the cunning and selfish Marrakshi, the greedy Jew, etc. On the other hand, adaptations of foreign works abounded: a characteristic example is supplied by The Inquisitive ones by Ahmad al-Tayyib al-Šaldh al-Din al-Ayyûbi, after Molière's Les Femmes savantes. Finally, serious theatre was enriched by historical dramas which, written by young authors, sometimes display the exuberance of youth. In this spirit `Asîz Sâh*rî`îh describes, in The Battle, the heroic attitude of the inhabitants of al-Šajîdî (formerly Mazagan) in their opposition to the occupation of their town by the Portuguese at the beginning of the 16th century. Similarly, `Abd Allâh Šâkrîn devotes numerous plays to the past of his country and develops the theme of resistance to foreign occupation, especially in al-Wâhi`a ("The Battle").

Around the year 1965, changes took place in the world of the theatre. The majority of those who, for ten years, had contributed to the development of dramatic art, abandoned the stage to enter public administration. Among the pioneers, only one remained at the forefront: al-Tayyib al-Šiddîkî.

Born at Mogador in 1958, his father a teacher of Arabic and his mother of rural origin, al-Šiddîkî spent his childhood in his native town. After studying at the High School of Casablanca and a brief period of working in postal administration, he began his stage career at eighteen years old, in an Arabic adaptation of Les Fourberies de Scapin which, as indicated above, enjoyed major success in Morocco and in France. Al-Šiddîkî then spent two years in Paris, where he learned techniques of production from Hubert Ginioux at the Comédie de l'Ouest before acting for a season at the Théâtre National Populaire, under the direction of Jean Vilar. Returning to Morocco in 1958, he devoted himself entirely to the theatre. Under the auspices of the Union marocaine du travail, he established the Théâtre travailliste, setting up his stages on the Casablanca waterfront and mounting productions adapted from plays by Aristophanes and Gogol. This experiment lasted no longer than two years, after which he formed his own company, consisting of a dozen players who followed him to the Municipal Theatre of Casablanca when in 1964, at twenty-six years old, he took over its direction. Simultaneously, actor, producer, director and administrator, al-Šiddîkî exerted himself unstintingly in efforts to draw the masses of his fellow-citizens to the theatre.

In ten years, he wrote, translated, adapted, presented—almost invariably in dialect—about fifty plays with widely varied themes. First, productions, as more generally, large-scale exhibitions dramatising events of the past of the present: Les Femmes savantes, Zaouia d'Oued Meghezem, Marrakech 1973, etc., huge pseudo-
historical tableaux performed in the open air on the occasion of the annual festival of the tolba. Next came pieces inspired either by classical Arabic literature, such as the makāmāt of al-Hamadhānī, or by the oral tradition as expressed, for example, in the rhymes of al-Madhūb [q.v.] which are still today recited on many occasions in the Maghrib. Finally, al-Siddīkī adapted some forty foreign plays, from Jeu de l’amour et du hasard by Marivaux to Amédée by Eugene Ionesco and En attendant Godot by Samuel Beckett. In sum, we have burgeoning répertoire continually enriched.

In fact, al-Siddīkī sought to provide himself with a lasting supply of material by vigorously seizing everything suited to his purposes, as much in the living popular culture as in foreign works. This versatility corresponded, in his personality, to a threefold concern: to try to interest the largest possible public by offering it numerous and varied productions; to make it aware of the problems faced by contemporary man in the political as well as the social and cultural domain; and to engage it in debate by establishing a dialogue between actors and audience. These parties could not communicate except by using the language of daily conversation. Al-Siddīkī knew that he was risking the disapproval of the partisans of literary Arabic, but he believed that this was a price worth paying for the development of the theatre in his country.

The prestige of al-Siddīkī should not obscure the efforts of writers and actors of lesser importance who for the most part have shared his motivations. There are several scores of them contributing to theatrical life in the main cities of the kingdom, Rabat, Fez, and especially Tangiers. Radio and television regularly devote broadcasts to the theatre, both in literary Arabic and in dialect. Studies of the traditional methods of performance (kisāʿ, ḥalqa and ʿurr) are followed at centres of popular arts. As in Algiers and Tunisia, annual competitions are formed to reward the best dramatists. In short, significant efforts are being made in Morocco to promote and to popularise the theatre.

In the three countries of North Africa, there is periodic talk of crisis in the theatre, expressed in various terms of which the most often heard refers to the paucity of writers, poor standards of performance-venues, public apathy, meagre patronage and the excessive cost of seats. In fact, it is perhaps in the very prosperity of the theatre that the true reasons for the crisis should be sought. Dramatic art in the Maghrib is suffering from inflation. There, as elsewhere, many are called and few chosen. The quite considerable number of mediocre works, hastily mounted productions, insufficiently trained actors, the excessive publicity applied to performances or performances of average quality, the constant confusion between original works and those which only pretend to be such, the urge to educate at any price—all these factors are liable to hinder the progress of the theatre without, however, truly threatening its existence. On the contrary, one is constantly surprised by its vitality, the constant innovation on the part of the young people who devote their daily energies to it—writers, producers, designers and actors—even if the coordination necessary between these elements is not always evident and the style of the particular period is not accurately invoked. What is clear, in any case, is that theatrical people are not doomed, as were their predecessors, to work in isolation. The problem of the relationship that they must establish with the public has never been better addressed than ever before. In conclusion, the basis of hope for the future is founded as much on the development of communication between actors and audience as on the success of an art form.


III. Morocco. Hassen El Mniā, Du côté des

3. In Turkey.
The art of theatre in Turkey developed from the same religious, moral and educational urge to imitate human actions that accompanied its growth in ancient Greece. There are four main traditions of theatre in Turkey: folk theatre, popular theatre, court theatre and Western theatre. Improvised theatre developed in two complete different social environments: as part of the popular theatre tradition in big cities, such as Istanbul, and as part of folk-literature. Although the two traditions seem poles apart, they are essentially not so different in spirit as external characteristics might suggest. Both are extempro and non-literary. In both traditions, the action gains naturalism and vividness by spontaneity, and in both the language is simple, direct and strong. Performances were held at ground level in an arena, thereby lending flexibility to the acting and helping to create intimacy with the audience. Although highly different in presentation, techniques and conventions, both theatres have approximately the same genres: puppetry, storytelling (acted out), dramatic dancing and rudimentary play by actors.

Unlike most Asiatic countries, Turkey had no greatly individualised and distinctive court theatre tradition. Until the period of Westernisation, court theatre simply imitated popular theatre. The courts of mediaeval rulers all over Anatolia attracted dancers, actors, storytellers, clowns, puppet masters and conjurers. They performed only for the aristocracy of the periods—that is, the periods of "reorganisa-

tion" and "despotism"; the second major period, from 1908 to 1923, is that of the Revolution of 1908; and the third from 1923 to the present can be called the Republican period.

Four public playhouses were built in the first year of the Tanzimât period: a Western theatre, a playhouse for performances of traditional Turkish theatre, and two large amphitheatres for circus-like spectacles. (Before this date, however, there were probably several temporary theatres. For instance, documents have established that in 1830 a theatre was under construction in Izmir.) This theatre construction was important to the development of Western theatre in Turkey. As the Tanzimât intelligentsia pointed out, what distinguished Turkish traditional theatre from Western theatre was the latter's reliance on playhouses and written texts. With the opening of four theatre buildings in 1839, the first major distinction had been breached. The second, the development of written text, was to follow.

To go ahead in time, 1908 saw the restoration of the constitution of 1876, and what is commonly called the "Declaration of Freedom" (Hürrîyetti tâhâni). The political change brought a reawakening of the nation's creative theatre life, and the years that followed have been identified by drama historians as the theatre of the Constitutional period. To summarise, it may be said to have begun with the declaration of the Republic on 23 October 1923, first of all because the Republican period finally saw the removal of an obstacle which had been blocking the development of Turkish theatre: the ban against the appearance of Turkish Muslim women on the stage. Though some courageous Turkish women had previously attempted to break this ban, and a few musical comedies called The fugitives from the ballroom (Balâ kacaklari), and the picture of the leading actress Sedâ德 Nazîre Khâmîn, was featured on the cover of a women's magazine. The following year two women appeared in a performance of Shakespeare's Othello, Badîiyâ Muwahhid as Desdemona and Nceyire Neyyir as Emilia. With this general view in mind, the development of Western-style theatre in Turkey can be analysed in detail.

In 1839 the Royal Decree of Gülhane inaugurated the Tanzimât period, important as a period when an audience for theatre was created, professional personnel developed and playwrights emerged to write hundreds of plays. Among the factors which helped facilitate the establishment of European theatre in Turkey, the following are important.

The sultan and his environment. Three reformist sultans were especially important to this development: Selim III and Mahmûd II, both prior to 1839, and Abd al-Magjid. In 1836 Mahmoud II's library contained 500 plays, of which 40 were tragedies, 40 were dramas, 30 were comedies, and the rest farces and vaudevilles. The sultans sometimes attended public performance, and were a kind of insurance against opposition from fanatical orthodox quarters. When the latter attacked the notion of theatre, the sultans would use the sultan's support as a defence: "Would you know better than His Maj-

esty, not only our Sovereign but the Caliph of all Muslims, who is building a theatre in his own palace,
and rewarding foreign and native actors? He himself honours performances on many occasions. 4 'Abd al-Aziz was not so keen on the theatre as his predecessors, but it was during his rule that Turkish theatre had its golden age. During the thirty-three year reign of his successor, 'Abd al-Hamid II, despotism and rigid censorship halted positive developments in the theatre, and public theatre almost ceased. Nevertheless, he himself had two theatres built in his palace, where he maintained two permanent, salaried theatrical companies, one foreign and the other native.

Turkish statesmen and ambassadors also contributed to the development of Western-style theatre. Early in 1870, the Grand Vizier 'Ali Pasha unsuccessfully tried to establish a national theatre, but later that year he achieved his objectives by granting Gülü Agop, director of the Ottoman Theatre Company, a ten-year monopoly.

The press was another important factor in promoting Western-style theatre. Newspapers appeared in Turkey at just about the same time as the theatre, and many journalists began to write plays. Naturally, newspaper reports and reviews of theatre activities helped stimulate and guide public opinion. Foreign embassies, especially the French and Italian ones, played an important role, since many of these embassies had their own theatres. Both foreign and Turkish actors were often invited to private performances. The embassies were also instrumental in bringing theatre and opera troupes to Turkey from their own countries. Non-Muslim minorities contributed greatly to the development of Western theatre in Turkey, most importantly, the Armenian community. An important role was also played by the cultural centres of other minorities of residents: the German one with its Teutonia, the French with their Alliance Française and the British and Italians through various theatre organisations.

Western theatre was perhaps most strongly promoted by visiting foreign troops, many of which stayed as long as a whole season and gave regular performances. Some of these companies included the leading musical and artistic talents of their nation. These and Turkish actors often learned their profession by watching these performances. Some seasons were so rich that the several foreign companies gave parallel performances, as for example on 11 September 1896, when there were three different performances of Verdi's Aida in Istanbul. Some of the operas of Verdi, Donizetti and Bellini were performed in Turkey before they were seen in Paris or other European capitals. Because of the influx of foreign companies, many more theatres were built. Often when these companies returned home, some of their members remained in Turkey, and it was from these actors, directors, set designers and conductors that Turkish theatre people learned their skills.

As has been pointed out, for the intelligentsia of the Tanzimat period, the establishment of a Western theatrical tradition in Turkey was dependent on the building of theatres and the availability of written texts. The first modern Turkish play dates from 1859. Called The poet's marriage (Bir şah'în evlenmesi), this satire on prearranged marriages by the poet İbrahim Şinasi had been commissioned for the newly-completed court theatre of the Dolma Bagche Palace. Though it was the first Turkish play written by a Turk in Turkey, it was not the first Turkish play. The first Turkish play, attributed to those of the Azerbaijani playwright Mirza Fethi 4 'Ali Akgündüz (1812-78), who wrote six comedies between the years 1850 and 1855. His popular plays were translated into Russian and later into the various languages of the present-day Soviet Union, as well as into Persian, French, English and German. Though Akgündüz preceded İbrahim Şinasi and enjoyed wide popularity outside his own country, Şinasi's short play demonstrates greater skill.

Mention should also be made of a Turkish manuscript found in Viennese archives by Professor Fahir Iz, The strange and curious tale of Ahmet the Cobbler (Wakdyî-i *-adj_ibe we hawddith-i gharibe-yi kefsher Ahmed). Dated 1809, the manuscript, contains translations of the play in Italian, German and French; the name Iskerleç on it is probably that of the copyist. Two more plays were subsequently found: one, Godefroi de Bouillon, dealing with the First Crusade; the other, in both Turkish and French, was by a foreigner, Thomas Chabert, and its long title can be shortened to Hâdîdî Bekdîsh or the founding of the Janissaries. The source of these texts was the Paris Ecole des Langues Orientales, which trained translators for the European embassies in the Middle East countries. Some of these plays were actually produced in the school. Years later, the catalogue of Turkish and Persian manuscripts in Poznan listed another version of Ahmed the cobbler and another work entitled Nasreddin Hoça's appointment to an official post (Nasreddin Khâgûnî nin mansûbî). The manuscript, translated into German, Italian and French was like the earlier-found version of Ahmed the cobbler dated 1809, but the Poznan copy of Ahmed the cobbler bore the signature Dombay, instead of Iskerleç, and the Nasreddin Khâgû play was signed Johann Lippa. The evidence suggests that in the School of Oriental Languages, Turkish was taught by members of the Turkish embassy staff. Though they doubt wrote these plays, they chose as professional diplomats to remain anonymous. They probably dictated them as exercises to students, who in turn translated them into the three major languages of the Austrian Empire. Written from dictation, the manuscripts contain spelling errors, but since the authors were Turks, there are not many mistakes in syntax.

Other plays in Turkish that pre-date Şinasi's were only translations, some of which were performed but never published. For instance, 'Abd al-Medjid's chamberlain, Safêt Bey, translated Molière's plays for performance by the young Turkish musicians of the imperial band, and in 1845 the sultan invited three of his doctors to be present at the Turkish performance of two of Molière's plays, one of which ridiculed the medical profession.

Many foreign plays were translated into Turkish and performed by the Armenian theatre companies prior to the foundation of the Ottoman Theatre. Some of the plays that pre-date Şinasi's play are in Armenian characters. The earliest, published in 1813, is a translation of Molière's Le médecin malgré lui. Four plays by Metastasio were translated into Turkish and published in Armenian in 1831. Since the source of these latter plays was the Bible, it seems likely that they were used to propagate the Christian faith. Unlike contemporary Turkish texts, they do not contain Persian or Arabic words. Lithographed translated texts of opera libretti for Turkish audiences are very rare, but there are some in the Topkapi Museum and in private collections. An Italian opera on Turkish subject, The siege of Silistra, written in Turkish and performed there, has libretti in both Italian and Turkish.

Some students of Turkish theatre consider the first Turkish play to be Khayr Allâh Efendi's Hikâyeye-i İbrahim Pasa, a 19th century version of a 16th century
story about Ibrâhîm Pasha of Sulaymân the Magnificent's time. The manuscript of this play by the father of the well-known Turkish poet and playwright 'Abd al-Hâjj was discovered by İsmâ'îl Hâmî Danışmend in 1939. Written in 1844, fifteen years before Şinâşî's play, when Khâyûr Allâh was a student in medical school, it is little more than a rough draft by an amateur, probably never meant to be seen by others.

The Armenians and Levantines of Istanbul gave Turkey its first Western theatre in the Turkish language, generally adapted to local theatre tastes and conditions. Before the Armenians became active in the theatre, the private residences of foreign embassy personnel were the only places in which Turks could see Western theatre and opera companies in their own languages. By the third quarter of the 19th century, however, the Istanbul Armenians had established two companies that sought a wider Turkish audience. First, a company called Şâirk ("The Orient") and, later, one called Vaspûrakan, came into existence, both of which translated, adapted, and performed European plays in both Armenian and Turkish.

The most important effort in this Armenian-Turkish development was that of the Ottoman Theatre Company at the Gedîkpaşa Theatre in Istanbul. Headed by an Armenian Agop Vartovian (Gûllû Agop), the company prepared the way for a genuinely national Turkish theatre, training and directing his actors in original Turkish plays. Sometimes given minor roles, the Turkish actors helped correct the pronunciation of Armenian performers, and Turkish writers were employed to make sure that the translations were idiomatically correct. The proceedings inevitably aroused the enthusiasm and support of university students.

But the guiding spirit remained Gûllû Agop, who completed this Armenian-Turkish integration by eventually becoming a Muslim. In 1868 he committed his company to performances of plays in Turkish, and in April of that year he offered Istanbul its Turkish-language modern theatre production, a translation of a French play entitled César Borgia. This production was received somewhat unenthusiastically, and Gûllû Agop immediately followed it with a tragedy based on the Turkish romance Leylâ and Majnûn by Muşafâ Efendi. The following year saw a marked increase in original Turkish plays.

As noted earlier, in 1870 the Grand Vizier 'Ali Pasha granted Gûllû Agop a ten-year monopoly of the production of dramas in the Turkish language. This patent, however, required him to open new theatres in various parts of Istanbul within a given time. Other would-be-producers barred from producing plays in Istanbul by Gûllû Agop's monopoly, were encouraged, occasionally by prominent statesmen, to open theatres in the provinces. One such man, Dîvâ Pasha (1825-80), brought a company from Istanbul, and another theatre was opened in Trabzon by the governor 'Ali Bey, who was a playwright. In Bursa, the governor Ahmed Wefîk Pasha adapted nearly all of Molière's plays into Turkish and personally ran his own theatre, training and directing his actors and inspiring talented Turkish authors to write plays.

In Istanbul, Gûllû Agop's monopoly was soon challenged, first by an open company which claimed that his patent did not apply to musical performances on stage, and then by ototayuna [q. e.] actors, who used every subterfuge to put on plays indoors as well as outdoors. They charged Gûllû Agop with having failed to build the new theatres called for in his patent, and that in any case their performances were improvised, without text or employment of a prompter, and therefore not covered by the monopoly. Thus the seed was sown for a new theatre that could perhaps better nourish itself in the native tradition than the borrowed theatre translated from European literatures or directly imitative of them. With their tâlû'a'at (improvisatory) theatre, which filled the outline of a vague plot with local events, incidents picked up from the newspapers, or from street gossip, the ototayuna players gave their generation a kind of commedia dell'arte which stands midway between the traditional Turkish theatre and the imported Western theatre. However, after the Ottoman Theatre Company, was abruptly abolished by an order of the sultan in 1884, theatre activity in Turkey generally suffered an eclipse.

The second phase of the Western theatre tradition in Turkey is considered to have begun in 1908, the year of the constitutional revolution and to have ended in 1923, the year of the proclamation of the Republic. It was an important transitional period, a time of political turmoil. It also marked the restoration of theatre and some attempts to develop in new directions. The early months of 1908 were full of tension and excitement, as the new regime was being greeted with understandable delight. The theatres shared this enthusiasm, and put on productions suited to special occasions. Many new theatres sprang up under the leadership of such directors as the Armenian Agop, and during the next fifteen years they changed names and administration in rapid succession, some managing to survive only briefly. Too often, dramatic offerings were supplanted by political speeches and demonstrations meant to fire audiences with liberal enthusiasm. Plays previously banned by 'Abd al-Hamîd's censorship were revived to stir up the populace against the former regime. The dominant genre of theatre was the pièce de circonstance. These works were set in contemporary Turkey, and their protagonists were the Young Turks, the leaders of the Union and Progress Party, who were shown as patriots, while the supporters and followers of 'Abd al-Hamîd were portrayed as opportunistic villains. Playwrights of the time saw theatre as a vehicle for the abasement of the former regime on the one hand and for enthusiastic praise of the constitutional reforms on the other. Thus the deluge of bad plays continued.

The theatre was also an ideal instrument for the strengthening of civilian and military morale. Wars followed in dizzy succession during that period, among them the Turco-Italian War of 1911, the Balkan War of 1912, World War I, and finally the 'Turkish War of Independence'. A long series of Turkish plays were loosely constructed from topical scenes derived from some recent war, glorifying the struggle of the Turkish people against their enemies. Other plays dealt with Ottoman history, lauding Turkish heroes of the past. The emphasis was always on solidarity and preparedness for war. Needless to say, most of these plays were extremely ephemeral.

Nevertheless, this period saw a number of significant developments in the theatre. Religious and official attitudes mitigating against the appearance of Turkish Muslim women on stage began to give way in 1919, when for the first time an actress—her name was 'Affî—appeared in a play on the Turkish stage. Though her career was not without difficulties, her example was soon followed by others.

The same period also saw the establishment of a school of drama and music in Istanbul. It was organised in 1914 by André Antoine (1859-1943), founder of Paris's Théâtre Libre, who had come to Turkey at the invitation of the mayor of Istanbul. In
1916, it started giving public performances, gradually becoming more of a theatre than a school and leading to the establishment of the present Istanbul Municipal Theatre. It was also during this period that many native playwrights and theatre men of distinction started their careers. Until the Constitution of 1908 and the dethroning of Abd al-Hamîd, government censorship discouraged the development of playwrights. After the reforms, however, there appeared dramatists who treated a variety of previously forbidden subjects. Several professional, semi-professional, and amateur companies were active in this period. Among these were the Şahîn-ye Hewes (formed by amateurs, among whom there were playwrights), and the short-lived Şanâyi-i Nefse. Amateurs later formed other troupes, such as Mûrebîbi Hüsiyyet, which was housed in the Othmânî Agha Theatre. Burhân al-Dîn Tepsi, a pupil of Silvain, studied drama in Paris and subsequently formed a company which gave regular performances. It was followed by another company called Dâr al-Tamâmî-i Othmânî, formed by the actor Hüseyn Kâmi Bey. Certain playwrights, intellectuals and actors unsuccessfully planned to found a national theatre. Other attempts in this direction were the Othmânî Tiyatrosu Kulûbû (Ottoman Theatre Club), the Istanbul Kumpanya, and the Sultan Selim-i Saadet Tiyatrosu. In the same period, the Perseverance of Warships, the Othmânî Donnanma D journalism was formed. Other important companies included Miñâkinâ's Ottoman Theatre and the Binemedjiyan Company.

The present period of Turkish drama dates from the proclamation of the Republic. This and the reforms of 1925-8 opened a new era and quickly brought about official approbation and government support of culture and drama in Turkey. The Turkish language was revived, and there was increased interest in bringing to audiences works based on national history and folklore. Because the state considered drama to be an essential element in the modernisation of Turkey, it assumed full responsibility for the actor's professional career. The state conservatory established in 1935 in Ankara for training actors, actresses, opera singers and ballet dancers has since then greatly advanced the development of Turkish dramatic arts. When the course at that school has been completed, the student is taken on as a member of the leading State Theatre Company, which is founded by the government and functions under the Ministry of Culture. Additional funds are obtained from the sale of low-priced tickets. Providing security and opportunities for work in the theatrical profession, the State Theatre now operates with ten or more stages. In recent years it has produced excellent productions of foreign playwrights, from Sophocles to Edward Albee, and has introduced new Turkish dramatists. Along with several private theatres, it has been sending companies on one or two-month tours throughout the country. The Halk evleri (People's houses) [see KHAIR EY] were established in 1931 and furthered cultural emancipation through a concerted programme of literary, artistic and mainly drama projects. Despite its success, this movement was disbanded on political grounds. The present trend is toward the establishment of regional theatre companies. Theatre activity in Turkey is still mostly confined to the two largest cities, Ankara and Istanbul. The latter has about 25 private theatres, as well as 5 owned by the municipality. Privately-owned and managed theatres do not receive government subsidies or tax relief. In addition to the 4 theatres of the State Theatre Company, Ankara has several private companies, although the number varies from season to season. Owing to the competition of television, most theatres are almost invariably half-empty; therefore, while there appears to be a highly active theatre life in Turkey, this is now only superficially so.

From the point of view of the development of Turkish drama, the Republican period can be subdivided into two main sub-periods: from 1923 to 1960, and from 1960 to the present day. Though rooted in a relatively short tradition, recent Turkish drama has shown considerable promise. Until 1960, the works seen on the Turkish stage reflected few of the changes which had overtaken the country. Some were poor copies of Western plays, in which an effort was made to assimilate the latter's surface qualities. The pre-1960 dramatists tended toward pseudo-symbolism or psychological realism, in which characters worked out their fate in an almost societyless vacuum. Highly popular were the traditional lightweight comedies that amused the audiences without ruffling their composure: plays focusing on unusual or off-beat characters: plays hammering on the theme that money is the root of all evil: plays on the inevitability of fate: plays involving dreams and psychoanalytic themes: plays on the eternal triangle; plays that made fun of puns and stock characters: plays contrasting big city and provincial life; plays in verse which failed to be poetic; and sentimental plays on themes of love, altruism and self-sacrifice. Dramatists most often provided only a sketchy treatment of these themes.

After the Army junta overthrew the Menderes government in 1960 and promulgated a new constitution in the following year, the theatre turned to a more outspoken treatment of contemporary problems. Though theatre was excluded from preliminary censorship, a long list of moral and political taboos remained in effect. Nevertheless, the new values imposed by the 1961 constitution lie behind every problem play of the period. Turkish dramatists were working toward some moment of release from constrictions, both self- and externally imposed. By 1960 they did not dramatise current affairs, but many playwrights writing before 1960 suddenly seemed to find new energy and new forms of expression. This lasted until the 1970s. During those memorable ten years, Turkish theatre enjoyed a vitality that enabled it to deal with problems of current social and political importance. In 1969 serious social, economic, and political unrest descended upon Turkey. Rural inhabitants were flocking to the big cities in search of work and student violence was erupting in the streets. Severe new codes were enacted which subjected the big cities to martial law. People naturally preferred to spend their evenings at home watching television, then quite a recent innovation in Turkey. Between 1960 and the 1970s, private theatre had mushroomed in Istanbul and Ankara, but many now closed their doors, leaving others that are still struggling to survive. Two theatres deserve special mention: Doostlari Tiyatrosu (Friends' Theatre) in Istanbul, and Ankara Sanati Tiyatrosu (Ankara Arts Theatre). Both are private theatres, and are socially and politically committed to the left. Thanks to their loyal audiences and staffs, they have been able to resist the tide. A new generation of aspiring playwrights began to appear in the 1960s, and a changing society provided them with ever-new material. For convenience, the considerable dramatic output of the Republican period can best be broken down by its main focus and
theme. Contemporary man’s sense of isolation, alienation, and loss of identity are dealt with in various plays. Plays about individuals caught in the cultural conflict between traditional values and modern Westernized ideas and manners are the subject of a number of plays. Peasants flooding into the big cities and being forced to live in slums are another topic. Many plays involve lower-middle class or working-class families in the grip of financial difficulties, and show the family as a microcosm of world problems as they fight against disintegration. Since 1960s there have been plays highlighting and revealing the role, the problems, and the social position of modern Turkish women. Some plays can best be described as village or peasant plays offering authentic pictures of village life in out-of-the way places. They deal with such problems as corrupt landlords and local administrators, marriage customs, jealousy intolerance, superstitions and family feuds. Some playwrights take their inspiration from mythology, old legends, local history and the history of previous civilisations. Plotless plays presenting glimpses of assorted characters and their everyday lives are often introduced by a narrator and depend largely on their atmospheric quality. Often they contrast an “inner” and an “outer” world. Many plays highlight political and social revolutionary ideals, the conflict between capital and labour, business ethics, and the fight against Fascism. Idealistic whose zeal mirrors those from contemporary Turkish reality are dealt with in a number of plays. Of a more general nature are those symbolic dramas concerned with such themes as man’s place in the universe, analyses of social organisation and criticism of contemporary mores. In recent years, Turkish dramatists and theatre groups have been experimenting with new forms and unconventional structures. Western culture is now seen not as an ideal model but as a contrasting tradition. Playwrights have also become aware that “modern” theatrical trends in Europe have their counterparts in Turkish traditional theatre, and this has facilitated their absorption into contemporary Turkish theatre. For example, the tradition of Karagöz [q.v.] or shadow theatre has been supplied with new scripts designed for performance by live actors. The contribution of traditional Turkish theatre far transcends mere borrowing or superficial treatment. It stems from the very essence of traditional theatre: a sense of anti-illusionistic rapport between the actors and the audience, an open or flexible form, the attempt to give the impression of improvisation and total theatre in performance, and the use of music, dance and songs as adjuncts to drama.


The history of the theatrical arts in Iran is obscured by the fact that they have only recently acquired a place among the manifestations of Iranian culture to be considered. Literary drama known from pre-Islamic times onwards, although it did not become numerous enough to allow us to describe their origin and development in detail until the last few centuries. Iran even made a unique contribution to Islamic civilisation by creating a form of religious drama [see TA'ZIYEH]. A common feature of these types of drama is that they are based almost entirely on improvisation so that they only rarely have left traces of their past existence in the form of written plays. They belong essentially to popular culture, even if they were adopted by the courts and by members of the educated class as forms of entertainment.

Religious objections to the impersonation of living beings, and to frivolous entertainment in general, being as they were prevalent during the Islamic period, have undoubtedly been an impediment to the development of serious drama. Already before Islam, however, dramatics did not play a prominent part in Iranian culture, at least not in that section of it about which we possess any knowledge. The Greek theatres which existed in some places after the invasion of Alexander remained a foreign element and soon disappeared without having exerted a noticeable influence.

The Sāsānīd kings amused themselves with the performances of minstrels, singers and musicians, as well as with many other kinds of entertainment. Descriptions of these court traditions can be found in the Pahlawi book Khusraw and his page and in many Islamic sources (cf. M. Boyce, in JIRAS [1957], 10-45). They provided a model for the amusements of polite society in later times. This tradition continued without fundamental changes till it came under the attack of modern types of entertainment. It remained close to the popular tradition of performances, called ma’rīka, a rope-dancer, an acrobat, a magician or a leader of dancing animals. Literary sources seldom pay attention to these types of folk art, but a remarkable exception is the Futuḥawat-nâma-yi sulâhî, by Kâshîf (q.v.; see also Galunov, Iran, iii, 94). The earliest observations of such performances made by European travellers date from the 17th century (cf. e.g. J. B. Tavernier, Les six voyages... en Turquie, en Perse et aux Indes, Amsterdam 1678, i, 442-3 (performances at the masdn of Tabriz); J. Chardin, Voyages en Perse, ed. L. Langlès, Paris 1811, iii, 326 f. (variety at Tabriz), 180 R. (wrestlers, sword fighters and fighting animals at Isfahan), 436-64 (Exercices et jeux des Persans)). At the social occasions held at the courts or in private mansions, singing, playing and dancing were among the principal amusements. Central figures were the minstrel (khosuyār; cf. the description of his craft in ch. 36 of the Kâbâb-nâma by Kay Kâwîs [q.v.], ed. Tehran 1345/1967, 193-7), and the singer-musician (mawrîb), who appears frequently in Persian literary works and also entertains at a local court about the end of the 5th/11th century is presented in a short ma‘nawi poem by Mas‘ūd Sâ‘d-i.
The most important types of puppet-play which until quite recently were current in Iran belong to the kind in which the puppets are shown directly to the public. The shadow-play never gained in Iran the prominence which it had in the folklore of other peoples of the Middle East (see KHYAL AL-ZILL) and disappeared already quite early without leaving many traces. A variety making use of glove puppets was called pahlavan-kalal ("the bald hero") after its leading character who also appears however in other forms of popular theatre. It was sometimes called pand or, because they were required to play the stock parts of the show, much more elaborate was the khayma-shab-bazi, a marionette theatre operating, as the name implies, at night and enacted, at least originally, in a tent. The performers were itinerant artists who were reckoned among the lilit (q.v.) or the gypsies. In the present century, the khayma-shab-bazi was also played at a fixed locality such as the kaft-ye shahidbari at Tehran between 1941 and about 1950 (Baydawi, Namayish, 110 ff.). The puppet-player (ustad) and his assistant (shahid) manipulated the figures from behind a screen and let them speak. They used a small whistle (suktabak) to imitate high-pitched voices. In front of the scene, the leader (murfid) introduced the performance and argued occasionally with the characters of the play. Musical accompaniment was played on various instruments.

The variety shows performed by live actors originated from the acts of individual performers of different types. There is perhaps a historical connection with folk traditions, such as the installation of a mock king at the time of the New Year festival, which was practised in parts of Iran until quite recently (cf. M. Kazwini, Min-i Nawzi, in Yadgar, ii/3, 13-6, who described an instance of the custom witnessed at Budjurd in 1923). Wandering groups of actors used to perform humorous sketches during this holiday. One of the stock figures was known as Haji Piruz, a clown with a blackened face. Jesters, called dalkak (originally talkak) or maskhana, have been common in Iran since ancient times. They were present in the private madfis (q.v.), as well as in the public square. In the middle of the 19th century, the maskhana could be seen at Isfahan in the twenties of this century, was the shahri-firang (a name referring probably to its European origin), a metal case inside which a roll (jamda) could rotate to show pictures one by one through an opening at the front of the case (Narodnyi teatr Irana, 67 ff.).

Puppet-shows were known in Iran already during the Middle Ages, as is witnessed by many references in the works of classical poets to puppets (khyi, la'bat) as well as to certain props of the puppet-player, e.g. the curtain (parda), the cloth (na'it) on which the plays were enacted, and the box (sandak) into which the puppets were put away after the show had ended. Mention is also made sometimes of a magic lantern (faris-i khyi), but it is uncertain whether any of the known references may be interpreted as evidence of the existence of shadow play in mediaeval Iran (see P. N. Boratav, art. KARAGOZ). Whenever mention is made of puppet-shows in these sources, the intention is to use them as symbols pointing to the thought that the existence of this world and its inhabitants is dependent entirely on God's will. In the Uthtar-nama, a mystical mathnawi poem attributed by tradition to Attar (q.v.), a Turkish puppet-player is presented as an emblem of the divine rule over human destiny. The literary role of the puppet-player, according to the description in the Fustawat-nama of Karghi (see Galunov, Iran, ii, 72-4).
example of a farce performed about 1838, A. Chodzko, Théâtre persan, Paris 1878, pp. x-xiv). A special type of popular theatre was known as batsal-baiz because the play's main character was a rich grocer who claimed to be a hadji and was made fun of by his insolent servant. The latter was often represented as a negro, and plays in which he appeared in a major role were also called isjah-baiz. A variety show including various kinds of entertainment is the ba-bausti or tah-i bausti, which derives its name from the stage where it was commonly performed: a platform on a pond in the courtyard of a house. Occasions when the artists could be summoned, such as weddings and circumcisions, were especially important days in the life of a family. Popular theatre also attracted the attention of the court, where performances are on record from the time of the Zand dynasty onwards. Under Naser al-Din Shah, the favourite court-jester Karim Shira'i led a group who performed batsal-baiz. Plays were also enacted in tea-houses and, in the present century, in small theatres, notably at Tehran.

In spite of its great popularity, popular drama was always under attack from the side of the religiously minded. In the thirties of this century, the government, suspicion of the satires of the popular forms of drama,.permitted them only by decree, that the script should be made and submitted to the authorities beforehand. Perhaps its most formidable opponent, however, presented itself in the form of modern entertainment as offered by cinema and television. Yet the oral tradition of drama somehow managed to survive long enough to make its impact on the development of modern drama.

The theatrical arts were an element of such prominence in Western civilisation during the 19th century that they could not fail to impress Iranians who travelled to the West, including Naser al-Din Shah himself. In comparison with other countries in the Middle East, however, the introduction of Western-style drama to Iran proceeded at a very slow pace. The only instance of a theatre fitted up to stage modern plays before the end of the century was an auditorium in the building of the Dar al-Funun at Tehran. It was used merely for private performances attended by the Shah and his retinue, and even these were discontinued after some time. Plays by Moliere were the first to be translated, or rather adapted to a Persian audience: Guzdrish-i mardumguriz (Le Misanthrope) was published at Istanbul 1286/1869-70 (cf. Browne, LHP, iv, 459-62); other early translations were Tabrzi- i idjbdri (Le Medecin malgre lui) and Gogol's Tabrizi- i medecin (Le Medecin malgre lui) and Gogol's Les comedies de Malkum Khan, Paris 1867). They are closet dramas written without much concern for the requirements of theatrical performance.

The beginning of theatrical performances in public cannot be dated earlier than the first decade of this century. Tabriz seems to have preceded other cities. The Russian consul B. Nikitine saw performances at Raht in 1912. They included at least one original Persian play, on the problem of alcoholism. The female parts were played by men (Iran-i man ghahma am, Tehran 1329/1951, 127-8). In the capital, theatrical activities started about the same time. Among the first companies which gave regular performances were Kamyari- i Iran (1915), led by Sayyid ʿAli Nafr, and the drama section of Iran-i gawashin (1921), an organisation of progressive intellectuals. The Kamyari- i mazkal (1919) brought musical shows on the stage which were modelled on shows performed in Caucasian Russia. Non-Muslims were at this stage very prominent in the Iranian theatre. From their midst came especially the female actors, as the religious objections to the appearance of Muslim women on the stage were still very strong.

Although translated plays continued to hold their importance in the repertoire of the Iranian companies, original plays were also produced. The bi-weekly magazine Tfar published already in 1908 dialogues which criticised the theatre. The playwright of the earliest period was Ahmad Mahmudi, also known as Kamal al-Wizara (1875-1930). In his Hddjdji Riydji Khan he presented a Per-
sian Tartuffe, and in Ustdd Nawruz-i pambaduz a type similar to the bakkdl of the popular farce. This successful comedy ridicules the type of the westernizing Iranian (cf. I. Djamshid, Hasun Mukaddam wa Djo"far Khân as Firang amad, Tehran 1357/1978 repr. Oakland, 1984, with a French translation by the author himself). Its first performance at the Grand Hotel, Tehran, on 23 March 1922, was an important event in the history of the modern theatre in Iran. The drama was used as a literary genre by the poet Muhammad Ridâ Mirzâ 1shki (1894-1924) for works like Idrâl, Kafan-i siyâh and the “opera” Rastakdz. Sâdik Hidayat [q.e.] and many others wrote plays on episodes from the History of Iran. Notable as a playwright was also Djabîb Bihruz (1891-1971).

Under the Pahlawi regime, the theatre was subjected to censorship, but it also received for the first time official recognition as an important section of modern Iranian culture. In 1939 a college for the training of actors, the Hunaristdn-i hunarmanddn, was founded. The leading personality of the theatre in Iran during the Ridâ Shâh period was the actor and playwright Sâyid Alî Naşr (d. 1961). A similar rôle was later played by 1Abd al-Husayn Nushm (1905-70) who was active as a director and a translator of foreign drama, and wrote the handbook Hunarzân-i adabi (195)2.

The rise of the cinema and afterwards of television in Iran broadened the scope of the dramatic arts. Together with the theatre, they benefited from the remarkable flourishing of these arts, which took off in the 1960s and continued until the revolutionary turbulence began about a decade later. The promotion of indigenous theatre became a matter of official concern.


5. In Central Asia and Afghanistan. Islamic Central Asia—Western Turkistan including Kazakhstan, Eastern Turkistan (Shinjiang) encompassing the area of the present Uyghur Autonomous Province, Afghanistan and contiguous territory where Islam was or is professed and Central Asian or Turkic languages are spoken—has known three main types of theatre. Oral folk art probably pervaded the region long before the advent of Islam, although documentation is as yet unavailable to prove it. Muslim religious drama, known especially to Shî'is [see TAVV], received performance as late as the end of the 19th century in certain areas. Modern indigenous drama and theatre using written scripts, fixed stages and enclosed auditoria began activity within the region no earlier than the second decade of the 20th century.

Historical precedents for organised, formal theatrical presentations long existed in the region. A great, 35-tier, semi-circular outdoor Greek theatre was built and ruins survive at Ay Kahanum, a fortified capital city located on the left bank of the Oxus River (Amû Daryâ) at the confluence of the Kokâ River under the Greco-Bactrian Kingdom in the 3rd and 2nd centuries B.C. Additional archaeological finds from the vicinity of Termez (Tirmdh) and Bukhârâ—in the form of Hellenic carvings, dishes, frescoes and sculptures dating from the 1st to 8th centuries A.D.—have depicted the head of Dionysus, the youthful god, patron of drama and wine, as well as musicians playing harps, drums and local stringed instruments. A ceramic ossuary dated to the early centuries A.D. (at Xorazm, under the nose of Samarkand, shows the clear depiction of several actors holding tragic masks. A comic figure originated from


(J. T. P. de Baar)
the same sites. More direct evidence for theatrical life in that period is difficult to come upon. No clear evidence has been reported conclusively linking that activity with the development of indigenous Central Asian theatre art in the Islamic epoch, beginning there no earlier than the 1st/7th century in western Central Asia. It has been surmised that the obligatory attributes of recent folk performers from Khwarazm known to follow the oldest traditions of maddah (clown) art in Central Asia—such as the goatskin mask and two-horned, cone-shaped or simply dishevelled cap of goat's wool—refer to the ancient Dionysian cult, and particularly to the 5th-6th centuries A.D. in Khwarazm (L. A. Avdeeva, in Uzbekskii sovetskii teatr, Tashkent, Izdatel'stvo "Nauka" Uzbekskoy SSR, 1966, 22, 18; Annaya F. Korsakova, Uzbekskii opernyi teatr, Tashkent, Gosudarstvennoe, Izdatel'stvo Khudozhestvennoy Literatury, 1961, figure facing p. 24, 33).

**Oral folk art**. Undoubtedly the oldest continuous forms of Central Asia theatre still existing late in the 20th century belonged to the folk tradition. At their most uncomplicated level came performances by bear trainers, jugglers, stilts walkers, wrestlers and acrobats, horsemen, slight-of-hand artists, balancing artists, animal imitators and dancers. The last two categories often differed from the other entertainers by representing imagined actions to an audience rather than merely executing certain practiced skills. From at least the 9th/15th century onwards in Harat and Samarkand, the existence of the maddah [see maddah] is recorded. He was a professional storyteller who, with gesture and facial expression, added action to words with an extensive repertory of saint's lives, legends and tales told in public. Several storytellers continued to render their dramatic oral narratives as late as the reign of the Amir Abd al-Ahad of Bukhara (1883-1910) in towns such as Mazari Sharif, Afghanistan (Muhsin H. Qadiraw, Ozbek khalk tamashati sanoati, Tashkent, "Okituvi", 1981, 8).

Puppeteers went even further in the direction of dramatization. One of the two best-known varieties of puppet theatre in Central Asia is the tedzhikhayal, a marionette show with both full-bodied and koghirvaklar (marionettes) suspended and activated from above on strings. The second sort of puppet, usually a half-torso figure, was manipulated from below by the hand of the koi koghirvakhaz (puppeteer). Both kinds of shows presented in confined space the interactions of lively figures whose sounds or words came from behind the scene, uttered by the puppet master, who sometimes talked through a tube or thin disk in order to alter his voice for different puppets. The puppeteer sometimes introduced himself, explaining his purpose, the background of the show, the shows, as the powerful men observe monkey trainers, various sensuous dancers in costume, and a military parade. At the end, a devil sometimes abruptly informs these high-ranking sinners of their involvement with theatre in Afghanistan, Mimoigraphed Essay, Kabul, 18 Jan. 1975, 4). This emphasis upon movement and brusque gesture to entertain viewers was carried over to a notable degree into skits and farces by human actors in folk theatricals. Among Central Asians a form of tannya ("show") could be seen that edged much closer than other folk art to modern comedy.

Typical was the short play, Ra's ("The Keeper of morals"), in which a governor's beadle, the main figure, enforces the injunctions of religion and keeps order as well as verifying the correctness of weights and measures in the marketplace. The keeper of morals suddenly appears in a bazaar, creating consternation among shopkeepers and tradesmen, who must submit to scales and coffins where inspectors for the bazaar bring their goods for inspection. Violators bribe the officials flagrantly. In both Tajik and Uzbek versions of The keeper of morals, the traits of a semi-amateur folk performance are well exemplified. Flexible, unstable dialogue typifies the improvisation in the absence of any written script. Audience volunteers and other, less-experienced performers are openly coached during a show by the master of the troupe. The comedic vein is almost invariably ribald, and the subject of the skit confined to everyday activity in town or countryside. No specific site or stage was used or needed for the presentation. This brief comedy placed emphasis, like the puppet shows, upon slapstick, pantomime, and stock characters. The skit depended for its effect largely upon minimal, repeated variants of one action. In The Keeper of morals, peddler after peddler encounters the same moramide at the entrance of his shop and is heavily fined by inspectors. The action moves forward through reiteration and rough jokes made at the expense of offenders publicly humiliated and by the surprisingly varied sorts of bribes offered to ward off extortion. The second part of the same farce presents the keeper of morals similarly cross-examining hapless Muslims concerning their religious duties and the obligatory rituals, and meting out harsh discipline for infractions (Nizam Nurdzhanov, Tedzhikskii narodnyi teatr, Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Akademii Nauk SSSR, 1956, 145-50, 309-14; Muhsin Qadiraw, Ozbek khalk ag'aziki dramasi, Tashkent, Uzbekistan SSR Fannlar Akademiyasi, Nashriyati, 1963, 37-63).

The many playlets extant differed greatly in size of cast. The Keeper of morals was used as many as 50 performers, but some required only one or two. Many received command performances at the Central Asian courts, and most diverted townspeople or villagers as late as the early 20th century. A sizeable troupe of kizikis (buffoons) at the Kokan (Khokand) court of 'Umar Khjan (1809-22) was led by a star, Bedaghim. Succeeding generations of buffoons consider him to be their patron and founding father. (Uzbekii sovetskii teatr, i, 1966, 47). Troupes of buffoons were maintained in the Khivan and Bukharian courts, except during the reign of an amir or khan whose pious priestly duties provoked a ban on public theatricals. In Khujgihar,
under Ya'kub Beg (1865-77) [q.v.], the ra^is and his muhtasibs strictly enforced the Shari^at. They actively prevented vices, storytellers and actors from diverting the faithful. Before Ya'kub Beg's day, Chinese administrators had allowed all sorts of amusements there (D. Bougle, Central Asian questions, London 1878, 6). Popular folk plays included Uylanizh ("The wedding"), humorously revealing a bridgeroom's reluctance to start life with an unknown woman, especially when it is discovered at the unveiling that she is not the promised bride. Another favourite skit, Zokatki ("Golden这个词"), portrays forbidden dances and rituals engaged in by a group of men and women. They make their bacchanal so alluring that even the keeper of morals sent to censure them joins in the festivities. In Mudarris ("The seminary teacher"), the vices of a Marghilan schoolman become the subject of the farce. Massar ("The tomb") turns on the interaction between a venal custodian of a sacred shrine and women and men who bring offer-

ings to the saint buried there.

Plays in this genre depended for their appeal not only upon the familiar themes but upon theatrical style and verve of the performers, as well as on special effects utilising such devices as flashes of gunpowder, fire, the antics of animals imitated by human per-

formers, and stylised, rudimentary costuming. Most of these plays will not have required more than 20 minutes to perform unless the characteristic repeti-

tions were greatly multiplied. Their bawdy nature and irreverence offended the strict religious leaders of the capitals and repelled the urban literati with their crudity. Thus although folk theatre prepared the way for new developments in Central Asian stage activity by whetting an appetite among the public for more plays, it also created obstacles and provoked prohibitions which affected what was to follow—especially when it is discovered at the unveiling that she is not the promised bride. Another favourite skit, 3a7i7a in Iran and India, the episodes attracted fascinated attention of all villagers. These perfor-

mances, with lines chanted in Turkmen—one source

translated and augmented an existing core of mainly enslaved Sunn! Muslims, performances consisted mostly of readings, recitations, and ritual feasting, but included extended daily presentations of the mystery plays. Known as gasha ("imitation"), among them, and as ta^ziyu in Iran and India, the episodes attracted fascinated attention of all villagers. These perfor-

mances, with lines chanted in Turkmen—one source

observed the plays between 1878-81 says that they were in 3a7i7a—were offered by professional players who travelled from town to town during al-


The main segments of this cycle portray the suffering of Muslim, especially bridgemothers, and other members of the Muslim Holy Family and their offspring and retinue. The martyr-

dom of Husayn, in particular, the bereavement of their women, and the death of some children in the unequal battle on the field at Karbala4 in 60/680, comprise the central theme of the drama. Besides the sacred religious power of these episodes, tremendous effective theatrical use is made in them of physical suffering, acute thirst and hunger, personal sacrifice and loss, heroism, and inevitable human destruction. European witnesses have declared that these village presentations offered the most realistic acting the outsiders had ever seen (O’Donovan, ii, 42). Nevertheless, the producers and performers firmly rejected the notion that the gasha qualified as drama and theatre at all. If universal participation of those engaged in those repetitious performances deprives these presentations of a separated audience to watch without acting, and if that lack thus removes the requirement obligatory for theatre, the Central Asians may be justified in distinguishing such celebra-

tions from what they otherwise call "theatre". No serious person denies that the Islamic mystery or miracle play, as it is designated in Western literature, exerts dramatic force and theatrical effect upon both Muslim and non-Muslim. Notwithstanding this fact, no vestige of this precedent, except possibly in historical tragedy, seems to have carried over into the new drama and stage that overlapped chronologically with it in Central Asia.

Modern drama and theatre. Nearly all forms of theatre known actively to the region began to coex-

ist in the civilization of Central Asia once the modern genre appeared. That innovation occurred separately in the three main sectors of the region only after the first decade of the 20th century. Two factors delayed adoption of the new theatre by Central Asians long after visiting troupes began touring in Tashkent and other cities of the Tsarist Russian sector. Racy folk skits had given "theatre" in Central Asia a bad name in polite society. In addition, the Armenian or Rus-

sian troupes that acted there under the Russian conquest in 1876 were not followed by Central Asian or Chinese troupes which only after the Russian conquest in 1876 were not followed by Central Asian or Chinese troupes which
Azerbaijani and Tatar troupes brought their all-male, Muslim casts and plays to Western Turkistan's cities were educated Central Asians able to accept European-style drama and theatre as their own institution. Central Asian women initially performed on stage in Tagkent and Samarkand, when several actresses were recruited as trainees for the Model Uzbek Troupe established in December 1920. Women could not act publicly in Kâbul theatres until 1959, much later than they went on stage in Kâshâbah and Urumchi in Eastern Turkistan, where, following Central Asian models, they freely played roles beginning around the mid-1930s.

Modern indigenous drama and theatre of the region drew its initial audience in Samarkand, Russian Turkistan, in January 1914. 

Pâdarâkhs yakhûd okumânan balaning hâlî ("The patricide, or the plight of an uneducated boy"), written by the Samarkand author Mâhmûd Khâdja Behbudû (1874-1919) in 1911, provided the premier performance of a play by a local dramatist. Thereafter, the short tragedy quickly went on tour throughout the Tsarist Russian sector among Uzbek, Tajiks, Uyghurs and others. Behbudû's theme—the crying need for education—became a standard subject for Central Asian playwrights. Like some folk plays, these Dzadiid (Reformist) dramas invariably focused upon some social issue, sometimes even though they could not have acknowledged any link with folk theatre. The patricide influenced the entire theatrical development for years to come by inspiring many young poets to begin writing for the theatre. They as a rule created didactic works meant to edify or reform the public and its behaviour, and usually avoided politics or outright comedy. Kolbay Toghis ulf (b. and d. unknown) wrote the first Kazak-language drama, Nenuwûl kînbandari ("Victims of ignorance"), which was printed at Ufa in 1914 and performed at Orenburg in 1916, both towns being located in the Tatar-Bashkir sphere at or beyond the northern fringe of Kazak territory.

The play explored serious difficulties arising among the nomads from the practice of polygamy, again blaming abuses upon a lack of enlightenment in the society. Another theme, the curse of pederasty, also reflected public concern over the prevalence of that practice in the sexually segregated urban life of Central Asia. Abduurauf Shahidi (Shahshudîn) (b. and d. unknown), a Tatar schoolteacher living in Koqan, wrote the play first published (1912) in the Turki language of southern Central Asia. The plot of Mâhrâmandar ("Forbidden to marry") dramatised the destructive effect upon young Turkistan boys of the organised homosexual circles in which many were kept by older men of means.

An acknowledged follower of what was termed Behbudûy akîmi (the Behbudûy tendency), Abdullah Kadirî (1894-1939), chose the second most common serious plot, after backwardness, for his drama, Bûgdiy kastav ("The unfortunate bridegroom"), published in 1915 and staged the same year. In it, Kadirî explored the practice and often unhappy consequences of arranged or forced marriage in Central Asian life. That theme emerged, as well, in one of the earliest original plays presented in Kâbul, Afghanistan, in the 1920s, in Izzudîyûd iştîhârî ("A girl's forced marriage"). Similar social themes animated the modern Uyghur theatre in Kâshâbah during its first period, starting after 1933. Drug addiction, polygamy, bribery, stupid pretension and forced or arranged marriage led the list of subjects in the Chinese sector of the region. Exposure to modern theatre in capitals of the Near and Middle East strengthened the conviction of reform-minded Central Asians that the theatre offered a compelling medium with which to educate and indoctrinate the woefully illiterate populace (96.8% of the total, on average, in 1920) of Central Asians (E. Allworth, Central Asian publishing and the rise of nationalism, New York 1965, 22). In 1913, for example, the disgruntled, socially alienated Koqan poet, Hâmzâ Hâkimzâda Niyaziy (1889-1929), visited Egypt, Syria, Turkey and Russian Azerbaijan, each of which had enjoyed lively indigenous modern stage activity beginning in the 1850s to the 1870s (Mamâdh Râkmânîvan, Khâmzâ i uzbekîkiti teatr, Tagkent: Gosudarstvennoy Literaturî UzSSR, 1960, 38, 70, 81). He returned to write several plays, similarly focused upon social abuses, during 1915-16. His works, unlike the better-known Dzadiid drama, aimed not so much toward constructive persuasion and change as at exacerbating social tension and increasing civil strife. For this reason, Niyazi remained little staged and outside the mainstream of new Central Asian dramaturgy in the initial period. But the same antagonistic quality was to earn this pro-Russian writer an ideological approval from Communist leaders in the 1920s that persisted long after his death. Niyaziy's first play, the four-act Zahirî hâyer uzbekî ("Revolutionary Uzbak drama"), written in 1915, published by the author in 1916 at Tagkent, dramatises the anguish of forced marriage already portrayed in Central Asian poetry, fiction and drama. His version blames religion for permitting the practice. The playwright staged, directed, publicised and organised a company to act in this tragedy in Koqan's military assembly building at the end of 1915. Religious controversy closed the show and he disbanded his troupe after two performances (Mâmâmân Râkmânîvan, Ozbek teatri târkîhi, Tagkent, Uzbekistan SSR "Fân" Nâşrîyati, 1968, 313-16).

Plays that avoided treating contemporary life, usually historical dramas, in the beginning mainly served patriotic purposes, and often ended tragically. They still, however, reflected the current concerns, also persisted in early Reformist drama and literature, reflecting public concern over the prevalence of that practice in the sexually segregated urban life of Central Asia. Abduurauf Shahidi (Shahshudîn) (b. and d. unknown), a Tatar schoolteacher living in Koqan, wrote the play first published (1912) in the Turki (later, "Uzbek") language of southern Central Asia. The plot of Mâhrâmandar ("Forbidden to marry") dramatised the destructive effect upon young Turkistan boys of the organised homosexual circles in which many were kept by older men of means.

An acknowledged follower of what was termed Behbudûy akîmi (the Behbudûy tendency), Abdullah Kadirî (1894-1939), chose the second most common serious plot, after backwardness, for his drama, Bûgdiy kastav ("The unfortunate bridegroom"), published in 1915 and staged the same year. In it, Kadirî explored the practice and often unhappy consequences of arranged or forced marriage in Central Asian life. That theme emerged, as well, in one of the earliest original plays presented in Kâbul, Afghanistan, in the 1920s, in Izzudîyûd iştîhârî ("A girl's forced marriage"). Similar social themes animated the modern Uyghur theatre in Kâshâbah during its first period, starting after 1933. Drug addiction, polygamy, bribery, stupid pretension and forced or arranged marriage led the list of subjects in the Chinese sector of the region. Exposure to modern theatre in capitals of the Near and Middle East strengthened the conviction of reform-minded Central Asians that the theatre offered a compelling medium with which to educate and indoctrinate the woefully illiterate populace (96.8% of the total, on average, in 1920) of Central Asians (E. Allworth, Central Asian publishing and the rise of nationalism, New York 1965, 22). In 1913, for example, the disgruntled, socially alienated Koqan poet, Hâmzâ Hâkimzâda Niyaziy (1889-1929), visited Egypt, Syria, Turkey and Russian Azerbaijan, each of which had enjoyed lively indigenous modern stage activity beginning in the 1850s to the 1870s (Mamâdh Râkmânîvan, Khâmzâ i uzbekîkiti teatr, Tagkent: Gosudarstvennoy Literaturî UzSSR, 1960, 38, 70, 81). He returned to write several plays, similarly focused upon social abuses, during 1915-16. His works, unlike the better-known Dzadiid drama, aimed not so much toward constructive persuasion and change as at exacerbating social tension and increasing civil strife. For this reason, Niyazi remained little staged and outside the mainstream of new Central Asian dramaturgy in the initial period. But the same antagonistic quality was to earn this pro-Russian writer an ideological approval from Communist leaders in the 1920s that persisted long after his death. Niyaziy's first play, the four-act Zahirî hâyer uzbekî ("Revolutionary Uzbak drama"), written in 1915, published by the author in 1916 at Tagkent, dramatises the anguish of forced marriage already portrayed in Central Asian poetry, fiction and drama. His version blames religion for permitting the practice. The playwright staged, directed, publicised and organised a company to act in this tragedy in Koqan's military assembly building at the end of 1915. Religious controversy closed the show and he disbanded his troupe after two performances (Mâmâmân Râkmânîvan, Ozbek teatri târkîhi, Tagkent, Uzbekistan SSR "Fân" Nâşrîyati, 1968, 313-16).

Plays that avoided treating contemporary life, usually historical dramas, in the beginning mainly served patriotic purposes, and often ended tragically. They still, however, reflected the current concerns, also persisted in early Reformist drama and literature, reflecting public concern over the prevalence of that practice in the sexually segregated urban life of Central Asia. Abduurauf Shahidi (Shahshudîn) (b. and d. unknown), a Tatar schoolteacher living in Koqan, wrote the play first published (1912) in the Turki (later, "Uzbek") language of southern Central Asia. The plot of Mâhrâmandar ("Forbidden to marry") dramatised the destructive effect upon young Turkistan boys of the organised homosexual circles in which many were kept by older men of means.

An acknowledged follower of what was termed Behbudûy akîmi (the Behbudûy tendency), Abdullah Kadirî (1894-1939), chose the second most common serious plot, after backwardness, for his drama, Bûgdiy kastav ("The unfortunate bridegroom"), published in 1915 and staged the same year. In it, Kadirî explored the practice and often unhappy consequences of arranged or forced marriage in Central Asian life. That theme emerged, as well, in one of the earliest original plays presented in Kâbul, Afghanistan, in the 1920s, in Izzudîyûd iştîhârî ("A girl's forced marriage"). Similar social themes animated the modern Uyghur theatre in Kâshâbah during its first period, starting after 1933. Drug addiction, polygamy, bribery, stupid pretension and forced or arranged marriage led the list of subjects in the Chinese sector of the region. Exposure to modern
dramas staged, like most Afghan plays, in the Dari language. King Amān Allāh (1919-29) [q.v. in Suppl.]
took the lead towards westernizing Afghan theatre in 1926 when he caused a theatre building to be con-
structed in the Paghman suburb of Kābul (Heusler, loc. cit.). Historical themes likewise attracted Afghan
dramatists in later decades, despite the risk entailed in writing about kings unflatteringly in a monarchy.
Abdur Ghafur Breshna (1907-74) wrote his Haji Mir-
awāt Khān about an 8th-century clan leader and khan
who leads intrigues and battles for possession of the
fortress of Kandahār (Breshna, Haji Mirawat Khan. A
historical play in 3 scenes and 17 acts, in Afghanistan:
Historical and Cultural Quarterly, xiii/2 [Summer 1349/1970], 59-81).

In the Russian sector, the earliest historical plays
served supra-ethnic patriotic, but not nationalist,
purposes. They represented Islam at the height of
expansion against Christianity or made allegories for
the Central Asian situation under foreign rule. After
the coup d'état in November 1917, and the increasing
Russian Communist domination of cultural develop-
ment in the sector, historical drama became explicitly
civil—(i.e. class)—war-minded and anti-nationalist. Such
plays were meant to depict rulers and most other past
leaders as "class enemies", a procedure that persisted
into the 1930s. An Afghan edict of 1923, which
works devoted to a few approved potentates who were
usually also poets or scholars. Thus Uzbek drama fur-
nishes an example; the Timūrids Ulugh-Beg (1394-
1449), Mir ʿAli Shīr Nawātī (1441-1501), and Zahir
al-Dīn Muḥammad Bābūr Pāshā (1494-1530), or
ʿUmar Khān's talented wife Nadīrā Khānim (1792-
1842) has each furnished the subject for at least one
full-length stage work in Uzbekistan alone. Selected
historical figures served similar ends elsewhere in
Central Asia.

Most active among the first prominent local
Uyghur playwrights of Eastern Turkistan became the poet Abūdūrāhīm Tilāğh Otkūr (1922-), from Komul
district. He wrote his initial play, “A million flowers
from one drop of blood” (Tarnā kaändi milīyon irtēkalār
(1945) in a patriotic vein. With the poet Lutfrego
(Salumtoy, 1942-45) as an editor of several other
ideological plays—Otkūr wrote “The Steadfast
peony” (Čing modängul), (1943), soon staged in
Urumūći. And, when Otkūr served as Editor-in-Chief
of Shīnjìng gazet, the principal East Turkistan
newspaper, he published his drama, Niyazīkiz (1948).
(Yusup Koḥayef, Çekmaq kəbi hayat, in Biziring wa’dan,
no. 2 [Jan. 1983], 3; personal interview, İstanbul
1956, with Mr Polat Kadr, former Managing Editor,
Shīnjìng gazet).

At Urumūći and Turpan in Chinese Turkistan in
1982, Uyghur troupes staged a new historical drama,
Kantlik yillar (“Bloody years”) that had been published
in the revived, modified Arabic script in 1981. The
Uyghur author Tursun Yunus (b. and d. unknown),
issued it in the unusual Uyghur language journal,
Shinjiang sanqi ("Art of Shinjiang") from Urumūći.
Sidik Zalli, an 18th-century Uyghur poet and hero of
this six-act play, affirms the identity of his country
within the world of Islam when he prays for an end to
religious conflict, rhetorically asking in his final
speech: “When will the sectarian slaughter of the
world of Islam (Islamiat danyari) come to an end?”
Commenting to Chinese critics upon his reason for
creating this long historical drama, Yunus once re-
marked that he wanted it to oppose the old Muslim
sect of ʿIḥānās which had “raised its head again in
recent years in some parts of southern Shinjiang”.
(Tursun Yunus, Kantlik yillar, in Shinjiang, sanqi, no. 1 [July 1981], 24-93; Zhorhilmizning mukhbir,
Tarḥāy dramā “kantlik yillar” sohbat yiyg’inniñ ḥalatist, in Shinjiang tarikh, no. 1 [July 1981], 7-13).

Alongside historical plays there came staged ver-
sions of legendary tales, heroic epics and popular
romances. Mukhtar Auez ufl (1897-1961) not only
gave Kazak audiences such a rendition of legendary
romances and made them increasingly
and death of young Djora and his beloved Nargul
from one drop of blood” (Tamça kandin miliyon ciceklar].
Uyghur author Tursun Yunus (b. and d. unknown), later
used a traditional eastern Romeo and Juliet theme to
the accompaniment of indigenous music. Accord-
ing to an eye-witness, audiences jammed the theatre’s
performances and sang along with the music. Indig-
enous plays were musical comedy and a form of serious
theatre termed "musical drama" which combines
spoken and sung parts for the stage characters. This
type of theatre became institutionalised first in the
Russian Soviet sector, then appeared in Afghanistan
as well as Shinjiang. Gulum C̱afar (1889-1944) wrote one
of the earliest regional musical dramas, the four-act
Hālima, 1918-19. A Taγhket cast with a woman in
the lead role staged it in 1919-20. Oyghur theatre in
Kazakhstan saw its first formal Uyghur musical drama,
Anderkhan, by Dī, Asim and A. Sadır, and based again
upon popular folk songs, staged in 1934 at Dīarkent,
now Fat’ıf, located just eleven miles from the
Shinjiang frontier near Kuldja [q.v.]. Like the refor-
mist plays of two decades earlier in Samarkand
and Kokan, Anderkhan elaborates the unhappy conse-
quences of a forced marriage between a young bride
and an unloved older and wealthy man. In
Kazakhstan, among the small Uyghur population of
109,000 recorded for the USSR in 1926, a succession
of Uzbek theatrical directors, producers and actors
from Uzbekistan helped with the first staging of Ander-
khan. Māmmān Uyghur (1897-1955) and ʿĀli Ardubāsh
Ibrahim (1900-59) infused those initial Soviet Uyghur
endeavours with the brief Uzbek experience in drama.
Ibrahim had also worked earlier in Stalinalad
organised troupes, amateur or professional, coalesced wherever traditional or modern theatre was performed. The Kokan Khanate's next-to-the-last indigenous ruler, Khudayar Khan (1854-8, 1862-3, 1866-75) [see Gilkamb], maintained a well-known folk troupe at court. Itinerant troupes of performers often presented Muslim religious drama in the villages. Neither folk nor religious drama troupes could effectively adapt themselves to the modern stage when it appeared. The first Reformist dramas necessitated creation of entirely new theatre groups to perform them. At Samarkand in 1913, Behbudiy acknowledged his difficulty in forming the initial indigenous troupe of amateurs because of lack of interest and experience. His group soon turned semi-professional through rehearsals and exposure during active road tours outside Samarkand, playing also in Bukhara, Kokan, Andijan and other towns until it disbanded in 1916 (Mamajan Ramanov, 281-2).

The future playwright, Abdullah Awlaniy (1878-1934) established one of the earliest of these troupes, the semi-professional "Turkistan" group, basing itself on Tashkent, in 1914. Like the first Samarkand group, "Turkistan" began assembleing a répertoire around Behbudiy's The patricide, presenting various additional Central Asian plays and some translations from Turkish, Azerbaycan, and the like. Numbers of other private theatre groups came into being, mirroring the custom in folk theatricals. Traditionally, ensembles of clowns, buffoons, puppeteers, conjurors, stilt walkers, equilibrists, horn players, bellringers and related performers had been combined in one kisâsha-ya szandad or mihirâk (guild of musicians) rather than separated into guilds for each special art. As late as the early 20th century, this guild still possessed its own tısâla (statute or treatise), giving a legendary history of the art's origins, naming saintly protectors, and setting forth religious duties and prayers linked to each phase of the vocational activity. In 1926, political authorities in the Soviet sector incorporated these folk performers into a "Union of Art Workers" and continued their performances under government auspices (A. Samoilovč, Turkistanšiki ustav-nusulâ yteqle artístico, in Măteriáli po etnografii, Leningrad: Izdâni, Gosudârstvennogo Russkogo Muzeya 1927, 54-6). Thus sponsorship by provincial governors, added to some patronage of the khâns and âmirns, along with guild structure and tradition, gave performers in folk theatre systematic recognition and status comparable to the position enjoyed by many artisans of the region in different vocations.

In the initial modern period, amateur troupes attempting new productions regularly drew to them in various centres as actors persons who were already accomplished teachers, poets or playwrights. A Tatar author, Abdullah Badiri (b. d. unknown), later a playwright, originally acted to acclaim the women's roles offered by Behbudiy's Samarkand troupe. As "Bay", Abdullah Awlaniy had the lead in the Tashkent presentation of The patricide on 27 February 1914. Hâmzâ Hâkim Zâdä Niyaziy acted in his drama A poisoned life in Kokan on 22 October 1915. Mâmmân Uyghur and Awlaniy performed in the "Turkistan" troupe when it put on Abdullah Kadirüî's The unfortunate bridgenoom in Tashkent, November 1915. Ubaydullah Khødâji's troupe toured all over the Târâghânâ valley. The success of the March and November 1917 changes in Russian governments, some private theatricals had continued in Central Asia. Except for folk art shows, most of their activity was soon curtailed by political authorities. All theatre houses and properties became government-owned after 2 October 1918. By 1922, in the Russian sector among the Central Asians, only state theatre groups received approval or support, and political censorship was again firmly established. Uzbekistan's comprehensive law code in this field became a model for all Soviet Central Asia. It controlled répertoires as well as productions. The decree, enacted by the Turkistan Autonomous SSR on 16 April 1923 and codified by the successor Uzbekistan SSR on 8 February 1927, provided for Union republic censors in publishing houses and press and at all levels of local political hierarchy down to the county (okrug) (Uzbekistan Idgiýa's Shorulâ Dijorak Dijorjorikti Islâyi wa Dîhkan Hokomâtning Kanon va Boyqoqaringlik Yig'indisi, no. 9 [7nci Mart 1927niči yil], 199-202).

Nevertheless, the legacy of theatres, troupes and faithful audiences had already created the environment needed for enlarging modern drama performances on a regular basis. A network of new theatres and troupes quickly grew up in the Russian sector, though there were setbacks. The "Karl Marx Drama Troupe" organised there in October 1918 was led in 1921 to Bukhârâ, which was at the time still semi-independent from Soviet Russia, by Mâmmân Uyghur, to propagate for the new régime's ideology. During a performance of Fitra't Alâ Muslim in 1922 components burned down the theatre and dispersed the troupe, leaving Bukhârâ again without a professional theatre group for years. At Alma Ata in Kazakhstan, in order to lay a stable foundation for guided theatrical growth in its area, the Kazakhstan Autonomous S.S.R. Ministry of Education ordered the establishment of a Kazak Theatre Studio to accommodate 40 students from January 1933 onwards. This followed by almost a decade the founding of a studio for Uzbek theatre troupes in Moscow. The 24 young people sent to Moscow from Uzbekistan had included several who contributed greatly, as authors, directors, actors or translators, to the development of Central Asian theatre. They included the mature Abdullahâmad Sulâyman Çöllân (1896-1938), a promising 14-year old actress Sarâ Â Şâhânturarâyevâ (1911-), Mâmmân Uyghur, and Abâr Hidayâyâv (1900-57). The latter subsequently achieved fame in the role of Hamlet during 21 consecutive Uzbek performances after the premiere in 1935. Cultural leaders dispatched another group of 17 from Uzbekistan to Baku in Azerbaijan for a theatrical apprenticeship (Kazak teatrining tarihî, Alma Ata: Kazak SSSR'ning "Chîlim Başpasâ", 1975, 201-2; Uzbekski zvotestnî teatr, 1, Tashkent: Izdatel'stvo "Nauka", Uzbekskoy SSR, 1966, 246-8). In 1937, there were 124 centres, including both Russian and Uyghur ones, functioning in Kazakhstan.
By 1934, the quantity of regularly performing local-language theatres in all Uzbekistan had reached its peak of 32, after which the numbers gradually subsided to a fairly constant 22 to 28. This did not include provincial, Uzbek houses operated in the Kirgiz SSR at Osh and Tajik SSR at Now (Nau). The quantity of Tadjikistan's theatres working in various languages rose from four in 1934 to 24 by 1941. (Mamajmän Rämänaw, 413-5; N. L’vov, Kirgizskii teatr. Oček istorii, Moscow: Gosudarstvennoe Izdatel’stvo ‘Iskusstvo’, 1953, 127; Yakov Moscheev, My recollections of Now Raion: the status of a peripheral theater in Soviet Tajikistan, in Central Asian Survey, nos. 2-3 [1982-83], 108-22; Nizam Xabiibullovic Xurjджанным, Istorija tadzhikskogo sovetskogo teatra (1917-1941 gg.), Dushanbe: Izdatel’stvo ‘Donish’, 1967, 401). Thus the quantity of theatres in all Central Asia multiplied strikingly from 1913 onwards, reaching an estimated 150 official houses, government sponsored and supported, in the three sectors, during the 1950s and thereafter. The capital cities saw a division of labour among serious drama theatres, musical drama houses, opera, and comedy or children’s playhouses, as well as between the major languages and traditions. In 1983, Tashkent possessed nine of Uzbekistan’s 28 active theatres. Leading administrators in the three principal theatrical organisations of Uzbekistan in 1983 were the drama critics and historians, Professor Fudziyamu (1885-1937) and Saken Sadvakas Seyfullah-uli (1894-1975), the principal Uzbek journal publishing drama, and Director of the Hämza Institute for the Arts of the Ministry of Culture, Uzbekistan SSR; Professor Mämdädjan R. Rämänaw (1914-), Rector of the Ostrovsky Tashkent Theatre Arts Institute, the main training centre for theatre arts; Sara Iğhanturayeva, Bähriddin Nasreddinaw and other officers of the sole membership organisation for stage in the Uzbekistan Theatre Society (Qamismoi). The vigour of the theatrical institution implied a constant need for an attractive repertory, and, especially, for many original indigenous plays. The numbers of original Central Asian stage works written had risen from about 20 altogether by the end of 1916 to many hundreds by the 1980s. New Uzbek scripts of varying quality were written and produced at the rate of some 20 annually in the early 1980s. Yet critics and historians spoke soberly at the same time about a decline in drama, attributed generally to the emergence of radio, television and new popular music. Most keenly missed were good serious plays about contemporary subjects. Even before the strong growth of mass media in broadcasting, Central Asian theatre had endured slumps in attendance to a marked degree. Many auditoria remained nearly empty night after night in the 1920s and 1930s owing to public indifference to the offerings being brought to the stage, especially to those heavily ideological in content.

From the beginning, modern Central Asian drama bore three distinct traits: it was socially or politically didactic; purely entertaining and comic; or the plays were historical and patriotic, sometimes legendary. Newer drama combined some of these characteristics, remaining resolutely instructive in the Russian and Chinese sectors, but more balanced in spirit and aims in Afghanistan until the late 1970s. The theatre of all three sectors began to explore contemporary life seriously, in particular, after an opening period that was notably tendentious. Since the coming of Communist régimes to the three sectors, the nature of drama has shifted remarkably in the direction of propagandising political-social directives from the central authorities. In each case, the acknowledged ideological base is a kind of official Marxism. As a result, plays written and staged in the period following that political change in each sector have become at first outspokenly rhetorical and sloganeering. Themes announced by political authorities for each period can be found reflected in the dramaturgy and repertories. In addition, plays have persistently enunciated such principles as atheism, espoused by Communist régimes. Many Central Asian stage works originating in the Russian sector, far more than in the others, have openly and specifically opposed the religion of Islam. This paralleled the intensification of political and social tensions in the USSR in the 1930s, when Central Asian plays, too, mirrored the times. Zinnat Fathullin (1903-) wrote a drama typical of the period in 1932 entitled Nikah yirtildi (‘The mask torn away’), one which is engrossed with a search for ‘enemies’ ostensibly hidden inside Central Asian society. A related obsession with ‘external enemies’ and ‘traitors’ coloured political plays such as Kandi sarak (‘Bloody morgue’) (1961-4) in two acts and ten scenes, by Sarwar Aziyaw (1923-), a political activist and diplomat.

In the 1960s, dramas with a more human content began to appear increasingly. It was indicative of this evolution that Bähräm Rämänaw (1915-61) turned to themes such as Tursak sirldri (‘Secrets of the heart’) (1953), a play that ignored political topics and simply concentrated upon the private lives of its people. Rämänaw, a Communist Party member, headed the Administration for Art Affairs in Uzbekistan from 1953-5; thereafter, he became Director of the Scientific Research Institute for Studies of the Arts, and finally, in 1958, took the post of First Secretary of the powerful government-controlled Union of Writers of Uzbekistan. Another influential intellectual, Izzat Sultan (1910-), his play İmon addressed the ethical dilemma put before a family that finds a dishonest scholar in its midst. The senior Uzbek poet and playwright, Rämätullä Atäkiziyew Uyyyun (1905-), soon made audiences face the crucial test of social and political ethics in Soviet Central Asia. He looked, in his play Dostilär (‘Friends’) (1961), at the havoc raised among farmers by the Stalinist terror and false confessions that had resulted in unlawful treatment to the extremes of execution and exile. For Central Asian theatre this was a pointed theme, for many of the important earlier playwrights and other theatre people, including the Kazaks Mir Djakib Duwlat-uli (1885-1937) and Säken Sadvakas Seyfullah-ul (1894-1937) and the Uzbek Çolpan, Fitrpat, Kadiriya, Ziya Said (1901-30) and Zafar, had lost their lives in the political repression.

The Kirgiz dramatist and novelist, Čingiz Aytmawat (1928-) and the Kazak author, Kaltay Muhammadjanaw (1928-), joined in examining that very controversial ethical subject. They translated their Kazak language drama, Kölkijedegi kezdesu (“Mountain top encounter”) (1972) based upon a story by Aytmawat, into Russian as Vesokozhdendenie na Pudzysnam (‘The ascent of Mount Fuji’) and gave it its premiere in Moscow in 1973. They recreated the tension in society over collective indifference and guilt toward innocent victims of political repression and social discrimination. But the writers in the end concern themselves more forcefully with basic problems of individual honesty and responsibility for personal actions and outlook.

After those ethical dramas during the 1970s-1980s in the Soviet sector, historical tragedy and domestic comedy seemed to predominate, leaving assertively political and ideological plays less in the forefront that
they had been previously. Yashin returned to the story of climactic events in early 20th-century Central Asian history with a three-act musical drama he called Islam dengi musikal' ("Dawn of the evolution: Bukhara"), published in 1973. Its dramaturge personalities included the Bolshevik dictator Vladimir I. Lenin, the Young Bukharian politician Fazil Khodjaysay, the last Amir of Bukhara Sa'id 'Alimkhân and other historical figures, portrayed on stage with a cinematic flashback technique. Yashin represents the prominent old-time and doctrinaire Central Asian dramatists educated almost entirely in the Soviet period. Like Râhmanov, he held key positions in the administration of the theatrical arts and served as Secretary of the Government's Union of Writers in Uzbekistan. The contribution of these playwrights hardly lay in the comic genre. 

Comedy originally defined Central Asian theatre, for it was the essence of folk skits and acts long before and well after religious or modern drama appeared on the scene. In the early decades of the 20th century, both the Djadids and the very first Communist Soviet playwrights, as well as Afghan writers, initially for the most part rejected light comedy. They believed their message to be paramount and serious. In the first decade, the official bulletin, Ishtirakiyun, published by the Central Committee of the Turkistan Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic, considered that comedy be "a place of amusement and love intriguers", and it specifically criticised attempts to present "diverting comedy" (Ishtirakiyun, 11 December 1919, 12 October 1920). Consequently, from the 1920s to the 1950s in Soviet Central Asian theatre, most stage comedy spoke with a heavy satirical voice. Hâmid Qulam (1919-) wrote Taghabûn tashîk ("Taibalî in love") (1962), a musical sharply attacking religion and the practice of Islam in Central Asia. Folk humour incorporated in modern plays from the 1920s onward repeatedly conformed to the vision of comedy preferred by cultural managers. The Uyghur dramatist Yusufbek Muhlisi (1920-), who emigrated from the Chinese sector to Soviet Central Asia at about the same time as other writers, sc. around 1964, provided Uyghur performers in Kazakstan and Uzbekistan with a later specimen of this genre. Muhlisi's Nâsrîdîn Apanâmî (1966), a musical staged in 167 at Alma Ata, adapted several anecdotes from the widely popular Nasreddin tradition to fashion, in the Uyghur idiom, what critics called an anti-Islamic satirical comedy. (Akhmedjan Kadyrov, Godi stanovlenija (Iz istorii ugyrskogo teatra muzikal'nyj komedii) Alma Ata: Izdatel'stvo "Zhahlym", 1978, 62-3).

Subler, often lighter, humour characterised more of the works written later in the 1960s by younger dramatists. The new generation of playwrights interests itself directly in personal feelings, contemporary values and ways of life. Most notable in Uzbekistan in the 1970s-80s came Omâs Umârbekeep (1934-) and Adubkaihâr Ibrâhimaw (1939-), both natives of Tagkent. Ibrâhimaw's initial play, Birinci basta ("First kiss") (1969), which the author calls "a lyric drama", ran for 500 performances between 1971-5 on the "Young Guard Theatre" stage in Tagkent. The comedy focuses exclusively upon the personal motives, lives and loves of several teenagers, shown as growing into young adulthood by the end of the second and final act. Ibrâhimaw's unioleological but bitter comedy, the two-act Atrî ("The saw"), 1970, staged in the Farg'ana Oblast's Theatre, is about a lower-class family. It dramatises the character and ideals of Murad, the head of the family. He is an influential medical administrator and professor who is the cutting "saw" of the play Mânsuraw is convinced that everyone acts only out of selfishness or, out of what is closely related, a sense of obligation rooted in the principle of quid pro quo. He disallows the elements of affection, generosity, spontaneity and similar affirmative forces in human relationships. Ibrâhimaw's two-act play Meni ayidi demâng ("Not a word about me") satirises a hearty but impervious country town borough politician and educator, Hâshim-âkâ. His callousness, like that of Professor Mânsuraw in Atrî, permits any positive human urge to wither and die. This is symbolised in Not a word... by the corruption and demoralisation of the borough's best, most generous part-time gardener, a roofer, Ali, whose small courtyard plot has decorated, pleased and fed the whole neighbourhood well up until he acquires false values from a chain of irresponsible bureaucrats, including Hâshim-âkâ, and makes the lush garden to dry up. Ibrâhimaw's later play, Tumaal ("Supposition"), ran at the Samarkand Alimdjan Uzbek Drama Theatre in 1983, and another one, Çakana sâuda ("Retail trade"), was published in 1984. Six of Ibrâhimaw's plays, including Firtâkiss, The saw and Not a word about me, came out in Russian translation in 1982. (Abdukaihâr Ibrâhimaw, Birinci basta. Arrâ. P'tsâlar, Tagkent: Ghâför Qulam namidâgi Quraish adabiyatî tashkent sanoz, 1981; Abdukaihâr Ibrâhimaw, Obo mne ni slova. P'esy, translated from the Uzbek, Moscow: Sovetskii Pisatel', 1982; Çakana sâuda, in Şâhr yulduzi, no. 8 [Aug. 1984], 73-99; Abdukaihâr Ibrâhimaw, Tumaal. P'tsâlar, Tagkent: Ghâför Qulam namidâgi Abâdâbiyatî wâ San'at Nashriyati, 1985). Crimean Tatars, Tajiks and Turkmen also contributed new plays. After the earliest days of modern Central Asian theatre, translations and borrowings from plays written outside the region were frequently published in Central Asian languages and included in the repertoire. Although Tsarist Central Asians originated their own earliest dramas, the relatively few local productions soon required supplementing by adaptations from playwrights of Azerbaijan, Tatarstan and Turkey in order to make an adequate repertoire available. Into Afghanistan, modern stage plays first came from the Arabic, English or Turkish. To Shinjiang in the 1930s, the active theatre of Soviet Central Asia supplied numbers of its plays, easily adapted to the linguistic needs of Uyghur and Kazak actors and audiences. Throughout the region, the range of dramaturgy widened further with renditions of European and Russian dramas. Molère's comedies, especially L'Asare, Le Médecin malgré lui, Georges Dandin and Les fourberies de Scapin became perhaps the most popular in Soviet Central Asia and Afghanistan, as they had been in Egypt and Turkey. Shakespeare, most often represented by Hamlet, The merchant of Venice and Othello, appeared nearly everywhere. Colpan made the first published Uzbek translation of Hamlet in 1934. It was staged, along with Othello, in Tagkent in the mid-30s. By the 1960s and 1970s, Afghanistan's city theatres were staging recent American plays by Eugene O'Neill (Desire under the elms), Tennessee Williams (The glass menagerie), Edward Albee (The zoo story) and others. Translations of standard Russian plays seen in Soviet Central Asia included Gogol's comedy, The Inspector-General, Ostrovsky's melodrama, Thunderstorm, Gorky's ideological Veyor Bul vito and others, and many dozens of works from the linguistic needs of Uyghur and Kazak actors and audiences. Throughout the region, the range of dramaturgy widened further with renditions of European and Russian dramas. Molère's comedies, especially L'Asare, Le Médecin malgré lui, Georges Dandin and Les fourberies de Scapin became perhaps the most popular in Soviet Central Asia and Afghanistan, as they had been in Egypt and Turkey. Shakespeare, most often represented by Hamlet, The merchant of Venice and Othello, appeared nearly everywhere. Colpan made the first published Uzbek translation of Hamlet in 1934. It was staged, along with Othello, in Tagkent in the mid-30s. By the 1960s and 1970s, Afghanistan's city theatres were staging recent American plays by Eugene O'Neill (Desire under the elms), Tennessee Williams (The glass menagerie), Edward Albee (The zoo story) and others. Translations of standard Russian plays seen in Soviet Central Asia included Gogol's comedy, The Inspector-General, Ostrovsky's melodrama, Thunderstorm, Gorky's ideological Veyor Bul vito and others, and many dozens of works from the linguistic needs of Uyghur and Kazak actors and audiences. Throughout the region, the range of dramaturgy widened further with renditions of European and Russian dramas. Molère's comedies, especially L'Asare, Le Médecin malgré lui, Georges Dandin and Les fourberies de Scapin became perhaps the most popular in Soviet Central Asia and Afghanistan, as they had been in Egypt and Turkey. Shakespeare, most often represented by Hamlet, The merchant of Venice and Othello, appeared nearly everywhere. Colpan made the first published Uzbek translation of Hamlet in 1934. It was staged, along with Othello, in Tagkent in the mid-30s. By the 1960s and 1970s, Afghanistan's city theatres were staging recent American plays by Eugene O'Neill (Desire under the elms), Tennessee Williams (The glass menagerie), Edward Albee (The zoo story) and others. Translations of standard Russian plays seen in Soviet Central Asia included Gogol's comedy, The Inspector-General, Ostrovsky's melodrama, Thunderstorm, Gorky's ideologica
tory is emphasised in the fact that translations supplied around one-half of the 130 to 140 plays staged each year in Uzbekistan as late as the early 1980s (Uzbekistan âdâbîyatı va sânhâlî, no. 8 [19 February 1982] 4, 7).


6. In Muslim India and Pakistan.

The classical Sanskrit drama in India had reached its apogee two centuries before the first Muslim penetration. Its gradual decline—often blamed partly on the religious objections of the new Muslim rulers—was probably due as much to linguistic developments, through the mediaeval local Prakrits to the modern regional languages. But whilst Sanskrit drama, which was essentially court theatre, died out, popular vernacular drama prospered. Strolling players went from village to village performing various types of plays, pageants, monologues or other entertainment (Haywood, 294-6), often on familiar Hindu themes such as Krishna and Râdhâ, with singing, dancing and, at times, coarse humour. Among the actors were Muslims: female parts were performed by men or boys.

Some efforts were made in the 17th and 18th centuries to write plays in various languages such as Hindi, Bengali, Assamese and Gujarati of literary, and not merely of entertainment value. But there is no doubt that it was the influence of European—especially British—drama which provided the main impetus for the growth of a new interest in the theatre, though the heritage, both classical and popular, played part. Towards the end of the 19th century, English plays were performed in Calcutta, and two were performed in Bengali translation (Guha Thakurta, 40 ff.). Lord Macaulay’s Minute of 1833 led to the spread of English higher education in India. This in turn led to the study, then the translation or adaptation of English plays, and especially of Shakespeare. R. K. Yajnik, 270-8, lists 200 versions of 29 Shakespeare plays in nine languages between 1864 and 1919. These languages are Urdu-Hindustani, Hindi, Panjabi, Gujarati, Marathi, Bengali and Tamil. English plays were performed in several parts of the region, but mainly in the Calcutta area. The Indian government regarded Hindustani as a lingua franca and official language which could be written in either Persian or Devanagari script, depending largely on whether one was a Muslim or Hindu. People spoke of High Urdu and High Hindi, but the distinction was one of vocabulary, style and script rather than grammar. The entry of Muslims into the region are in print: "Askiya", ein wenig bekanntes Genre des usbekischen Volksgedichts, in Ural-Altaiische Jahrbücher, xii/2 (1964), 676-78; idem, Drama and the theater, in Uzbek Literary Politics, 1964, 215-35; idem, Reform and revolution in early Uzbek drama, in Central Asian Review, xiii/2 (1964), 86-96; idem, A document about the cultural life of Soviet Uzbek outside their SSR, in Central Asian Survey, iv/2-3 (1982-3), 103-25; idem, Mahmud Khodja Behbudiy, in Encyl. of World Literature in the Twentieth Century, i, 1981, 219; idem, Abdurahim Firit, in ibd., ii, 1982, 143-4; idem, Murder as metaphor in the first Central Asian drama, in UTB, Ivii (1986), 65-97; Inim Akhmidli et al., Melâjot tagh boranili, Urümî 1965; Sayyidin Azizin, Amannisakhun (Tarkhiy drammal), Beijing 1983; Akhmatjan Kadirov (compiler), P'isrâl (Uyghur dramaturgi p'tesirîning toqlim), Alma Ata 1978. (E. Allworth)
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Elizabethan England. Each company had a resident playwright, most of them Muslims. Plots were often taken from Islamic Persian or Indian folk-lore or history, but contemporary social themes gradually emerged. The leading dramatist was Āghā Ḥašār Kāšmīrī ([q.v. in Suppl.]). Plays were largely in verse, but rhymed prose, and increasingly prose, were also used. Plays by Shakespeare were adapted. There were sub-plots and many short scenes, and the general tone tended to be melodramatic.

This Urdu drama was certainly lively, but it was derived by purists on both moral and literary grounds. Its influence on drama in other languages, such as Hindi and Gujarati, has often been deplored (Tindal, 180-1, and Munshi, 304-5).

The theatre declined after the First World War, due to the emergence of the cinema, and especially of the talkies. Āghā Ḥašār became a film-star in Calcutta, and then founded his own film company in Lahore. On the other hand, radio, and even more, television, have given a new impetus to drama. Thus in Urdu, Miřāz Ādīb (b. 1914), who has specialised in one-act plays on social themes, has worked for Radio Pakistan. Imtiyāz ʿAlī Tāḏ̣i, (1900-70), who wrote for radio and films, excelled in comedy. His chef d’oeuvre is Anārkhālī. On the other hand, ʾIṯrār Ṭahmānī, who is best-known as a critic and editor of dramas, has contributed to the translation of Western plays, with Ḥansī Ḥansī mēn (Brandon Thomas’s farce, Charlie’s Aunt) and Ek Ḥamsālmēn (Booth Tarkington’s Clarence).

The limited scope of this article precludes reference to some leading dramatists with no Islamic connections, particularly in Bengali, Marathi and Hindi. Information on them will be found in the works listed in the Bibliography. The name Massā is associated with the first Arab conquest of Morocco: according to legend, it was on the shore of Massā that Jonah was cast up by the whale. In any case, Massā appears in the list of places the name of the place where it is settled, some 30 miles south of Agadir at the mouth of the Wādī Massā. The latter is probably the flumen Masatat mentioned by Pliny the Elder (v. 9) to the north of the flumen Darat, the modern Wādī Darā, and the Masata of the geographer who would correspond to the modern al-Massā.

The name Massā is associated with the first Arab conquest of Morocco: according to legend, it was on the shore there that, after conquering the Sūs, ʿUkba bin Nāfiʿ embarked on the conquest of the land of the Sus, calling God to witness that there were no more lands to conquer on the west. In any case, Massā appears very early as an important religious and commercial centre. Al-Yāʾkūbī (Buldān, 360, tr. Wiet, 226) notes that the harbour was a busy one, where ships built at al- Ḥumrān and also sent many adventurers there to raise rebellions.

Towards the middle of the 15th century A.D., the Portuguese began to become interested in Massā, where they very soon acquired a privileged position (see R. Ricard, Études sur l’histoire des Portugal au Maroc, Coimbra 1953, 133, 136) and, at the opening of the 16th century, the Genoese came there to purchase gold, wax and goat and cow hides, lac and indigo.

Towards the end of the 15th century, the religious movement begun by al-Dżazūlī ([q.v.] made Massā one of the great zūcāyāt of Sūs, a remarkable centre for culture and piety (see M. Hajji, L’activité intellectuelle au Maroc à l’époque Sa’dide, Rabat 1976-7, ii, 626-8 and index). In the middle of the 9th/16th century, Leo Africanus (tr. Épaulet, 87-9) describes Massā as a group of three little towns surrounded by a drystone wall in the middle of a forest of palm-trees; the inhabitants were agriculturists and turned the rising of the waters of the Wādī to their advantage. Outside the town on the seashore was a highly venerated “temple”, from which the Mahdis was to come; a peculiar feature of it was that the little bays in it were formed of ribs of whalebone. The sea actually throws up many cetaceans on this coast and ambergris was collected here; local legend moreover says that it was on the shore of Massā that Jonah was cast up by the whale.

After the fall of the Sa’dids, the development of the
Marabout principality of Tazerwalt again made Masa a commercial centre. The port was frequented by Europeans, but it was soon supplanted by that of Agadir. The rapid decline of the Principality of Tazerwalt and the steadily increasing influence of the central Moroccan power finally destroyed almost completely any religious and economic importance of Masa.


(G. S. COLIN*)

**MASSALAJEM, the name given to two Islamic settlements in North-West Madagascar:** Old Massalajem, otherwise Langani, is also known as Nœst Manja, and the daughter settlement of New Massalajem, also known as Bœny (Swa. correctly Bwini). The original town is reputed to have been founded from Kilwa [*q. v.*], and to have had regular trade relations with it and with Malindi and Pate, until its destruction by the Sakalava at the end of the 18th century. Sherds found there do not antedate the 14th century. New Massalajem served the Sakalava first as their northern capital, until they moved to Majunga, also a town of Islamic origin.


(G. S. P. FREEMAN-GRENVILLE)

**AL-MAŠṢĪŠA, the Arabic form of the classicalrop Mopsuestis, Byzantine Greek form Μαυσσις, Syriac Maṣṣīštā, Armenian Mez, Ottoman Türk. Meşis, or Massis, modern Tkish. Missis, a town of Cilicia on the western or right bank of the Djîşr al-Walid [i.e., 18 miles/27 km. to the east of Adana [*q. v.*]] and now in the modern vilayet of Adana.

In antiquity it was called Mêdōu ēstūa, a name, which (like that of Mêdōu ʾṣṭīra in the Cilician passes) is derived from the cult of the legendary seer Mopsos (cf. Meyer, *Gesch. d. Alten*, iv, 22, § 483). In ancient times, the town was chiefly famous for its bishop Theodoros (d. 428), the teacher of Nestorius and friend of the suffragan bishop and inventor of the Armenian alphabet, Maghṭūc[^1].

The emperor Heraclius is said to have removed the inhabitants and laid waste the district between Antioch and Mopsuestia on the advance of the Arabs, in order to create a desert zone between them (al-Ṭabarî, i, 2596; al-Baladhûrî, *Fatîh* 163; between al-Iṣkandarûn and Tarsûs), and under the Umayyads all the towns taken by the Arabs from al-Maṣṣîṣa to the fourth Armenia (Malatya) are said to have been left unfortified and uninhabited as a result of the inroads of the Mardizi (Theophanus, ed. de Boor, i, 363, 17). According to Abu ʾl-Khaṭṭāb al-Azdi (in al-Baladhûrî, 164), the Arabs conquered al-Maṣṣîṣa and Tarsûs under Abû ʾUbayda, according to others under Maysara b. Masrûq, who was sent by him and who thereafter acted as governor of Cilicia (al-Bidâya, 16/6307; Caetani, *Annales dell’Litâm*, iii, 805, § 311). Muʿawiyah, on his campaign against ʿAmrūriyya in 25/645-6, found all the fortresses abandoned between Anṭakiya and Ẓarsîs (see above). According to the *Maghazi Maṭʿawî*, he himself destroyed all the Byzantine fortresses up to Anṭakiya in 31/651-2 on his return from Darawliyya (Δάραλλιον in Phrygia) (al-Baladhûrî, 164-5). After the Syrian rebellion against ʿAbd al-Malik, the emperor Constantine IV Pogonatos in 65/684-5 advanced against the town and regained it (al-Yaʾqûbî, ii, 321). Yahyâ b. al-Hakam in 77/696 marched against Marjd al-Šâhm between Malatya and Masaït (al-Yaʾqûbî, ii, 397). It was only in 84/703 that ʿAbd al-Malik’s son ʿAbd Allâh retook the town and had the citadel rebuilt on its old foundations (al-Baladhûrî, 165; al-Yaʾqûbî, ii, 466; al-Wâkidî, in al-Ṭabarî, ii, 127; Ibn al-ʾĀthîr, iv, 398; Theophanus, *Chron.*, ed. de Boor, 372, 4; Michael Syrus, tr. Chabot, ii, 477; Elias Nisiben, *Opus chronolog.*, eds. Brooks, 156, tr. 75; *Script. Syri, chronica minora*, ed. Guidi, 232, tr., 176, under 1015 Sel. year; Weil, *Gesch. d. Chalifen*, i, 472). In the following year, he installed a garrison in the fortress, including 300 specially picked soldiers, and built a mosque on the citadel hill (Tall al-Ḥiṣn); a Christian church was turned into a granary (ḥaryun, ḥuryd = horreum, horrea; al-Baladhûrî, 165; Ibn al-Šîbîna, ed. Beirut, 179).

To the same event no doubt refers the wrongly-dated reference in the *Chronicle* of the Armenian Samuel of Ani of 58/742 A.D. to the fortification with strong walls of the town of "Mamestia, i.e. Miṣîs" by the Muslims under ʿAbd al-Malik (Ratio templorum usque et suam aetatem presbyteri Samuelis Aniensis, in Euseb. Pamphil., *Chron.*, ed. A. Mai and I. Zohrab, Mediolani 1818, App. 57; Alîshan, *Sissouan*, 286). Every year, from 1,500 to 2,000 men of the advance troops (sasîsît) of Antàkiya used to winter in the town. According to Michael Syrus (tr. Chabot, iii, 478), ʿAbd al-Malik died in 1017 Sel. (705 A.D.) in al-Maṣṣîṣa.

ʿUmar II is said to have intended to destroy the town and all the fortifications between it and Antioch and to have been either prevented by his own death (al-Baladhûrî, 167) or dissuaded by his advisers; according to this version, he then had a large mosque built in 155/770 (tr. Brooks, 156, tr. 75; al-Baladhûrî, 165; but Kafarbayya was probably not really built till the time of al-Maṭʿāsîm (al-Baladhûrî, 165); and Kafarbayya was cistern with his inscription. It was called the "Citadel Mosque" and kept up till the time of al-Muṭṭasîm (al-Baladhûrî, 165); but Kafarbayya was probably not really built till the time of al-Maṭṭāsîm (al-Baladhûrî, 165; but Kafarbayya was not built by Heraclius, the emperor’s brother (Theophanus, ed. de Boor, 372, 23; A. M. 6196; according to al-Ṭabarî, ii, 1185, and Ibn al-ʾĀthîr, iv, 419, wrongly not till 87 A.H.).

Higham built the suburb (al-rabad), Marwân II the quarter of al-Khaṭṣūs east of the Djîshān, which he surrounded with a wall with a wooden door and a ditch. The bridge of ḏîṣr al-Walîd between al-Maṣṣîṣa and ḏîṣr al-Maṭ ṭāsîm, 9 mîls from the former, was built in 125/742-3 and restored in 225/840 by al-Muṭṭasîm (al-Baladhûrî, 168; yakūṭ, Muṭṭâm, ii, 82; Safl al-Dîn, *Marâsid*, ed. Juynboll, i, 255). In the first half of the 2nd/8th century the caliph al-Walîd and ʿUzîd III brought the gipsy tribe of the Zutt [*q. v.*], who had been deported to ʿAṣyr by Muʿawiyah in 50/670, and settled them with great herds of buffalos in the region of al-Maṣṣîṣa in order to fight the plague of lions in the district of the ḏîṣr al-Lûkâm (al-Baladhûrî, 168; De Goeje, *Bijdrage tot de Geschiedenis der Zeynabiers*, Leiden 1873, 17-22).
The first 'Abbasid, Abu 'l-cAbbas al-Saffah, on his accession strengthened the garrison by 400 men, to whom he gave lands; the same estates were later allotted to them by al-Manṣūr. The latter in 139/756-7 required the walk was said to have been damaged by an earthquake in the preceding year, and increased with 8,000 settlers the much diminished population of the heathen temple, he built a large mosque which far surpassed the mosque of 'Umar in size. When 'Abd Allah b. Tāhir was governor of the West (i.e. in 211/826), it was enlarged by al-Ma'mūn. Al-Manṣūr increased the garrison to 1,000 men and settled in the town the inhabitants of al-Khūṣūs, Persians, Slavs and Christian Arabs (Nabataeans), whom Marwān had transplanted thither (see above), and gave them allotments of land. It is probably to the same event that the story refers that Ṣāliḥ b. 'Ali, when in the 'Abbāsīd period the inhabitants of al-Māṣīṣa, harassed by the Byzantines, resolved to migrate, sent Djibilt b. Yahyā al-Badjaḫīl al-Khūrsānī in 140/757-8 to rebuild the town and settle it with Muslim inhabitants (al-Baladhūrī, 166; according to al-Ṭabarī, ii, 135 in the year 141). Under al-Mahdī, the garrison was increased to 2,000; in addition, there was the Ṣanṭīqiyā corps of almost the same size which was recruited for the front line until the caliph of Cordoue became their wāli and increased the garrison by 500 men instead. There is a brief reference in the Syriac inscription of ʿEnēsh to a raid by al-Mahdī to the Djiyban (Syr. Gihon) in 780 A.D. (1091 Sel; Chabot, in Ḫattuša, iv, 2000, 88-9, n. 4), al-Muṣānḏ [1900], 88-9, n. 4), al-Muṣānḏ (Freytag, ZDMG, xi; Elias Nisibēn., op. cit.). The gates of Tarsus and of al-Māṣīṣa were


In 352/963, the emperor Nicephorus took Adana, the inhabitants of which fled to al-Māṣīṣa, and sent the Domesticus John Timissēs (Yānīs b. al-Shimīḏīk al-Dumīṣīk) against this town. The latter had besieged it for several days but had to withdraw as his supplies were running short, and after laying waste the country round burned the adjoining al-Mallūn (Mallūq) at the mouth of the Djiyban (Yahyā b. Saʿīd, 793-4). The emperor himself came again in Dhu ʿl-Kaʿda 353/Nov. 964 to the marches (al-Baghdār) and besieged al-Māṣīṣa for over 50 days, but had again to abandon the siege owing to shortage of supplies and retired to winter in Kaysariyya. Finally, the town was stormed by John Timissēs (Arm. Kūṯīr Žan) on Thursday 11 Raḏjab 354/13 July 965. The inhabitants set it on fire and fled to Kafarbayra. After a desperate struggle on the bridge between the two towns, the Greeks took this suburb also and carried off all the inhabitants into captivity (Yahyā b. Saʿīd, 795; Ibn al-ʿAṯīr, viii, 408-11; Abu ʿl-Fida, Ann. Mosl., ed. Reiske, ii, 482-3; Michael Syrus, iii, 128; Elias Nisibēn., ed. Brooks, 218, tr. 106; Georg. Gedemen., ed. Bonn, ii, 362; Leon Diakon., ed. Bonn, 52-3; Matteo Erhayevacī, ed. Dulaurier in Rec. hist. crois., Doc. arm., i, 5; Step’an Asoh̀k of Taron, Armen. Gesch., tr. H. Gelzer and A. Burckhardt, Leipzig 1907, 134, 24). They were, to the number of 200,000, it is said, led past the gates of Tarsūs, which at that time was being besieged by the emperor's brother Leo, to terrify the people of the town (Ibn ʿIrabī, Rawdat al-maṣārid, in Freytag, ZDMG, xi; Elias Nisibēn., op. cit.). The gates of Tarsūs and of al-Māṣīṣa were
gilded and taken as trophies to Constantinople, where one set was put in the citadel and the others on the wall of the Golden Gate (Georg. Cedren., ii, 363). In 1097 the Byzantine Emperor sent two ships with the hands of the Byzantines; the Emperor Basil II Bolgarconuts stayed for six months in the region of al-Maṣṣīṣa and Tarsūs before going to Armenia, after the death (31 March 1000 A.D.) of the Kurupolates David6 of Tayk, to take possession of his lands by inheritance (Yahyā b. Saʿīd, Taʾrīkh, ed. Rosen, 39, in Zap. Imp. Akad. Nauk, xiv, St. Petersburg 1883). In 1042 the Armenian prince Apšapir, son of Hassan and grandson of Khaṭṭāk of the house of the Arturians, was sent by the emperor Constantin Monomachos as governor to Cilicia (St. Martin, Mém. sur l'Arm., i, 199). In 1085 Philaretos Brachmonios, who was appointed in Cilintopole perhaps as Sebastos (Michael Syrus, ii, 173) or at least Kurupolates (Mich. Attal., Bonn ed., 301) and whose episcopal kingdom comprised the land from Tarsūs to Malayta, Urfa and Anṭākiyya, held al-Maṣṣīṣa (Michael Syrus, loc. cit.; Laurent, Byzance et Antioche sous le kurupolate Philarite, in Rev. des Et. Arm., ix [1929], 61-72).

Shortly before the arrival of the Crusaders, the Saljuk Turks took Tarsūs, al-Maṣṣīṣa, ʿAyn Zara and the other towns of Cilicia (Michael Syrus, iii, 179). About the end of September 1097, the Franks under Tancred, who had been invited thither by Lambert of Outremer, took the town, which was stormed after a day's siege: the inhabitants were slain and rich booty fell into the hands of the victor (Albert, Aquens., iii, 15-16, in Migne, Patro. Lat., clxvi, col. 446-7; Radulf. Cadom., Gesta Tancredii, ch. 39-49). William of Tyre describes al-Maṣṣīṣa on this occasion (iii, 21, in Migne, Patro. Lat., cci, col. 295): Erat autem Mamistra una de nobilioribus eiusdem provinciae civitatibus, muro et multorum incolatu insignis, sedet Optimo agro et gleba saeculari et urbani, ubere et amoenitate praecipua commendabilis. Count Baldwin, who had quarrelled with Tancred, followed him along with the admiral Winimer of Boulogne and encamped in a meadow near the Djayhān bridge; Winimer left him there and went with his fleet to al-Lāḏḏiḥiyya, while the two rivals had a desperate fight, after which Baldwin withdrew to the east (Albert, Aquens., iii, 161, 146, 5). Bohemund only took possession of the towns of Tarsūs, ʿAyn Zara and al-Maṣṣīṣa in August (William of Tyre, vii, 2). After the town had again fallen to the Greeks for a period, Tancred again took it in 1101 (Rad. Cad., ch. 143), but had to hand it over with Tarsūs, Adana and ʿAyn Zara to Bohemund on his return from captivity in 1103 (William of Tyre, vii, 2, in Migne, op. cit., col. 379). In the following year, however, Longjinas, Tarsūs, Adana and Māḏṣūr were regained for Byzantium by the campaign of the general Monastras (Anna Commena, Alexiad, ed. Reifferscheid, ii, 140, 5, who apparently did not recognise the identity of Māḏṣūr with Mofou ἔρημος, which she mentions several times). In the treaty between Bohemund and the emperor Alexius of September 1108, the town was promised to the former (Anna Commena, loc. cit., op. cit., 218), but Tancred had taken it in the preceding year with 10,000 men from the Byzantine general, the Armenian Aspietes (ibid., ii, 147). At this time, of the quarters of the town the one (probably Kalafbarbaya) was in ruins (ibid.). Baldwin of Burg and John of Courtenay, who allied themselves against Tancred with Kogh Vasil of Kaysum, were supported by the latter with a detachment of 800 men and a body of Pećenegs, who were stationed in al-Maṣṣīṣa as Greek mercenaries (Mattēos Urhayecē, tr. Daulurier, 266-7 = RHC, Doc. arm., i, 86). The great earthquake of 1114 destroyed the town, like many others in Cilicia and Syria (Gesta Tancredii, Soc. doc. arm., i, 614).

Under the Frankish patriarchate of Antioch, Mopsuestia-Mamistra was separated from the ecclesiastical province of Anazarbus and made an autocephalous metropolis (Michael Syrus, iii, 191; recensions of the Notitia Antiochena of the Crusading period). The ένωρα Μοσπουστέας stretched (according to Notitia Antiochena on the boundaries of the Antiocheia dioceses, ed. Papadopoulos-Kerameus, 67) from Seleucia in Syria and Adana ἀπὸ τοῦ μεγάλου Ἑξηρωτομοῦ (now Ozerci or Rabatç), τῶν τοῦ μεγάλου πολιοτόμου φιδίου. The latter is undoubtedly identical with αὐτὸς ὁ μέγας πολιοτόμος Ἀντανακλής, the Sayhān.

In 1132-13 the Rupēnids Levon I (Αὐτοκέφαλος), son of Constantin, took the town (Arm. Masis, Mises, Mmeceia et Mamistia, ad ann. i, 615). The brother of the emperor John II Comnenus went to him, and Levon gave his sons his daughters as wives with the towns of al-Maṣṣīṣa and Adana as dowries. But when they quarrelled he took back from the Greeks all that he had given them, and Isaac had to flee with his sons to sultan Masʿūd (Michael Syrus), ii, 230). Levon, falling through anarchy into the hands of Raymond of Poitiers, had to cede (1136-7) al-Maṣṣīṣa, Adana and Sarvantsikar (now Sawaran Kaf'eh?), but regained his liberty in a couple of months; he very soon retook these towns (Doc. arm., i, 152-3 = Chron. de Matthieu d’Edesse, tr. Daulurier, 457; Smbat, op. cit., 616). The emperor John in 1137 (1448 Sel.) had his revenge on Levon. He invaded Cilicia, took Tarsūs, Adana and al-Maṣṣīṣa, and Levon fled with his wife and children and took them to Constantinople, where Levon subsequently died (Ibn al-Athir, xi, 35; Michael Syrus, ii, 245; Gregory presbyt., Forts. d. Chronik des Matthäos, tr. Daulurier, 323; cf. Docum. arm., i, p. xxxii, 1 and 153, 4; William of Tyre, xiv, 24, 46; Röhrich, Gesch. d. Krgr. Jerusalem, 211). John installed Coloman (Calamanus), son of Boris and grandson of Cilicia (William of Tyre, xiv, 24, xiv, 9, in Migne, Patr. Lat., cci, cols. 603, 756; a Dux Ciliciæ mentioned in Regum et principum epistolae, no. 24, in Borgas, Gesta Dei per Franc., 1182, i, 46 and passim). When the emperor John died at Marād ila-Bīdāji on 8 April 1143 (William of Tyre, xv, 22; Röhrich, Gesch. d. Krgr. Jerusalem, 228, 4), his successor Manuel I Comnenus had his body brought by boat from Mopsuestia down the Pyramos to the sea and taken by sea to the capital (Niketas Choniatis, Mon. Komn., i, Bonn ed., 67).

Thoros II, the son of Levon, who had escaped home from his confinement in Constantinople, was again able to cast off the Byzantine yoke. When in 1151 he took Masis and Tīl (Tall Hamdun) from the Byzantines (Smbat, in Doc. arm., i, 619) and made their general Thomas prisoner, the emperor Manuel in the following year sent against him with 12,000 cavalry and Andronicus Comnenus, whom he had appointed governor of Tarsūs and al-Maṣṣīṣa (Gregor. presbyt.,
portion of his army thereupon went to Antioch via Tarsus, Mamistra and Thigo (Hish al-Mutlaqash; not Portella, the Syrian passes, with which Rohricht, Gesch d.Kgr. Jerus., 531, identifies). Buller, who visited the East in the train of Duke Leopold VII of Austria and Styria and the Teutonic Grand Master Hermann von Salza, came in the beginning of 1212 to Mamistere which he describes as follows: (Wilbr., ch. 18, ed. Laurent, Pergermanatores, Leipzig 1864, 175): Hic est civitas bona, super flumen sita, sita amowna, murum habens circa se turritum, sed antiquitatem corrompsit paucis in quodam regno habens inhabitatores, quisque omnibus rex illius terrae imperat et dominatur. In the vicinity lay quoddam castrum quod erat de patrimonio beati Pauli sed nunc temporis possidetur a Graecis. In hac civitate [Mamistere] habebatur sepulchrum beati Pantaleonis. Ipsa vero sita erat a Camanella (cf. Tomaschek, SB At. Wiem [1891], app. viii, p. 71) magnam dixtam. Levon II granted the republics of Genoa and Venice the privilege of having their own trading centres in al-Maṣṣīṣa, which could be reached by ship from the sea before the mouth of the Ḏiyāḥān became silted up (Altanhang, Sissouan ou l’Armeno-Cilicie, 287). The attempt of Raymond Rupēn of Antioch to seize the throne of Armenia after Levon’s death in 1219 failed; he was, it is true, able to take Tarsūs and attack al-Maṣṣīṣa but he was taken prisoner by Conor (Conagan) of Antioch and thereby compelled to take the oath of allegiance to the emperor (Dulaurier, 338 = Doc. arm., i, 171). For a century the Rupēnids ruled almost undisturbed in the town. Their glory reached its height under the splendid-loving Het’ūm I (1219-70). These were held the annual festivals of the Church at which numerous princes and nobles used to gather down to the last and difficult years of the king. Here was held the brilliant ceremony at which his 20-year-old son Levon was dubbed knight. Hither the king brought the seat of government after the destruction of Sis (Altanhang, Sissouan, 287-8).

Baybars sent a punitive expedition against Het’ūm in 646/1246 under al-Malik al-Mansūr of Hamā, who advanced as far as Kafat al-ʿAmidīyān and into the district of Sis, where Saltīf Safīd al-Dīn al-Maṣṣīṣa, Adana and Tall Hamdūn (Tlln Hamtunoy) in 1156, but Shaddad, in Rec. Hist. Orient. des Crois., i, 392), advancing al-Maṣṣīṣa, Adana and Tall Hamdūn (Tlln, he took from the Greeks Adana, al-Maṣṣīṣa and Ayn Zarba and to attack Thoros. The sultan, who on the first occasion (548/1153) was content with the defeat of the Armenians and the return of the lands taken from the Greeks, again attacked al-Maṣṣīṣa. On the 11th of February, 664/1266 under al-Malik al-Mansūr of Hama, who brought the seat of government after the destruction of Sis (Altanhang, Sissouan, 287-8).

Baybars sent a punitive expedition against Het’ūm in 646/1246 under al-Malik al-Mansūr of Hamā, who advanced as far as Kafat al-ʿAmidīyān and into the district of Sis, where Saltīf Safīd al-Dīn al-Maṣṣīṣa, Adana and Tall Hamdūn (Tlln, he took from the Greeks Adana, al-Maṣṣīṣa and Ayn Zarba and to attack Thoros. The sultan, who on the first occasion (548/1153) was content with the defeat of the Armenians and the return of the lands taken from the Greeks, again attacked al-Maṣṣīṣa. On the 11th of February, 664/1266 under al-Malik al-Mansūr of Hama, who brought the seat of government after the destruction of Sis (Altanhang, Sissouan, 287-8).

Het’ūm, the nephew of the Catholicoē Grigor IV and son of ʿOvrtvavel Tārnōn, who came to Cilicia in 1189 with his brother Shahingah, received from Levon II (1185-1219) his niece Alice, daughter of Rupēn III, in marriage and the town of Mēris, but died in the same year (Sucat, in Doc. arm., i, 629; Marquart, Südarmenien und die Tigrissellen, Vienna 1930, 481-2). The Emperor Frederick Barbarossa in 586/1190 was unable to go to Syria via Tarsus and al-Maṣṣīṣa when he met his tragic end in the Kalkajdos (alleged?) letter of the Armenian Catholicos in Ibn Shaddād, in Rec. Hist. Orient. des Crois., i, 162). A letter of the Armenian Catholicos in Ibn Shaddād in November, but he did no harm to the town and the surrounding district. The emperor, himself too weak to advance the insult, twice induced by gifts the sultan consented with the defeat of the Greeks, again attacked al-Maṣṣīṣa. On the 11th of February, 664/1266 under al-Malik al-Mansūr of Hama, who brought the seat of government after the destruction of Sis (Altanhang, Sissouan, 287-8).

Baybars sent a punitive expedition against Het’ūm in 646/1246 under al-Malik al-Mansūr of Hamā, who advanced as far as Kafat al-ʿAmidīyān and into the district of Sis, where Saltīf Safīd al-Dīn al-Maṣṣīṣa, Adana and Tall Hamdūn (Tlln, he took from the Greeks Adana, al-Maṣṣīṣa and Ayn Zarba and to attack Thoros. The sultan, who on the first occasion (548/1153) was content with the defeat of the Armenians and the return of the lands taken from the Greeks, again attacked al-Maṣṣīṣa. On the 11th of February, 664/1266 under al-Malik al-Mansūr of Hama, who brought the seat of government after the destruction of Sis (Altanhang, Sissouan, 287-8).

Het’ūm, the nephew of the Catholicoē Grigor IV and son of ʿOvrtvavel Tārnōn, who came to Cilicia in 1189 with his brother Shahingah, received from Levon II (1185-1219) his niece Alice, daughter of Rupēn III, in marriage and the town of Mēris, but died in the same year (Sucat, in Doc. arm., i, 629; Marquart, Südarmenien und die Tigrissellen, Vienna 1930, 481-2). The Emperor Frederick Barbarossa in 586/1190 was unable to go to Syria via Tarsus and al-Maṣṣīṣa when he met his tragic end in the Kalkajdos (alleged?) letter of the Armenian Catholicos in Ibn Shaddād, in Rec. Hist. Orient. des Crois., i, 162).
the Egyptians crossed the Djayhán by a bridge of boats, got behind the Armenians who had retired to Misis and inflicted a severe defeat upon them; among the towns taken by Shahsuwar in 871/1467 of the towns destroyed were Sis, Adana, al-Maṣṣisa and ʿAyūn Zarba, and Levon IV Cilician force against al-Maṣṣisa (Mamuestia), Adana, al-ʿAyni, Doc. arm., Orientis Christianas, Tyre, xiv, 10; Le Quien, in Erdkunde, xix, 66-8. To the east of their land (Taeschner, Gesch. d. Kgr. Jerusal., 1198-1200; Körnich, Gesch. d. Kgr. Jerusal., 42, 202). On account of the many Egyptian invasions, the Latin archbishopric was removed to Ayās by Pope John XXII in 1320 (Allahān, Siswan, 290).

After the fall of the kingdom of Little Armenia, the town of the city of Ptolemais, now called Alexandria, has been Turkish-controlled since 1177-1370 (1175-1206, David, 1215 Johannes, 1266 Sion, 1306 Constantine, 1316 John, 1323 Stephen, 1342 Basil, 1362-1370 unnamed; cf. Allāhān, op. cit., p. 290). Michael Syrus knows only al-Maṣṣīsa, but Merkez Kal īesi on the Bab Maṣṣīsa has been Turkish-controlled since 1320 (Alishan, Siswan, 290). According to Yakūt, the town originally had a wall with 5 gates, and Kafarbayra, one with 4 gates. A specialty of the town was the valuable fur-cla...
Marasid, ii, 167; Byzantine M. kástroν Συμμάχους, al-Safsaf on the present Suqatul-Din (ZDMG, xi, 180; Reiske on Abu l-Fida', Annal., ii, 649, n. 76, according to H. R. Macadam and E. F. J. Thomas, this is a corruption of Yekakt (ii, 401) to the marches of al-Maṣṣāsī. Not far from the town was a Syrian monastery, Gawikāth (mentioned in ca. 1200 A.D.: Barher., Chron. eccles., ed. Abbéos-Lamy, i, 624, in Alīghan, Sissouan, 295; Dījkhoth, probably identical with Jawdeṭel). The neighbouring fortress of Anti-Mandalana (now Tumbu-Kaλ-Safsaf, Combenteur, territoria Meloni, i.e. of Mūn, Ar., al-Mallūn) were, according to Wilbrand of Oldenburg (op. cit.), in ca. 1212 in the possession of the Teutonic Order (Allemanni). The Venetians had a church in al-Maṣṣāsī (Gestes des Chrétiens, in Doc. arm., ii, 831). Armenian authors mention there the churches of St. Sarkis, Thòros and Stephan (Alīghan, 286-9).

The present Misis is a large village or small town whose population was, according to the 1905 census, 1,177. A stone bridge with nine arches (in Baedeker, Konstantinopol und Kleinasiern, 1914, 303, wrongly: “five-arched”), the foundations of which are in part ancient (picture in Alīghan, Sissouan, 289; Lohmann, Im Kloster zu Sis, 15), leads to the left bank of the Djayhan where pieces of walls and inscriptions still mark the site of the ancient Mopsuestia. Here lie the modern villages of Kafarbina: while this term is the one in general use in Arabic texts and in modern authors, Hādīddjī Khālīfa (Dīhān-nūmā, Constantinople 1145/1732, 602) has Kafarbīnā (Taeschner, in ZDMG, xi, 180; Annal. orient., ii, 173; iii, 237, no. 121; Istakhri, 63; Ibn Hawkal, 257, iv, 72, 83, 134, tr. in Gaudefroy-Demombynes, La Sirte à l’époque des Mamelous, Paris 1923, p. cvi, 9, 100; Ibn al-Shināh, al-Durr al-muntakhab fi taḥrīr al-Ḥalab, ed. Sarkis, Beirut 1909, 178-81, cf. index, 292; The Loire, Palestine under the Moslems, 26-7, 37-8, 62-3, 78, 82, 505; index, Lands, 128, 130-2, 141; RHC, Doc. arm., i, index, 824; K. Ritter, Erdkunde, xix, Berlin 1899, 195-115 (the older traveller's name) has also Kafarbīnā, “kafar” (McC. ‘Alī, 1885) ist gêr und girop auf dem Arìmûn. i. Paris 1819, 198 (according to P. Câm’ârîan, Armen. Gesch., ii, 995, 50, 157, 335); W. M. Leake, Journal of a tour in Asia Minor, London 1824, 217; W. B. Laker, Larsen and Penates, London 1853, 34, n. 2, 111; J. von Hammer, Gesch. der Ichane, i. Darmstadt 1842, 291; V. Langlois, Voyage en Cilicie, Mopsuestia, in Rev. Arch. xii (1855), 410-20; F. X. Schaffner, Cîlicia, in Ptolem. Mitteil., Erg-Heft, cxi, 40; C. Favre and B. Mandrot, in Bulletin de la Société de Géographie (Jan.-Feb. 1878). and in Globus, xxxiv (1878), 236; W. R. Ramsay, Histor. geogr. of Asia Minor, London 1890, 385 and index, 483; W. Tomasek, in SB Ak. Wien (1891), part vii, 68-71, 76; V. Guiner, La Topographie d’Asie, ii, Paris 1891, 42-3; H. Striegau, Im Kloster zu Sis, Venice 1899; E. Lohmann, Im Kloster zu Sis, Striegau 1901, 3, 15, 31; A. Janke, Auf Alexanders d. Gr. Pfaden, Berlin 1904, 76; G. Cousin, Kyros lejeune en Asie Mineure, Nancy 1904, 277-8, 436-8; G. L. Bell, in Rev. Arch., iv, vol. vii (1906), 386; F. Taeschner, Das anatolische Weltwelt nach osmanischen Quellen, i (Tûrk. Bibliothek, xxiii), 1924, 102, 145, 151, ii (ibid., xxix), 1926, 30; idem, al-Umarî’s Bericht über Anatolien in seinem Werke Masalik al-ahsâr fi mamalik al-amsâr, i, Leipzig 1929, 66; E. Hönigmann, Die Ostgrenze des byzantinischen Reiches von 363 bis 1071, Brussels 1935, index s.v. Mopsuestia.

MÂSÜTĐ, village, fort, and district in the upper Yârkûn valley formerly included in the Dir, Swat and ČÎRÎT Political Agency of the North-West Frontier Province of British India and now in Pakistan. It apparently formed part of the ancient territory of Syamaka (Sylvain Lévi, in JA, ser. 11, vol. v, 76; and H. Lâders, Weitere Beiträge zur Geschichte und Geographie von Ostenurkestan, 1930, 29 ff.). Stein identifies Mâṣûtî with the territory of Čî-wei of the Chao-T’ang, who were situated on the Chen, a tributary of the Wuk’ûng in the 8th century A.D. (Ancient Khotan, Oxford 1907, i, 15-16, Strinnia, i, 18). An inscription discovered at Barenis points to the fact that Mâṣûtî...
was included in the dominions of the Hindushahiyya dynasty of Wayhind [see Hindu-ghānihs]. The village of Mastūdūj lies at an altitude of 7,800 feet, and is 71 miles north-east of Čīrāl town and to the west of Qūz, in the Coal. The history of Mastūdūj is closely connected with that of Čīrāl [q.v.]. British relations with these two states arose as a result of their relations with Kāshmīr, which state recognised British suzerainty in the year 1846. During the viceroyalty of Lord Lytton, it was deemed expedient, in view of Russian military activities in Central Asia, to obtain a more effective control over the passes of the Hindu Kūsh. With this objects in view, the Māhārājā of Kāshmīr was encouraged to extend his authority by means of peaceful penetration over Čīrāl, Mastūdūj and Yāsīn. (The fullest account of early British relations with these states is to be found in Foreign Office mss. no. 65, 1062.) After the introduction of Lord Curzon’s tribal militia scheme, Mastūdūj became the headquarters of the Čīrāl irregulars.


**MASŪD b. MAH MŪD, Abu Ṣa’Ibād, SHIHĀB AL-DAWLA, QAMĀL AL-MILLA, etc., sultan of the Ghaznavid dynasty, reigned 421-32/1030-40.**

The eldest son of the great Mahmūd b. Sebūtīgīn [q.v.], he was born in 388/998. In 406/1015-16, as nāfī ‘udd and heir apparent, he was made governor of Hārāt and in 411/1020 led an expedition into the still-pagan Makrān and in 426/1035 asserted his authority in Gurgān and Tabaristān, where the local ruler Abu Kālidjar was two years in arrears with tribute. In India, raids were made into Kāshmīr (424/1032-3), but policy regarding India in the middle years of his reign was taken up with lengthy operations against the rebellious commander of the army of India at Lahore, the Turkish officer Abu bāqar al-Mawsīl, against whom Masʿūd appointed as his commander the Hindū Tilāk (424/1032-3). When order was restored in the Pan- dūja, the sultan in 427/1036 led a successful expedi-

tion against Hānṣī, leaving his son Mawdūd as governor in the Pandūja.

This concentration on India meant that Masʿūd could not give adequate attention to the western parts of the empire, where the situation grew increasingly menacing. On the death in 423/1032 of the Ghaznavid governor in Khvārazm, the Khvārazm-Shāh Aftāntūs [q.v.], that distant province, which had been annexed by Mawdūd less than twenty years before, fell away from Ghaznavid control under less amenable governors there. The loss of this outpost, guarding approaches from the steppes to northeastern Persia, led to Masʿūd in dealing with the incursions of the Turkmens led by the Sāldjūk family, who had been repulsed from Hārāt and Farāwā early in the reign but who were by 425/1033-4 making systematic raids into Khvārazm. Although the Ghazna-

**MASʿūD b. MAW DūD b. ZAN GĪ, ʿĪzz al-Dīn, fifth Zangī Atābāk of al-Mawsīl (Mosul) (576-89/1180-93).**

Masʿūd’s prestige and military reputation were now shattered. Fearing that even eastern Afghanistan and Kāshmīr might fall to the Sāldjūks, he resolved to leave for India, but after crossing the Indus his army rebelled at the ribāt of Mārkīlā, deposed him and soon afterwards killed him, having set up his brother Muhammad again for a brief second reign (Rābī’ II 432/December 1040), before Masʿūd’s son Mawdūd [q.v.] was able to avenge his father.

The verdict of contemporaries such as the official Abu ʿl-Fadl Baybākī [q.v.] was that Masʿūd was inferior in capability and determination to his father; his advisers complimented of this capriciousness and lack of sound judgement. But in retrospection, one may well conclude that the Ghaznavid empire had reached a high point by the end of Mahmūd’s reign which no successor of his, however competent, could have sustained such an emprise.

North Syria and the Djazira. Though he had neither the material resources nor the political imagination to block Salah al-Din's ambitions altogether, he nevertheless proved a tenacious opponent, and in the end was able to retain in the confederation his family al-Mawsil and the core of that of Diyar Rabi'a. We should also note that he seems to have enjoyed the active support of his subjects, whose energy and stubbornness were decisive factors in the defence of al-Mawsil in 581/1185.

Like every other Syro-Djaziran prince of the 6th/12th century, Mas'ud operated within the framework of a family confederation. Once he came to the throne of al-Mawsil, he was the senior member of a group of Zangid princes, but he had little capacity to intervene in the affairs of their appanages or to compel them to accept his leadership. At the time of his accession in 576/1180, Halab (Aleppo) was held by his cousin al-Salih Isma'il b. Nūr al-Dīn Mahmūd; Djazirat Ibn Umar by his nephew Mu'izz al-Dīn Sandjar Shāh; Sayf al-Dīn Ghāzī II, and Sandjar by his younger brother Ihlāq al-Dīn Zangī II. But with Salāh al-Dīn's occupation of Aleppo (Ṣafar 579/1183), Zangīrid rule was restricted to the principalities of al-Mawsil (always the principal one), Sandjar and Djazirat Ibn Umar. These three towns retained in fact the main elements of the Zangī confederation down to its end in the early 7th/13th century. As always in such political arrangements, the princes were seldom united among themselves, and Salāh al-Dīn played with great skill on the petty ambitions of Sandjar Shāh and Ihlāq al-Dīn Zangī II. On the other side, Mas'ud hoped to establish a close supervision over his relatives, but Salāh al-Dīn's presence prevented that.

Mas'ud began his career in the service of his older brother, Sayf al-Dīn Ghāzī II (565/1170-80). He was commander of al-Mawsil's contingent at the disastrous battle of Kurun Hamat (Ramadan 570/April 1175), which marked Salāh al-Dīn's first great military triumph in Syria, and was likewise present at the equally unfortunate Tall al-Sulṭān the following year, though on this occasion his brother Ghāzī was in command.

After this we hear nothing of Mas'ud until the death of Ghāzī (Ṣafar 576/June 1180). Ghāzī had intended to name his twelve-year-old son Sandjar Shāh to succeed him, but was persuaded by the amīr Mudājdīd al-Dīn Kāymāz—the éminence grise of Zangid politics throughout this period—to assign al-Mawsil to his brother Mas'ud and to compensate Sandjar Shāh with Djazirat Ibn Umar. In spite of these, Mas'ud's succession went without incident and was never seriously challenged throughout his reign.

Mas'ud now had the primary responsibility for checking Salāh al-Dīn's evident ambitions, and the first six years of his reign were almost entirely taken up with this problem. The first crisis came with the death of al-Salīh Ismā'il of Aleppo (Rajab 577/December 1181). Ismā'il bequeathed Aleppo to his cousin Mas'ud as the only Zangī prince with sufficient resources to hold the city. Mas'ud in fact did occupy Aleppo during the winter of 577/1182. But he soon negotiated an exchange of Aleppo for Sandjar with his younger brother Ihlāq al-Dīn Zangī II. Ibn al-Athīr states that the reason was Zangī's threat to turn Sandjar over to Salāh al-Dīn; equally a factor, no doubt, was Mas'ud's desire to consolidate his territorial gain of al-Mawsil. The exchange was consummated in Muḥarram 578/May 1182, and at once provoked Salāh al-Dīn's great Syro-Djazīrī cam-
paign of the same year. Al-Mawsil was subjected to a short siege in the autumn of 578/1182, but far more important was Salāh al-Dīn's capture of a string of major Djazīrūn towns, including Sindjar itself. Mas'ud's desire to consolidate his defensive alliance (including Kūfā al-Dīn Il-Ghāzī of Mārīdīn and the Shāhī Arman of Khāṭī) failed, and in the spring of 579/1183 Salāh al-Dīn captured Amid and Aleppo. The latter city was taken through negotiations with Zangī, and this prince was compensated with the restoration of his old seat of Sindjar together with several other towns. Mas'ud's strategy had thus utterly failed; he was now isolated, while Salāh al-Dīn had gained a powerful new client in 'Īmād al-Dīn Zangī II. Worse, a moment of turbulence in the palace politics of al-Mawsil caused Mas'ud to lose control of a traditional client-state in Irbil, whose ruler also went over to Salāh al-Dīn.

At this juncture, Mas'ud sought the support of the powerful Atābāq of al-Dībāl and Atābāqba'yajān, Pahlawān Muhammad b. Eldiğiz [see Eldiğiz], but it did not happen. The garrison and townpeople of al-Mawsil put up a spirited defence, and the caliph's envoys made it quite clear that Salāh al-Dīn's venture did not enjoy the support of the population. Finally, a grave illness forced Salāh al-Dīn to withdraw to Harrān in late autumn, and negotiations throughout the winter at length led to a treaty in Dhu 'l-Hijja 581/March 1186. Mas'ud would retain al-Mawsil and would have full autonomy in internal affairs, but he would recognise Salāh al-Dīn's supremacy in the khutba and sikka and would supply him with military aid as demanded. These terms did in fact govern relations between the two princes for the rest of their lives. Mas'ud's support to Salāh al-Dīn during the reconquest and the Third Crusade even earned for him permission to attack his troublesome nephew Sandjar Shāh in Djazirat Ibn Umar in 587/1191. He did not succeed in taking the city, but did compel Sandjar Shāh to concede him half his lands.

With Salāh al-Dīn's death (Ṣafar 589/March 1193), Mas'ud hoped to recoup the fortunes of his house. Joining forces with Zangī of Sindjar, he moved to occupy as much of the Djazīrī as possible. But before any major results could be achieved, Mas'ud fell ill and returned to al-Mawsil. Meantime, Ayyūbīd forces under al-Ādīl were able to compel the helpless Zangīds to make a quick peace before they suffered irreparable territorial losses. After an illness of some two months, Mas'ud died on 29 Shaban 589/30 August 1193. He left al-Mawsil to his son Nūr al-Dīn Arslān Shāh (d. 607/1211), who would be the last effective ruler among the Zangī-Atābāk of al-Mawsil.

Bibliography: The Arabic sources for ʿIzz al-Dīn Mas'ud are essentially those for Salāh al-Dīn. Of particular importance are Ibn al-Athīr, Atābāq, ed. Tulaymāt, Cairo 1963, and with a French translation by Barbiere de Meynard in RHC, historiens orientaux, ii, 1876; idem, al-Kāmil, xi-xii, passim; Ibn Khallikān, Wayfayt al-ṣūrān, ed. I. ʿĀhūba, Beirut 1972, nos. 236, 521, 721 (Ibn Khallikān follows Ibn al-Athīr closely but adds
some fresh details). Modern works: the Zangid
background is given in N. Elisseeff, Nür al-din, 3 vols., Damascus 1967; of the many works on Salah
al-Din, the most useful at the moment are those of E. H. Lucas, From Saladin to the
Mongols, London 1977, passim. There are no
specialised monographs or articles on Mas'ud.

(R. STEPHEN HUMPHREYS)

MAS'UD B. MUHAMMAD b. MALIK-SHAH
Abu 'l-Fath Ghuyyeb at-Tawr was 'l-Din, Saldjik sultan in 'Irak and western Persia
529-47/1134-52.

Like the other sons of Muhammad b. Malik-Shah [q. v.], Mas'ud was entrusted as a child to the tutelage of
Turkish Atabegs [see ATABAK], latterly with Ay-Aba
Djuwayni Beg acting thus, and given the appanage of
Adharbaydjan and al-Djazira; at Djuwayni Beg's
defeated a coalition of discontented amirs in 542/1147
and killed a major thorn in his flesh, Boz-aba; but
jealousy of the sultan's favourite, the amir Khâbîs Beg
Arslan, provoked further warfare in the next year,
with the rebel group endeavouring, unsuccessfully, to
place Malik-Shah b. Mahmud on the throne in
Baghdad. Mas'ud later gave him one of his daughters
in marriage and made it his goal when Mas'ud died at Hamadân in 547/1152 September
1152, Malik-Shah succeeded briefly to power as the
protégé of Khâbîs Beg. Ibn al-'Azhîr regards the for-
tunes of the Saljuq dynasty as going into steep
depression on Mas'ud's death.

Bibliography: 1. Sources: See the general
chronicles, Ibn al-'Azhîr, Ibn al-Djâwiz and Shîh Ibn al-Djâwiz on amirs; and of the specifically
Saljuq sources, Bundârî, Zubdat al-nura, 163-6,
172-227; Râwandi, Râhat al-sudur, 234-49; Sadr al-
din Husaynî, Âghbâr al-dawla al-salajukyya, 106-27,
Eng. tr. Qbîla Ayaz, An unexploited source for the history of the Saljuq..., Edinburgh Univ.
biography in Ibn Khallikân, ed. Ihsân 'Abbâs, v. 200-2, no. 720, tr. de Slane, iii,
355-6.

2. Studies. See M. A. Köymen, Büûkî Seljuklu
imparatorluku tarihi. ii. İkinci imparatorluk devri,
Ankara 1954, 250-305; Bosworth, in Cambridge histor.
of Iran, v. 124-34; C. L. Klausner, The Seljuk

Mas'ud Beg, minister in Central Asia of the
Mongol Khaân in the 13th century A.D.

Soon after 1238, in the reign of the Great
Khân Ogodey (1227-41), parts of Transoxania
and Moghîlîstan [q. v.] (the region of the steppes to
the north of Transoxania) were ceded to Çağhatay as an
investment on a sub-vassal [see ÇAGHÂTAY KHAN
AL-NAHR. 2. History]. Mas'ud Beg's father Mahmud
Yalawâ (q. v.) was transferred from his government of
the sedentary population of Transoxania and
Moghîlîstan to China, and the son then appointed
to succeed him there. Indeed, according to Râqîd al-
Dîn, tr. J. A. Boyle, The successors of Genghis Khan,
New York and London 1972, 94, cf. 183, 218,
Mas'ud Beg administered the affairs of the entire
sedentary population, sc. all but the nomadic Turks
and Mongols, throughout Inner Asia from
Khâzâr-azam to Kâshgharia and Uyghûrîa, Muslims
and non-Muslims alike. Djuwayni praises him for his
just rule over the Muslims of Transoxania. His
benefactions included such buildings as the Kâhînîyya
madrasa (built by him with money given by the Christi-
An Queen Sorkotani, widow of Toluy and mother of
Mongke Khân and Hulegu) and the Mas'ûdiyya
madrasa, both situated near the Rûghstân of Bûkhrâ,
and also, it seems, the Mas'ûdiyya madrasa in
Kâshghar (Djuwayni-Boyle, i, 108).

Mas'ud Beg remained governor of Inner Asia
under Mongke and Batu, during the civil strife of
Alguh and Berke and after the victory of Kaydu over
his rivals in 1269, showing remarkable powers of sur-
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third in Kashghar under Kaydu’s son and successor Capar.


(C. E. Bosworth)

MAS’UD-I SA’D-I SALMAN, eminent Persian poet of the 5th/11th century (ca. 440/1046 to ca. 515/1121-2) who early and late in his life enjoyed position and fame at the Ghaznavid court, but spent some eighteen years of his maturity in onerous imprisonment. As a poet, he is most famous for the powerful and eloquent laments he wrote from his various places of incarceration [see HABSYYA in Suppl.]. Mas’ud-i Sa’id was born in Lahore to a family of means and education. The family’s original home was Hamadân, but had been settled in the region long enough for his father to have become a responsible official at court. About Mas’ud-i Sa’id’s early life no reliable information survives. He makes his first dateable appearance in 460/1076-7 as a panegyrist in the retinue of prince Sayf al-Dawla Mahmûd, son of the ruling sultan (Zahir al-Dawla Ibrâhîm [see ghaznawids]), who was appointed governor-general of India in that year. The kaftâr-yi mdâbhâ which Mas’ud-i Sa’id composed on that occasion is the work of a mature and accomplished poet. By his own assertion in other poems from about this period, he was also a brave warrior, and a responsible and highly-regarded member of the prince’s court. In about his fortieth year, Mas’ud-i Sa’id went to Ghazna to reclaim land that had been seized from him by persons unspecified in the sources. While there, he fell under suspicion, and possibly more because of the suspected disloyalty of his patron than of his own, he was imprisoned. This period of imprisonment, which he spent in the fortresses of Sâ’i, Dakhâk and Nây, lasted some ten years despite the repeated entreaties of a number of officials friendly to the poet, and the supplications of Mas’ud-i Sa’id himself.

He was released early in his reign by sultan Ibrâhîm’s successor, ‘Alâ’ al-Dawla Mas’ud (III) who also made the poet curator of the royal library. Mas’ud-Sa’di also enjoyed the patronage of Abû Naṣr-i Fârsî, deputy to the current governor of India, ‘Aṣğr al-Dawla Shîrzâd, and was appointed by him to the governorship of Džâlandhâr/Gâlandhâr, a dependency of Lahore. When shortly thereafter Abû Naṣr-i Fârsî was disgraced and fell from favour, his protégé suffered a like fate and was again imprisoned, this time in the Indian fortress of Marandj; and for a period of eight or more years.

Mas’ud-i Sa’id was released from his second and final period of incarceration in ca. 500/1106-7, shortly after the opening of the reign of Sultan Mas’udd’s successor, Kamâl al-Dawla Shîrzâd, but he remained in obscurity throughout both his reign and that of his successor, Sulhân al-Dawla Arslân Shâh. Only toward the close of his life, with the beginning of the reign of Yamîn al-Dawla Bahrân Shâh, a notable patron of literature, did the now aged poet once again enjoy the recognition that his poetic talents merited.

Mas’ud-i Sa’id was a skilful court panegyrist who continued the style of his eminent predecessors, ‘Unsûrî, Farrûkhî and Manûşîrî [q.v.]. His work does not reflect either the shift toward mystical subjects nor the more complex metaphorical structure that can be seen in the poetry of his contemporaries Sanâtî and Azrâkî. His panegyrics have a special interest for the historian because they contain a measure of historical data about a period for which other sources are rare. However, his most enduring contribution as a poet has been his prison poems (hab-şyâyâ), in which, through the skilful deployment of conventional language, he conveys the despair and power the wretchedness of his days. One hears in these poems that intensely personal voice whose lack is so frequently decried in studies of Persian poetry.

Bibliography: The notices of Mas’ud-i Sa’id salman in mediaeval Tâdâkir are not to be trusted, and the only reliable source for his biography is his Dîwân, which has been capably edited by Râghib Yâsîn. Tehran 1338/1939, and frequently reprinted. Although he boasted of his knowledge of Arabic, no Arabic poetry by him has survived. The best study of his life and work remains that of Mirzâ Muhammad b. ‘Abd al-Wahhâb Kazwînî, Mas’ud-i Sa’id-i Salamân. Translated by E. G. Browne, in JRAI (1905), 693-740, and (1906), 11-15. C. E. Bosworth makes a number of comments on the life of Mas’ud-i Sa’id and the general literary situation at the Ghaznavid court in his The Later Ghaznavids, splendour and decay: the dynasty in Afghanistan and northern India 1040-1186, Edinburgh 1977. There is a lengthy chapter on his imagery in M. Shaffî- Kâddâni, Suwar-i shâhî d dar shîr-i Fârsî, Tehran 1350/1971. (J. W. Clinton)

MAS’UD, SAVÎD SALAR, called Ghasî Mîyân, a legendary hero and martyr of the original Muslim expansion into the Gangetic plain of India. He is alleged to have been the son of a sister of Sultan Mâhmûd of Ghazna [q.v.], to have been born at Admîr [q.v.] in 405/1014, and to have been killed in battle against Hindu idolaters, aged 19, in 424/1033. His tomb is on a pre-Muslim sacred site in Bahrâstî, in the sub-Himalayan plain of northern Uttar Pradesh, and is the centre of a widespread cult. The hero-cult was well-established by the beginning of the 11th/17th century, and is succinctly described by Ibn Bâttûta. The Sultans Mâhmûd b. Tughlakh and Firuz Shâh Tughlakh visited the tomb. The procession of the hero’s nêzâ (“lance”), a tall tufted pole, was prohibited by Sultan Sikandar Lodî (d. 923/1517) but remains a highlight of the annual festival (cf. similar poles of Lîl Beg of the Cuhfas, and of Shâhbaz Kalandar at Sehwan). The myth of Salar Mas’ud was elaborated in Persian in the early 11th/17th century in the Mirzâ-i Mas’udî, a heroic romance which owes something to the Dîstân-i Amîr Hamza though it strives for a greater air of historical authenticity. Ghasî Mîyân’s cult extends to Bengal and the Pandjab, probably sometimes conflated with the cult of other local Muslim shâhîds. The main ‘urs or death anniversary is celebrated on the first Sunday of the solar month of Diwyetha/Dijêt h, between 14 and 21 May, but an ‘urs is also mentioned on the significant date of 11 Muharram. The martyr-cult is combined with a fertility-cult (cf. the secondary sexual symbolism of the pole, and the “mystic-marriage” implication of ‘urs). Legends and songs of the marriage of Ghasî Mîyân before his last battle are widely distributed and were sung at Muslim weddings. At an extreme popular level a conflation may occur (e.g. in the east Nepal), with the celebration of the martyrdom of Hushayn at Karbalâ, with the bridegroom figure of Kâsim b. Hasan, lamented in Iranian märtyrs. The ‘urs of Ghasî Mîyân is celebrated by lower-class Hindus as well as Muslims. Mendicant followers of Ghasî Mîyân carry a daff (tambourine) and are known as daffî fârsîs.

Bibliography: Amir Khusrav Dihlavi, l’îjâzî-i Khusravi, Lucknow 1872, i, 155; Ibn Bâttûta,
Al-Mas'ūdī, Abu 'l-Hasan 'Ali b. al-Husayn, Arab writer whose activity, in the words of Brockelmann (in *EP*, s.v.) “has been undertaken outside the well-trodden paths of professional scholarship”, with the result that he has been rather neglected by biographers and copyists and that a normally well-informed writer like Ibn al-Nadim, who has obviously not read his works, takes him (Fihrist, 154) for a Maghribī and devotes to him only a short, moreover probably truncated, article. In fact, the only reliable account which is available concerning the biography of this eminent individual must be drawn from his two surviving works, the *Murūj al-dhahab* (abbreviated here as *M*, referring to Pellat’s edition—*M*, *passim*) and the *Tanbih* (*T*, ed. Cairo 1962, *Tanbih*, *AL-I*) which he may also have written.

Al-Mas'ūdī was born in Baghdād (M, 987; T, 19, 42) into a Kūfīan family which traced back its genealogy and connected its *nisba* to the Companion Ibn Mas'ūd [q.v.]. He himself does not record his ancestry in entirety, but it could well be as follows (see Ibn Ḥazm, *Djamharat ansdab al-ʿArab*, ed. Cairo 1962, 197; Ibn Khaldūn, *Ibar, ii, 319*): 1. Ali b. al-Husayn b. 'Ali b. Abū 'l-ʿĀl (M, § 522) b. Zayd b. 'Utbā b. 'Abd al-Rahmān b. 'Abd Allah b. Mas'ūd (for the rest of the genealogy, see Ibn al-Kalbī-Caskel, *Djamharat*, Tab. 58: Ḥudhayl, who does not however allot to 'Abd al-Rahmān a son named 'Utbā). The date of his birth is unknown; however, if we are to take literally the expression *haddaṭah-nā* preceding the reference (T, 254) to Ibrāhīm b. 'Abd Allāh al-Kaḥbštī (d. 292/904) or that (*ghābdān*) which is used (T, 254), the *nisba* of both, which includes al-Nādhī (d. 293/906 [q.v.]), must have been born later than some years before 280/893, and not ca. 283/896, as is suggested by A. Shboul (*Al-Mas'ūdī and his world*, London 1979, p. xv).

His youth was spent in Baghdād, but he gives no information regarding the development of his studies. From a reading of the *M*. and *T.*, it may however be deduced that he had the opportunity, during the period of his religious, judicial and literary education, to attend classes given by a number of eminent teachers who died in the early years of the 4th century, notably (T, 296) Wākidī (d. 306/918 [q.v.], M, § 2242) al-Faḍlī b. al-Hubāb (d. 305/917 [q.v. in Suppl.]), (M, §§ 139, 2282) al-Nawbakhtī (d. at the beginning of the 4th century [q.v.]), (T, 396) Abī Ḥaṣīna b. ʿAbd Allāh al-Dhūbaḍī (d. 303/915, see al-Ṭabarī, 396) al-Ash'ārī (d. 324/935 [q.v.]), (M, *passim*) al-Sulī (d. 324/935 [q.v.]), (T, 396) Abu 'l-Kāsim al-Balākhi (d. 319/931, see al-Balākhi, M, § 764) Ibn Duraḍ (d. 321/934 [q.v.]), (M, *passim*) al-Asḥārī (d. 324/935 [q.v.]), (M, *passim*) Nīlāwyā (d. 323/934 [q.v.], and others besides; it is also known that in 306/918 (al-Subkī, *Tabakāt al-Shīʿīyya*, ii, 307) he was present at the death bed of Ibn Suraydī [q.v.]. It would be tedious to list the personalities with whom he associated in the course of his career, but a further exception is to be made in the case of (M, § 3382) Djabīr b. Muhammad b. Hamdān al-Nawrussī (d. 323/944; see Sezgin, *GAS*, ii, § 225) and of (M, *passim*) Abī Bakr al-Sulī (d. 336/946, see al-Sulī), who seem to have played a particularly important role in his life. The scholars and men of letters cited above represent, at this highest level, the principal disciplines cultivated in this period (see, in this context, A. Shboul, *op. laud.*, 29-44; T. Khalidi, *Islamic historiography*, Albany 1973, 148-50; in the encyclopaedic index which follows the new edition of the *Murūj*, brief biographies of the contemporaneous personalities mentioned in this work are to be found).

Whatever may have been the interest and the value of the knowledge thus acquired through direct transmission, an echo of which is also to be found in his work, al-Mas'ūdī would never have attained his eminence had he not been endowed with an extraordinary intellectual curiosity which impelled him, on the one hand, to educate himself with books, and, on the other, to enrich his human experience by undertaking long journeys both within and outside the Muslim world. For the composition of his principal surviving work, the *Murūj*, he had recourse to no fewer than one hundred and sixty-five written sources, including, in addition to Arabic texts, translations of Plato, Aristotle and Ptolemy, as well as Arabic versions of monuments of Paliavi literature. In one paragraph of the *Tanbih* (154), he mentions Christian authors with whom he was in the majority of cases personally acquainted, and passes judgment on their works; he seems to have had them make translations of or to explain passages which provided documentation for chapters of his own works (e.g. M, §§ 523 ff.), and the transcription into Greek characters of the name Helen (M, § 735) is proof of his breath of interest and his curiosity.

The latter are also exhibited in the accounts, unfortunately dispersed, of his travels, a topic which raises the question of his profession, which he does not reveal, and thereby of the resources which enabled him not only to live but furthermore to undertake expensive foreign expeditions. By all appearances, he had no connection with regular commerce and he was neither an official representative nor a religious authority who could depend on hospitality from Muslim communities visited. The hypothesis of A. Miquel (*Geographie humaine*, i, 205-6) according to which he could have been an emissary of the Ismāʿīlīs seems hard to sustain, and ultimately it has to be assumed that this traveller possessed a personal fortune out of which he met the costs of his travels and that he perhaps drew some profits from the occasional commercial venture.

In 300/912, al-Mas'ūdī was still in Baghdād (M, § 2161); three years later (303/915), he is found visiting Persia (T, 106, 224), then India (M, §§ 269, 417-8; T, 224); it is hardly probable that he travelled as far as Ceylon and China (M, §§ 175, 342) since, when he speaks of these lands, he copies from Abū Zayd or the Abīdūr al-ṣīn wa l-ḥind (q.v. in Suppl.) (in 304/916, he returns to a previous source by a visit to the island of Kanbalū (M, § 246). From 306 to 316/918-26 he was travelling around Irāk and Syria (M, § 3326) and it was perhaps during this time that he made his way to Arabia (cf. Shboul, *op. laud.*, 12-13). In 320/932 or a little later he visited the provinces of the Caspian and Armenia (M, § 494), then, from 330/941 or 331 onward, he resided in Egypt, where, in 332/943, he composed the *Murūj* (M, § 874).
and passim), also returning to Syria in the same year (M, § 220) and visiting Damascus (T, 194) and Antioch (M, §§ 704-5) in 334/946. Naturally he visited Alexandria (M, §§ 679, 941) and Upper Egypt (Akhbdr al-zamdn, vi, 110-12), and it seems that he has spent his last years, reviewing his works and writing some new ones, in particular the Tanbih, completed in 345/956 (T, 401), shortly before his death, which came about in Djamrd II 345/September 956. On his travels, see especially Maqbul Ahmad, Travels of...al-Mas'udi, in IC, xxviii (1954), 509-21; A. Shboul, op. laud., 1-28. It is not known exactly at what period al-Mas'udi began the composition of his work and committed himself fully to his vocation as a writer, but the titles that he quotes in the Murudi suggest that he began with relatively short treatises before embarking on his major works and before turning to account the notes which he must have accumulated in the course of his travels. The first point that commands attention is the case which he devoted to the correction and enrichment of the original versions of his writings, in particular the Murudi, of which the first “edition” dates from 332/943 and the last, from 345/956 (T, 154). The second point is the fact that this abundant and diverse corpus of work has, in total, been curiously neglected by posterity, with the exceptions, specifically, of the Murudi, the success of which has never ceased but of which only the “edition” of 332, revised in 336, has been preserved, and of the Tanbih, which, owing to its conciseness, responds to the Muslim taste for abstracts; a third text that has been attributed to him, the Ikhb 'al-wasayya, has survived for obvious reasons (see below) but is of doubtful authenticity.

The content of the surviving works, which are presented in a historico-geographical framework, shows that this prolific writer has a close interest in various disciplines which are not to be arbitrarily classified as history or geography; since he displays in addition an active sympathy for the Akl al-Bayt and Twelver Imami Shi'ism, it is, to say the least, surprising that the Imami, who mention al-Mas'udi as one of their partisans, but are principally familiar with the Murudi (and subordinately with the Ikhb 'al-wasayya), have not devoted their efforts to the preservation of his works, beginning with the most “committed”; in fact, even if it can be understood that his major work, the Alhkb 'ar al-zamdn, might not have tempted the copyists on account of its volume, it is hard to see the reason for a general indifference with regard to the majority of his other writings which ought to have been interesting and more easily manageable. While Ibn al-Nadlm and later biographers have conscientiously enumerated the works, now lost, of so many less prestigious writers, not one of them has apparently entertained the idea of going through the Murudi and the Tanbih, in which thirty-four titles are mentioned, enabling us to establish thirty-six as the total number of al-Mas'udi's writings. It must be supposed that the article in the Fihrist has been truncated by a few lines, because it contains only five titles, whereas Yäkûr, who revised it and therefore must have known it well, refers to eleven (Udahb, viii, 90-4) and the same number recurs in the work of al-Kutubi (Fawdat, ii, 94-5); the Shfi' al-Naqjdsh (Rdgdt, 178) increases the number to fourteen, and Haddl Khâlîf (passim) to sixteen. Ibn Hâdjâr al-Askalânî (Lisan al-Mizât, iv, 224-5) confirms the general impression when he asserts that with the exception of the Murudi, copies of the work of al-Mas'udi are rare. In the West, a number of authors have attempted to compile inventories of his work: De Goeje in the Introduction to his edition of the Tanbih (vi-vii), Carra de Vaux in his translation of the latter (569-70), Sar- ton in his Introduction to the history of science (Baltimore 1927, i, 637-9), Brockelmann (I, 150-2, S I, 220-1), Sezgin (GAS, i, 334-4), but more recently, Khâldî (op. laud., 154-64) and Shboul (op. laud., 55-77) have made strenuous efforts, working on the basis of the titles mentioned in M and T and especially of such references to their content as are available, to identify the subjects of the lost works. When the researcher is confronted with such a discursive writer as al-Mas'udi, this method is often dangerous, but there is no reason why it should not be used in order to gain an impression of at least some of the questions examined and to establish an approximative classification.

I. A first category comprises works of general culture set in a framework of geography and history or of the latter alone:

1.—K. Alhkb 'ar al-zamdn wa-man ashbahu 'l-hdollmin min al-imam al-mazid wa-l-mudid, i (between 332/943 and the last, from 345/956 § 819). The K. Alhkb 'ar al-zamdn published in Cairo, in 1938, by Sâwi, has nothing in common with that of al-Mas'udi; it has been translated as early as 1896, under the title Abrégé des mœurs, by Carra de Vaux, who considered it a popular work (JA, 9th series, vii [1896], 133-44; cf. D. M. Dunlop, Arab civilization to AD 1500, London-Beirut 1971, 110 ff.).

2.—K. Alhkb 'ar al-arwaâb (before 332/943); despite the title, it is a supplement to the above-mentioned work and it concerns expeditions and wars (especially those of the mythical kings of Egypt) which did not figure in the preceding (M, § 819).

3.—Al-Kuldt al-arwaâb (before 332/943); this “Middle book” must have followed the same format as the Alhkb 'ar al-zamdn, since it was both an abridgement and a supplement on points of detail. The Oxford and Istanbul ms. mentioned by Brockelmann (in EP, s.v. al-Mas'udi) and Sezgin (GAS, i, 334) do not corre- spond to the ms. of the above-mentioned Shboul, op. laud., 89, n. 127, who has examined them.

4.—K. Murudi al-jahab wa-uczàid w-al-jawwar (fi tabb al-aghrâf min al-muluk wa-uh al-drâjd, T, 1): it is to this work, written in 332/943, revised in 336/947, again in 345/956 (T, 97, 110-1, 155-6, 175-6) that al-Mas'udi owes his reputation. The text of 332-6, the only version that has survived, was published at Bulât in 1283 and in Cairo in 1313, in the margins of the Naft al-tib of al-Makkarî in Cairo in 1302 and of the Kamîl of Ibn al-Aghîr at Bulât in 1303; Muhyî 'l-Dîn 'Abd al-Hamdî has made from it an annotated edition which has enjoyed a degree of success (2nd ed. Cairo 1368/1948, 3rd ed. 1377/1958, further ed. by Yuusuf Daghîr, Beirut 1973). As early as 1841, the first volume of an English translation, the work of A. Sprenger, appeared in London, and later Barbier de Meynard and Pavet de Courteille edited and translated the entire text into French (Paris 1861-77, 2nd ed. 1913-30); this work has been extensively exploited by orientalists, notably by Marquart (Streif- züge, Leipzig 1903) and A. Seippel (Rerum norman- nicarum fontes arabici, Osdo 1896-1928), who amended it on points of detail; finally, Ch. Pellat has revised the edition-translation by Barbier de Meynard and Pavet de Courteille (5 vols. of text, Beirut 1966-74 and 2 vols. of index in Arabic, Beirut 1979; 3 vols. of
translation, Paris 1962-71, have so far appeared, but the last two and the French index have been complete for some years; this revision has been based on secondary sources rather than on new ms. (which are listed in Brockelmann, v, 31, 220 and Zeising, i, 338).

Brockelmann (in Ep., s.v.) and other authors have accepted without reservation the interpretation by Gildemeister, who (in WZKM, v [1894], 202) asserted that Murūdī al-ḥiṣāb should be rendered as "gold-washings" rather than "meadows" of gold; taking as a basis the fact that the earth "makes gold to grow" (tabdīl al-ḥiṣāb: M, § 796); the author of the present article regards this suggestion as nonsensical, and in this respect is followed by Khalidi (op. luct., 2, n. 2) and Shboul (op. luct., 71).

The Murūdī comprise two essential parts. The first (§§ 34-665) contains "sacred" history up to the time of the Prophet, a survey of India, geographical data concerning seas and rivers, China, the tribes of Turkey, a list of the kings of ancient Mesopotamia, Persia, Greece, Rome, Byzantium, Egypt, and chapters on Negros, Slavs, Gaul and Galicia. Next come the ancient history of Arabia and articles on the beliefs, the various calendars, the religious monuments of India, of Persia, of the Sabaeans, etc., and a summary of universal chronology. In this first part, which takes up roughly two-fifths of the work, al-Mas'ūdī has set down, so as not to have to return to them, generalities regarding the universe and information of a historical nature on non-Muslim peoples (including the pre-Islamic Arabs). In the second part (§§ 664-3661), by contrast, there are only exceptional references to the peoples of countries outside the Islamic world, and it is the history of Islam, from the Prophet up to the caliphate of al-Mu'tāsir, which is recounted; the ḥulafa' rāshidūn, the Umayyads 'kings' (only 'Umar b. 'Abd al-'Azīz has a right to the title of caliph, while al-Hādīṣī enjoys special treatment) and the 'Abbāsid caliphs each form the subject of a chapter in which a brief biographical article is followed by accounts (akhbār), anecdotes and digressions on various subjects. In view of the fact that the author declares (§ 3) that this work contains a summary of studies which had been more fully developed in the Akhbār al-zamān and the Kitāb al-awṣūf, as well as supplementary notices on certain points, the Brockelmann, i, 1, 51, 220 and Sezgin, i, 338).

V.—The part of the book devoted to the history of the Umayyad and 'Abbāsid dynasties, which takes up roughly two-fifths of the work, was probably composed in an earlier period and is formed of the general format of these two works, where the points are perhaps presented with greater rigour.

6.—The K. Waṣl al-magāli al-ṭuṣalī bi-dawā'ī al-akhbār wa-muḥātaṭat al-sulūk al-ṣāliḥ al-āghāl, foreshadowed in M (§§ 3014, 3428, 3608) and mentioned in T (333), was a collection of various traditions, especially concerning the Andalus (the history of which is neglected in the Murūdī); it was probably composed in an unsystematic way and would certainly have appeared in a form closer to adab than to methodical history.

7.—The K. Akhkhār al-mas'ūdīyyat, also composed after M, dealt (T, 259, 333) with the history of pre-Islamic Arabia and of the Al-andalus.

8.—The K. Makālī fursan al-ʿArijan (332/943) was no doubt a collection of traditions concerning Persian heroes, which is of some sort of counterpart of the K. Makālī fursan al-Arab by Abū Ḫubbayda (T, 102).

9.—The K. Funūn al-maṣāfr al-waṣmā jārī fi l-ḥuṭūr al-sulūkī (after 332/943), which is mentioned several times in T (121, 144, 151, 153, 158, 160, 174, 182, 261), seems to have dealt especially with the Greeks, the Byzantines and North Africa and to have filled in the gaps left in preceding works.

10.—The K. Dhikhrīy al-waṣmā ḥāna fi sāliḥ al-duhār (after 332/943) seems to have been more detailed than the Tanbih (T, 97, 175, 400) on certain questions, particularly on the history of Byzantium.

11.—The K. Takhallū al-duwāl wa-taḥjarṣir al-arāḍ wa-l-mīlāl (T, 334) must have been a reflecting upon history with regard to the events which culminated in the seizure of power by the Fātimids in North Africa. This suggestive title makes one regret the loss of a work which Ibn Khalīdūn, who had a high regard for al-Mas'ūdī (see below), probably did not have the leisure to consult.

12.—Finally, the K. al-Tanbih wa-l-īṣārā, composed in 344-5/955-6, is probably the last work of al-Mas'ūdī. It is not exactly an abridgement of the major historico-geographical works which came before it, although it does return to and express, with greater rigour and precision, their essential points of information concerning astronomic and meteorological phenomena, the divisions of the earth, the seas, ancient nations, universal chronology, and then the history of Islam until the caliphate of al-Mu'tāsir. As its title indicates, it is basically a combination of overall review and a setting in temporal perspective. The Tanbih has been edited by De Goeje, in the BGA, viii, 1893-4, and by Sāwi, in Cairo, in 1357/1938; Carra de Vaux has translated it under the title Le Livre de l'aventure et de la révision, Paris 1897.

A second category is also of historical nature, but it is devoted especially to 'Ali b. Abī Ṭālib, the Al-ʿAṣīr and the Twelver Imāms.

13.—The K. al-Zāki (before 332/943) concerned 'Ali and the controversies to which he gave rise (M, § 1463).

14.—The K. Huḍāsik al-ṣāliḥān fī akhkhār Alī Al-ʿĀṣīr al-Nābi wa-taḥjarṣir-khām fī l-buldān (before 332/943) was apparently the history of the twelve Imāms and of the partisans of 'Ali (M, §§ 1013, 1943, 2506, 2704, 3232).

15.—The K. Māzāhir al-akhkhār wa-tbarsī l-ṣāliḥār fī akhkhār Alī Al-ʿĀṣīr-Al-Nābi (al-ṣāliḥār?), also prior to M, must have been a reflecting, like the preceding, a history, or, doubtless, a "sacred history" of 'Ali and of his partisans (M, §§ 1677, 1735, 3032).

16.—The K. Risālah al-BAyān fī ʾaṣma' al-ʾaʾmām al-kittīyya min al-Shīʿa, written before 332/943, contained (M, §§ 2352, 2798; T, 297) detailed biographies of the Twelve Imāms who, unlike the Wāḥiṣīyya, maintained that Mūsā al-Kāẓim [q.v.] was dead and had designated as his successor their eighth Imām, 'Ali al-Riḍā [q.v.].

III. His Imāmī beliefs inspired al-Mas'ūdī to write two works on the question of the Imāmate from the point of view of different sects and schools, as well as on other points of doctrine, such as temporary marriage, the religion of the ancestors of Muhammad, the beliefs of 'Ali before his conversion, etc.:
religions (Sabaism, Mazdaism, Judaism and Christ-
i
indiany). Judging by the number of passages where it is
cited (M, §§ 783, 1138, 1205, 1715, 1945, 1994,
2078, 2225, 2291, 2359, 2420, 2741, 2800, 3156; T,
154, 167-8), this work must have been regarded as
quite important by its author.

20. —The K. al-lhna an usul al-diyina, also prior to
332/943, dealt with the differences between Imamsim and
Mu'tazilism (from which al-Mas'udi admits having
borrowed some doctrines, M, § 2256) and attacked
Mazdaism, Manichaeeism, Dayshism, etc. (M, §§ 212, 2256; T,
§ 354).

21. —The (M, § 1990) was a refutation of
Khairidism (M, § 2190); this must be the text which
Yakut (Udaba, xiii, 94) mentions under the title
Akhbar al-Khawairid.

22. —The K. al-lisriqi' fi 'l-kalami must also have
been a refutation, but of certain beliefs of the
Mazdaeans, the Manichaeeans, the Christians, etc. (M, §
1223).

23. —The K. al-Da'irat al-Dawat al-qarn, men-
tioned only once (M, § 1195, where the translation
needs correction) was directed against "abominable"
beliefs such as the transmigration of souls.

24. —The K. Khaz'at an al-din wa-irr al-shar'in, writ-
ten after 332/943, dealt with the opinion of various sects,
especially the Carmathians, and revealed the
differences between Manichaeeism, Mazdaism and
Mu'tazilism (M, §§ 101, 1613, 385).

25. —The K. al-luqha wa tarr al-madiq, also
dealt with the soul, but a number of other subjects
were also discussed: the qualities of sovereigns, cosmology, diseases, music,
animals, etc. (M, §§ 533, 630, 743, 928, 1325, 1335).

26. —The K. al-Tahawwul fi 'l-madhal wa
'tabii' (cf. above, no. 20), and such an
problem does a difficult to solve. Omissions
example, this
be largely Shafi

AUTHORS.

27. —The K. Tafrik al-ma'qil, was also devoted to the
soul (M, §§ 988, 1247).


29. —The K. al-Ru'is wa sab'iyiya (?) min al-siyasa
al-summ cimuddan ya'ani wa-lamilal-ha al-
tab'iyiya seems to have been a treatise of political
philosophy (M, §§ 928, 1222-3, 1232, 1336), as
written before the preceding is prior to the Murudh.

VI. Two major works of scientific nature may
legitimately be classed separately:

31. —The K. al-Mudabi' wa 'l-tarabh, where there is
a discussion of the influence of the two luminaries
(M § 1325) and

32. —The K. al-Kadriya wa 'l-tdair, in which al-
Mas'udi gives an account of observations made in the
course of his travels of various phenomena, the three
domains of Nature, etc. (M, §§ 369, 705, 815, 817,
846, 1208, 2247).

VII. Although he can hardly be described a priori as a fakih, he did take an interest in the
Shar'i'a and its principles, as is shown by four
treatises:

35. —The K. al-lWaghj fi 'l-fani al-lawaizim, on
points of fikih on which Sunnis and Shi'is were in
disagreement (M, § 1525).

36. —The K. al-Nasr al-adila fi usil al-milla, both of
them prior to 332/943 (M, § 5, 7, 4);
To be sure, the Tanbih is presented in the form of a universal history from Adam to al-Mu'ti', preceded by a survey of general geography; to be sure also, the table of contents of the Muruǧi gives the same impressio

This voluminous work does not contain only history and geography; in addition, it has been observed that at least twenty are generally of a heresiographical, doctrinal, philosophical or legal nature. Even if it is considered that disciplines thus cultivated belong to global history, the qualification of "historian" in the normal sense of the term is only partially appropriate to this polygraph. A. Shboul has not hesitated to describe him, in the subtitle of his treatise, as A Muslim humanist, and A. Miquel (Geographie humaine, i, 202) confers on him the title of "imam of encyclopaedia", thus justifying the quality of adib of the Dāhijīzian type which the author of these present lines has been led to acknowledge in him (in Jnl of the Pakistan Historical Soc., i [1961], 231-4). Eager to acquire all available types of knowledge, of whatever origin, and anxious to present them in a form responding to the exigencies of adab which seeks to instruct without burdening the reader, al-Mas'udi writes for a public which seeks to educate itself, to escape from the narrow confines of traditional instruction and to extend the field of Arab-Islamic culture, while not regarding as negligible everything that happens outside the Muslim world. On the subject of Gaul, B. Lewis recalls (in Mas. Mill. commen. vol. 10) that, from the first millennium of Islam, there have survived only three works dealing with the "history" of Western Europe, and that the oldest of these is by al-Mas'udi, the Muruǧi. This author established no school, and in this there is no cause for surprise, in the sense that the last-named work was in itself adequate to satisfy the curiosity of readers for many years, to say nothing of the encyclopaedists of later times who continued to exploit it without reservation (e.g. al-Kalkashandi cites him forty-two times in the Sultan, the editor of which finds it without reservation (e.g. al-Kalkashandi cites him forty-two times in the Sultan, the editor of which finds it without reservation (e.g. al-Kalkashandi cites him forty-two times in the Sultan, the editor of which finds it without reservation (e.g. al-Kalkashandi cites him forty-two times in the Sultan, the editor of which finds it without reservation (e.g. al-Kalkashandi cites him forty-two times...

Bibliography: The Arabic biographical sources are not particularly detailed: see Ibn al-Nadim, Fihrist, 134 (ed. Cairo, 219-20); Nadim, Rāgīd, Bombay 1317, 178; Yākūt, Udabeh, ii, 90-4; Kutubī, Fawātīr, Cairo 1951, i, 94-5; Subkī, Tabākī al-Shī'īyya, i, 307; Ibn Ḥajar, Liṣān al-Maṣḏūn, iv, 224-5; Ibn Ẓāhirībīrī, Nadīmī, iii, 315-6; Hāḍidī Khālīfī, Kaṣf al-zunūn, index; Ibn al-ʿImām, Shamlabī, ii, 371; Khānsārī, Raḥīdī al-dīnāmī, 579-82; Nūrī, Mustadrak, iii, 310; Ṭālibī, Aʿyan al-Shīrī, xl, 198-213; Ėribī, v, 87; Khābīlā, vi, 80.

Studies: The many orientalists who have exploited the Muruǧi and, to a lesser extent, the Tanbih, have been led to review certain passages and, where appropriate, to amend them; this is especially the case with V. Minorsky, in the commentary on the Hudūd al-šīrīm, London 1937. Different aspects of the work of al-Mas'udi have been the subject of studies and papers, but the most worthy of mention are: the writings of T. Lewicki (in Polish) on the Slavs and other peoples; A. Czajkiewicz, Al-Mas'udi on balneology and balneotherapeutics, in Fīl. Or., iii (1962), 271-5; Ch. Pellat, La Espaňa musulmana en las obras de al-Mas'udi, in Actas del primer congreso de estudios arabes e islámicos, Madrid 1964, 257-64; and especially, S. Maqbul Ahmad and A. Rahman (eds.), Al-Mas'udi Millenary commemoration volume, Aligarh 1960, which contains some twenty contributions on particular subjects. J. de Guignes appears to have been the first to draw attention to the Muruǧi, in Notices et extraits, i, 1787, 27, but the earliest monograph is the work of E. Quatremère, Notice sur la vie et les ouvrages de Masoudi, in JA, 3rd series, vii (1839), 3-31; see also are Wiistenfeld, Geschichtscherher der Araber, no. 119; Marquart, Streifzüge, Leipzig 1903, pp. xxxiv-xxxv; Brockelmann, l, 141-3, S. 220-1, I, 150-2; Sezgin, GAs, i, 332-6; F. Rosenthal, Muslim historiography, index. The works of S. Maqbul Ahmad, Al-Mas'udi's contribution to medieval Arab geography, in Jc, xxvii (1953), 61-77, xxviii (1954), 275-86, and The travels, in ibid., xxvii, 509-25, in fact mark the beginning of a resurgence of interest in the author of the Muruǧi, illustrated by A. Miquel, Le geographie humaine du monde musulman...
MASYAD, a town of central Syria on the eastern side of the Jabal al-Nusayriyya situated at 33 miles/54 km to the east of Bānīyā [q.v.] and 28 miles/45 km to the east of Hamāt [q.v.], in long. 36° 35' E. and lat. 35° N., in the massif of the Jabal Ansariyya at the foot of the eastern slopes of the Jabal Bahārā7, at an altitude of 1,591 ft./485 m. and to the west of the great trench of the fault of the Ghab (q.v.).

The pronunciation and orthography of the name varies between the forms Masyād, Masyāf (in official documents and on the inscriptions mentioned below of the years 646 and 870 A.H.), Masyāt and Masyād (on the interchange of j and q, see O. Rescher, in ZDMG, lvxxiv, 465; Praetorius, in ibid., lvxxv, 292; Dussaud, Topographie historique. de la Syrie, 143, n. 4, 209, 395, n. 3). The variants Masyāt (Yākūt, Muṣīma, ed. Ravaisse, 49), Masyāf (Kahlīl al-Zahīrī, iv, 556), Masyd (ibid., ed. Ravaisse), 49), Masyēt in tr. Venture, 73 and Masyāt (al-Nābulusī, in Vor. Kremer, in SB Ak. Wien, 1850, ii, 331) are no doubt due to mistakes in copying (Van Berchem, in JA, Ser. 9, ix [1897], 457, n. 2). At a later period, the pronunciation Masyāf, Masyād became usual (al-Dimashkī, ed. Mehren, 208; al-Kalkaghāndī, Ṣaḥīh al-ḡāba', ed. ibid., 113; Ibn al-Shihibānī, ed. Beirut, 265; cf. Masyād on von Oppenhein's map in Pieterman Mūsālulān, bīlī [1911], ii, Taf. 11). The name is perhaps a corruption of a Greek Μασεύς (= Μασυάς) or Μασύης, which presumably lay on the Masyās ammī, the boundary river of the Nazerīn (ancestors of the Nusayris) (Pliny, Nat. hist., v. 81) (cf. Pauly-Wissowa-Kroll, Realenzyklopädie, xiv, cols. 1985-6, s.v. Masyās, no. 3).

Masyād was an important settlement which has developed under the protection of a powerful citadel whose traces are visible on a limestone outcrop. The region gets an average of 31.5 inches/800 mm of rain, and the climate is good. Various small watercourses have allowed not only the cultivation in the region of barley and wheat but also the existence of gardens and orchards (baṣātain). In her travel account, Gertrude L. Bell noted the abundance of flowers—anemones, iris, narcissus, and white and red orchids (basātain). In her travel account, Gertrude L. Bell noted the abundance of flowers—anemones, iris, narcissus, and white and red orchids (basātain). In her travel account, Gertrude L. Bell noted the abundance of flowers—anemones, iris, narcissus, and white and red orchids (basātain). In her travel account, Gertrude L. Bell noted the abundance of flowers—anemones, iris, narcissus, and white and red orchids (basātain). In her travel account, Gertrude L. Bell noted the abundance of flowers—anemones, iris, narcissus, and white and red orchids (basātain).
Masyād

557/1162 Rashīd al-Dīn Sinān b. Salmān b. Muḥammad al-Ḵabristānī [q. v. as envoy of the Grand Master of Alāmūt, the head of the Nizārat Ismā‘īlīs, sometimes known as the Assasīs or the Assassins (māzūrīyāt). He soon took over the direction of them in this region, and until his death in 588/1192, showed an extraordinary talent for organisation, making the sect a formidable military force which sowed terror amongst both the Crusaders and the Syrian Muslims. ʿAlā al-Dīn, who wanted to punish them for two attempts on his life, invaded the land of the Ismā‘īlīs in Muhammad ibn ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAlī ibn al-Ḡazwī during the summer of 580/1184-5 (see NIZARIS, HASHISHIYYA). While Sinān had completely emancipated himself from the suzerainty of the headquarters of the sect in Alāmūt, in 608/1211-12 we find the old conditions completely restored (Abū ʿAlī Shāhīm al-Fakhr al-Rūḍl dātayn, in Van Berchem, op. cit., 1495ff., n. 1).

The fortress of Masyād lies to the northeast of the settlement, at the foot of the Djabal Bahrā. Within the town wall, a few traces of which are still today visible. The fortress is perched on a rocky limestone block and has a situation running from north to south; the eastern edge of this bluff rises vertically for some ten metres and gives the appearance of a cliff. Like Shayzār, Masyād is an Arab citadel antedating the Crusades and having no connection with them; in its dimensions and size, it cannot be compared with such great mediaeval fortresses of Syria as Hisn al-Akrād, Markāb [q. v. or Sahlān], or Sayyūn. For Van Berchem and Fatio (Voyage en Syrie, 115, 172), this fortress resembles in silhouette those of al-Musayliḥa and Shūmayyim. It is one of the best-preserved of the Ismā‘īlīs castles of Syria (Dussaud, Topographie, 138-48). It is made up of a curtain wall of only modest appearance with numerous rectangular salients. A donjon or keep, also rectangular, is built in the centre and dominates the ensemble. According to P. Deschamps (Tripoli, 39), the Ismā‘īlīs are said to have repaired in the 7th/13th century, with good-quality materials, a Byzantine building of minor importance, of which a certain number of columns and capitals embedded in the doorways of the fortress (partially reproduced in Gertrude Bell, op. cit., 217-19) are still visible witnesses. The castle is entered by a grand gateway on the north side reached by several steps; the entrance is vaulted like that of Hisn al-Akrād; and the fitting-out of the interior is the work of the Ismā‘īlīs. The keep is in poor condition, and later accretions over the course of the centuries of stacks and constructions have disfigured this piece of military architecture, which merits study and publication of the results. A certain number of Arabic inscriptions mention the various building works made in the castle. The oldest, dating from the middle of the 6th/12th century, is the signature of a master of works, the māšāq Ḷuṭa (RCEA, viii, 3197); another inscription from 560/1165 bears the signature of a certain Ibn Mubārak (RCEA, ix, 3264). According to two inscriptions on a doorway inside the castle (RCEA, x, 3890-1), the building was put into a state of repair by the Syrian Master Kamāl al-Dīn ʿĀlī al-Dīn al-Ḥasan b. Māṣūd under the suzerainty of the Grand Master of Alāmūt ʿAlī al-Dīn Mūsammār al-Muhammadī (619-53/1221-55). The reference is probably to the Kamālī, who, according to al-Nasawi (Hist. du Sultan Djelal al-Dīn Markokābī, ed. Houdas, 132), was for a period before 624/1227 governor in Syria for the Grand Master of the Ismā‘īlīs. It is uncertain whether the commandant (mutawallī) Mādīj al-Dīn, who received in 624/1227 the ambassadors of Frederick II (al-Ḥamawi, in Amari, Bkd. arabil-ṣurāla, App. ii, 30) was one of the Masters (Van Berchem, in JA [1897], 501, n. 1). About 625-6/1228-9 and still in 651/1253-4, Sirādj al-Dīn Muṣṭafā b. al-Ḥusayn was Syrian Master (al-Nasawi, op. cit., 168; inscription of al-Ḵahīf, in RCEA, x, 4143). In the village, there remain traces of a mediaeval rampart provided with gateways and three inscriptions recording the repairs and works carried out.

A Persian from Alāmūt, Tādī al-Dīn, was in 637/1239-40 mukaddam of the Syrian Ismā‘īlīs (Ibn Wāṣīl, Muṣaffār al-ḵawāṣ, Paris, ms. 1702, fol. 333b, in Van Berchem, 466, n. 2). As Tādī al-Dīn Abu ʿl-Futūḥ he appears in an inscription in Masyād of Dhu ʿl-Kaʿdā 646/February-March 1249, according to which he had built the city wall of Masyād and its south gate. The commander of the fortress under him was ʿAbd Allāh b. Abu ʿl-Fadl b. ʿAbd Allāh (inscriptions A and B in Van Berchem, JA [1897], 456). – Van Berchem-von Oppenheim, Beitr. z. Asyr., vii, no. 19. Probably it was Tādī al-Dīn to whom the Dominican monk Yvo the Breton, a member of an embassy sent by Louis IX to the “Old Man of the Mountains” in May 1250, sent a naive and fruitless appeal for his conversion (Jean de Joinville, Hist. de St. Louis, ed. M. Fatio, 115, 172; Wailly, 246; Van Berchem, in JA [1897], 478-80).

After having got possession of Alāmūt in 654/1256 and having sacked Baghādād two years later, the troops of Hūleqū or Hūlākū [q. v.] invaded northern Syria in 658/1260 and temporarily occupied Masyād. In this year, in the time of the Master Rīdzī al-Dīn Abu ʿl-Maʿālī, the Mongols seized and held the fortress for a time, but after the victory of the Egyptian Sultan ʿUṯūt at ʿAyn Djalūt [q. v.], they abandoned it. About two years later, Baybars began to interfere in the affairs of the Ismā‘īlīs and to demand tribute from them. He very soon deposed the Master Nadjm al-Dīn Ismā‘īlī and appointed his son-in-law Ṣarīm al-Dīn Mubārāk in his place and took Masyād from him. When the latter returned there, Baybars had him seized and brought to Cairo, where he was thrown into prison. Nadjm al-Dīn was again recognised as Master for a brief period and then his son Shams al-Dīn, on payment of an annual tribute before the sultan definitely incorporated Masyād in his kingdom in Radjāb 668/1270 (Abu ʿl-Fidā, in Rec. hist. or. crois., i, 153; Muḥammad b. Abu ʿl-Faḍāl, Gesch. d. Mamlākensulanen, ed. Blochet, in Patrol. Orient., xiv, 445; Van Berchem, in JA [1897], 465, n. 2). Having now become a master of works, Muslim possession, Masyād presumably at first belonged to the “royal province of fortunate conquests” the capital of which was Ḥasan al-
Akrad, then to Tarabulus (after its capture in 688/1289).

Within the scheme of administrative reorganisation within the Mamluk empire, a route was established in the 7th/13th century for the barid [q.v.], a postal service between Hims [q.v.] and Masyad, which was at the time an important strategic point under the authority of a commander responsible directly to the sultan because of the fortress's role in the defence of the dâr al-İslâm [q.v.] just like Ḥisn al-Akrad and Ḥabba [q.v.].

Abu ʿl-Fidāʾ (about 720/1320) describes Masyad as an important town, with beautiful gardens through which streams flowed; it had a strong citadel and lay at the eastern base of the Djabal al-Lukkâm (more accurately Djabal al-Sikín) about a farkh north of Bârîn and a day's journey west of Hamâ (not Ḥims, as Le Strange, Palestine, 507 erroneously says; Abu ʿl-Fidāʾ, Geogr., ed. Reinaud, 229 ff.). As a result of its high situation, it has a more temperate climate than the low ground on the Nahr al-ʿAṣî, the young Usâma in 516/1122-3 brought to Masyad the wife and children of the amir of Shayzayr, his uncle ʿĪzî al-Dîn Abu ʿl-ʿĀṣākir Sulṭān, from the heat of Shayzar which was causing the amir anxiety about their health (Derenbourg, Vie d'Osûmâ, 43).

Ibn Baṭṭûta, who visited Masyad in 736/1335, mentions (Rûda, i, 186-7; tr. Gibb, i, 106) as lying near this stronghold the Ismaʿili fortress of Kadmûs, al-Manayka. Ṣullâya and al-Kahl. These five places, the kiṣâ al-ḍâr wa-ṣâra “fortresses of the [Ismaʿili] mission”, formed, with the castle of al-Ruṣāfa, the nîyâba of Masyad which, in the 8th/14th century, was a dependency of Tarâbulûs. Later, it was separated from this province and attached to the nîyâba of Damascus, to which it still belonged in the time of al-Kakkâshâdî (Ṣâhib, iv, 113, 202, 735). In 614/1122-3 its nîyâba was nominated from Cairo and was at various times an amir of tabâkâhna or an amir of ten, and it had a garrison of Mamlikûs. In 826/1423, under Barsbay [q.v.] there was no longer a barid service, but there was a road which allowed one to travel from Tarâbulûs to Masyad and then to reach, via al-Ruṣāfa and Khawâlî, Kadmûs, where it passed through al-Kahl and then Ullâyka to end up at Balattûn [q.v.]. In the middle of the 9th/15th century, Khâlîl al-Ẓâhirî, in his Zubda (ed. Ravaisse, 49, tr. Ventur, 73), tells us that around 850/1446 “the town of Masyad is still within this province (sc. Hamâwiyya); it is a pleasant town with an extensive surrounding countryside”. An inscription of Masyad of Ramadan 870/April-May 1466 contains a decree about taxes of the Sultan al-Malik al-Zahir Khâkhâzâdî (Van Berchem-Von Oppenheim, Beitr. z. Asyr., vii, 20, no. 23; no. 22 is perhaps of the same al-Malik al-Ẓâhir).

Under Egyptian rule, the position of the lands of the Ismaʿîlîs with Masyad as capital was to some extent exceptional (Gaudefroy-Demobynes, La Syrie à l'époque des Mamelouks, Paris 1923, 182, no. 3).

In the 10th/16th century, after the Ottoman conquest of Syria, Masyad is mentioned in the cadastral survey among the kiṣâ al-ḍâr wa-ṣâra related to the west of Hamât; these villages of the Ismaʿîlîs paid a special tax. Masyad formed part of the lûwâ of Hims; there was situated there a khân [q.v.] on which the Ottomans levied tolls which were abolished in the middle of the 10th/16th century (Mantran and Sauvaget, Reglements fiscaux, 92). In 1105/1693-4 ʿAbd al-ghanî al-Nâbulûsî [q.v.] passed through Masyad and mentions a certain Sulaymân, from the tribe of Tanāšî, as governor of the town at that time. In 1767-8, Masyad was cited in his Bibliothèque orientale as “Massiât”. In the middle of the 12th/18th century, Masyad continued to be the residence of Ismaʿîlî amîrs. On the map drawn up by the Sieur d'Anville in 1750, the place is called “Maisiat”. Of more recent date an earlier cartouche on the map bears the name “Masiat”; it is marked on one from the year 1203/1788-9 relating to the building of a fountain (sabil) (Van Berchem-Von Oppenheim, op. cit., 21, no. 24), and the other to the building of the house of the Ismaʿîlî amîrs (ibid., no. 25).

The Ismaʿîlîs lived constantly in open or secret enmity with the Nuṣayris, although various tribes of the latter had offered their services to the Ismaʿîlî Masters, for example, as early as 724/1324 to Râghîd al-Dîn (S. Guyard, Un grand maître des Assassins au temps de Saladin, in JA [1877], 165; R. Dussaud, Histoire et religion des Nosairîs, 80). A number of Nuṣayris of the tribe of Raslân, whom the amîr of Masyad had allowed to settle in the town under their Shaykh Mâmhûd, in 1806 murdered the amîr, his son and about 300 Ismaʿîlîs, and seized the town. The other inhabitants, who had sought refuge in flight, applied for protection to Yûsûf Pâshâ, the governor of Damascus. He sent a punitive expedition of 4-5,000 men against the Nuṣayris; Masyad had to be surrendered by the Banû Raslân after three month's stubborn resistance, and the fugitive Ismaʿîlîs returned to Masyad in 1810 (Dussaud, op. cit., 32; Burckhardt, Reiset in Syrien, 250). In 1812 Burckhardt estimated the population of Masyad at 250 Ismaʿîlîs and 30 Christian families. The population since then seems to have diminished still further. Burckhardt and Lammens found many houses in the town in ruins and large gardens within its walls. According to Burckhardt, the land east of the town was a desert heath, while in the north at the foot of the hills the citadel stands on a high steep rock; on the west side is a valley, in which the inhabitants grow wheat and oats. The town, which lies on the slope of a hill, is about half an hour’s walk in circumference. Three older gates have been incorporated in the present more modern walls. The mosque is in ruins. The old citadel is for the most part destroyed; only a few buildings have been roughly restored and in parts were still inhabited at the beginning of the 20th century.

From the 19th century onwards, the “Assassins” of Masyad, the generations of whom had lived since the 7th/12th century under the authority of delegates from the Nizâris of Alâmm before becoming subjects of first the Mamlûks and then the Ottomans, were exposed to repeated attacks by the Nuṣayris. In February 1919 the region between Masyad and Tartûs [q.v.] was shaken by the revolt of Shaykh Šâhîr against the French, whose troops were held in check on the road from Shaykh Bâdîr to Masyad. According to Latron, Vie rurale, 208, the Government of Lâdhîkiyya compelled some of the large landowners of Hamât to hand over to it in 1929 their villages in the kada of Masyad: Bayâdîyya, Mîryîmîn, ʿAkârî and Rûsâfâ, whose cultivated lands have been distributed amongst the peasants working them. In this way, the ʿAlawî part of the kada of Masyad, including the fortress of Abû Kubays, was taken away from the sandjak of Hamât for attachment to the new State of the ʿAlawîs.

In the mountain regions to the west of Masyad there exist deposits of iron known since Antiquity and still capable of exploitation. In order to provide a legal framework for disputes over the division of water, a list of the sharers and their entitlements was set down in writing and registered officially (Latron, op. cit., 160).
Until 1938, the mintaka of Masyad was part of the province of Hamat, but in 1939 the kadda of Masyad became part of the province of Hamat. Masyad is about 410 m above sea level, and has, according to the 1970 census, 75,437 inhabitants, 37,922 men and 37,515 women. The cultivators in the region of the Ghab do not benefit directly from the investment in the "Ghab Project". Nevertheless, the plans for this region and the settlement of nomads have favored a perceptible development of the minfak which has, according to the 1970 census, 75,437 inhabitants, 37,922 men and 37,515 women. Since 1965, the Syrian government has set up at Masyad a centre for carpet weaving, with workshops having an essentially female working force. Production amounted to 740 m² of carpets in 1979 but only 410 m² in 1980.

At present, Masyad is linked with the new autoroute which travels along the eastern bank of the Orontes northwards. There is a loop 7 km to the east of Masyad running northwards from the asphalt road having an essentially female working force. Production amounted to 740 m² of carpets in 1979 but only 410 m² in 1980.

astronomical handbooks known as zīdjs [see ZIDJ] for each degree of \( \lambda \) to two or three sexagesimal digits. The underlying formula expressed in modern notation is:

\[
\alpha(\lambda) = \arcsin(\tan \beta \cot e),
\]

where \( \beta \) is the obliquity of the ecliptic and \( e \) is the declination [see MAYL]. The function \( p(\lambda) = \tan \beta (\lambda) \) (multiplied by an appropriate constant related to the bases used for the various trigonometric functions) was also tabulated separately to facilitate computation of \( \alpha(\lambda) \)—it was called al-matāli\(^c\) li-kull al-ard, "ascensions for all the earth". More commonly, however, the quantity \( \alpha' = \alpha + 90° \), called al-matāli\(^c\) min awwal al-qubādy, that is, ascensions measured from the first point of Capricorn, was tabulated. The use of this function, now referred to as "normed ascensions", is explained below.

The ascensions of celestial bodies not on the ecliptic, such as stars, were also called matāli\(^c\). Fig. 2 shows a star with equatorial coordinates \( \alpha \) for ascensions and \( \beta \) for declination. Islamic star tables displayed either ecliptic longitudes and latitudes (\( \lambda \) and \( \beta \)) or equatorial ascensions (regular or normed) and declinations (\( \alpha \) and \( \beta \)) for a specific epoch. Since stellar longitudes increase steadily with time and stellar latitudes are constant, star tables could be modified for a different epoch by simply adding the amount of longitude increase (known as precession). Tables of equatorial coordinates could be prepared either by direct observation or by calculation from tables of ecliptic coordinates; in mediaeval times they could not be prepared from earlier tables of coordinates of the same kind because both stellar right ascension and declination are not linear functions of time. Formulae for the conversion of ecliptic to equatorial coordinates and vice versa, that is \( (\lambda, \beta) \rightarrow (\alpha, \delta) \) were available to Muslim astronomers from Ptolemy's Almagest, and were simplified by them. The universal astrolabe [see SHAHKAZIYYA] was particularly useful for performing transformations of ecliptic and equatorial coordinates.

(2) Oblique ascensions, associated with a specific latitude, were called maṭāli\(^c\) al-balad or al-maṭāli\(^c\) al-baladiyya. In Fig. 3, the arc \( \lambda \) of the ecliptic rises in the same time as arc \( \alpha \) of the equator over the horizon of a locality with latitude \( \phi \). Muslim astronomers tabulated \( \alpha(\lambda) \) for specific latitudes. From ca. 400/1010 onwards, they often tabulated it for each degree of terrestrial latitude, usually for each degree of \( \lambda \). The oblique ascensions, \( \alpha(\lambda) \), are related to the right ascension, \( \alpha(\lambda) \), by the identity:

\[
\alpha(\lambda) = \alpha(\lambda) - d(\phi, \lambda),
\]

where \( d(\phi, \lambda) \) is half the excess of daylight over 180°, called in Arabic the nisf fuṣūl al-nahdr. In Fig. 3, \( YH = \lambda \), \( YE = \alpha \), and \( EG = d \). The formula for \( d(\phi, \lambda) \) used by mediaeval astronomers was equivalent to the modern formula:

\[
\delta(\phi, \lambda) = \arcsin(\tan \beta(\lambda) \tan \phi).
\]

Again, the function \( e(\lambda) = \tan \delta(\lambda) \) was used to generate values of \( d(\phi, \lambda) \) and, hence, tables of \( \alpha(\lambda) \) for different latitudes.

Oblique ascensions are of singular importance in timekeeping and in mathematical astrology. In both disciplines, the point of the ecliptic instantaneously rising over the horizon, which is known as the horoscopus [see TALI\(^c\)], is of interest. In Fig. 4, it is labelled H. Clearly, from the geometry of the sphere, the oblique ascensions of the horoscopus (with ecliptic longitude \( \lambda_H \)) are given by the relation:

\[
\alpha(\lambda_H) = \alpha(\lambda_O) + T,
\]

where \( \lambda_O \) is the longitude of the sun and \( T \) is the time in equatorial degrees since sunrise. In order to measure the time of day, it is thus sufficient to control the oblique ascensions of the horoscopus and the solar longitude. Similar procedures hold for timekeeping by the stars at night. Muslim astronomers, following a tradition started in Ptolemy's Handy tables, generally preferred to use the normed ascensions \( \alpha' = \alpha + 90° \) because of the relation

\[
\alpha(\lambda_H) = \alpha(\lambda_M) + 90° = \alpha'(\lambda_M),
\]

where \( \lambda_M \) is the longitude of upper mid-heaven, the
point of the ecliptic culminating on the meridian. If a star whose ecliptic longitude is known is observed to be culminating, then the longitude of the horoscope can be found immediately from tables of \( \alpha_t \) and \( \alpha(A) \). Once the latter is found, the astrological houses can be determined using tables of ascensions. Ascensions, then, were important in both timekeeping and astrology. In all zīdā and treatises on astronomical timekeeping they figure prominently.

Ascensions were also important in determinations of lunar crescent visibility [see RU `YAT AL-HILĀL]. Since one of the most popular conditions for crescent visibility was that the difference in setting times of the sun and moon be twelve equatorial degrees (= 48 minutes of time), the problem could easily be expressed in terms of ascensions. The situation is shown in Fig. 4. Note that the 'descensions' (maghdrib) of an ecliptic arc \( \alpha \) are \( \alpha_t \) (\( \alpha + 180^\circ \)). Thus if \( \Delta \), and \( \lambda_m = \lambda + \Delta \), represent the longitudes of the sun and moon, the condition may be expressed as:

\[
\alpha_t(180^\circ + \lambda_m) - \alpha_t(180^\circ + \lambda) = 12^\circ
\]

Fig. 4

Using tables of \( \alpha_t(\lambda) \) for a specific latitude, as well as linear interpolation (al-ta'ādīl bayn al-satrayn), it is possible to calculate values of \( \Delta \), satisfying this condition for each range of \( \lambda \). Tables of such values, for each zodiacal sign of solar longitude, were compiled already in the 3rd/9th century for the latitude of Baghdad. Certain later Islamic lunar visibility tables display such information for several latitudes.


On a highly sophisticated method for converting ecliptic and equatorial coordinates, see idem, Al-Khāṭīb’s auxiliary tables for solving problems of spherical astronomy, in *Jnal. for the History of Astronomy*, iv (1973), 99-110, esp. 105-7. On the use of ascensions in astrology, see, for example, Kennedy and H. Krikorian-Preisler, The astrological doctrine of projecting the rays, in *Al-Abhdth*, xxv (1972), 3-15.


AL-MATĀMIR [see MATMURA].

AL-MATAMMA, a town in the Democratic Republic of the Sudan, located in Shandi District, western bank of the Nile, opposite Shandi town [q.v.]. The number of households there in 1973 was 1,108.

Its origins are unknown, but its development was closely connected with caravan traffic that crossed the Nile there, and its status as a sister-town of Shandi is indicated by the fact that it was also known as Shandi al-Qharb. At the end of the 18th century it became involved in the upheavals of the Funj kingdom [q.v.], and around 1801 a rival faction of the Sa’dāb royal family of Shandi settled in al-Matamama, eventually becoming an ally of the Shīkīliyya in their struggle against Funj domination. By the time of the Egyptian invasion (1820-1), the population of al-Matamama numbered about 6,000, being ruled by King Musā’id who was subordinate to his cousin Nimr, king of Shandi. Subjected to foreign rule, the rival kings united in a plot to kill the Egyptian commander Iṣmā’īl Pasha [q.v.] (1822). After the subsequent reprisals in 1823, which hit Shandi more severely than al-Matamama, the latter grew into the most important tribal and commercial centre of the Dājaliyyūn [q.v.], with a large merchant class, and served as a transit point for caravans as in former times. By the middle of the century it was celebrated throughout the Sudan for the manufacture of coarse cotton scarfs. During the Mahdiyya [q.v.], on the eve of the British invasion in 1897, the people of al-Matamama refused to evacuate the town in order to make it a stronghold, and instead established contact with the invaders. A battle ensued in which the Mahdist forces killed most of the rebels (30 Muharram 1315/1 July 1897). During the present century, al-Matamama has gradually recovered but has not regained its commercial role.


MATBAʿA (a.), printing.

1. In the Arab World

The Arabic verb tabaʿa, in the sense of printing a book, is a neologism probably inspired by the Italian or the French. This meaning is already attested in the
Outside Italy, worthy of note is an Arabic grammar half of the 15th century), and lithography (invented by G. A. Senefelder in 1796), which is the subject of which dates back to remote antiquity), printing by xylography or wood-block printing (the discovery of the three technical processes that it comprises, technical: lithography is more versatile than printing, and offers a greater range of possibilities in the production of designs and of maps. The second is artistic: it is an art which lends itself remarkably well to the reproduction of writing. As a corollary, there is the cultural reason: lithography causes no problem to the reader who is accustomed only to the manuscript style adopted for the writing-tablets of the Kur'an school. Finally, there are social and economic reasons. In the East, the profession of copyist was highly developed, giving prestige and prosperity to a large section of the urban working class. According to the Bologna scholar Luigi Ferdinando Marsigli (1658-1730), the number of Turkish copyists in Constantinople, when he visited the city, was as high as 80,000. The creation of printing-presses would therefore have caused devastating unemployment among the educated population. Further reasons are moral, doctrinal and political, and these may easily be imagined. Regarding the relatively late date of the introduction of printing in the Arab countries (except in Lebanon and Syria, the practice did not emerge until the beginning of the 19th century) two other factors, besides those already mentioned, played an important role. In the first place, the majority of the Arab countries had been under the Ottoman dominion since the beginning of the 16th century. Before establishing its own official press in 1726, the Sublime Porte had hitherto forbidden (edicts of Bayezid II in 1485 and of Selim I in 1515) the Muslims to print texts in Arabic characters (although it permitted the Jews to print texts in Hebrew). The second factor is the economic problem which would have faced the innovators. To found presses of even modest size required the investment of substantial capital sums, which the book market, revolutionised by the availability of large-scale mechanical production, remained incapable of repaying properly. It should not be forgotten that the Medici Press in Rome was virtually bankrupt in 1610, because its proprietor-director, Raimondi, lacked the expertise to distribute the books that he printed. And such must have been the fate, undeserved, of many other presses, whose record is confined to the production of a single work! A copyist, on the other hand, worked to a contract, and his only capital outlay was the purchase of paper.

A. Xylography

Xylography, or printing by means of plates or characters engraved on wood, was used by the Arabs, judging by the specimens which have been noted in the collections of manuscripts and papyri possessed by certain libraries in Europe (Vienna, Heidelberg, Berlin and the British Library), America (Museum of the History of Printing), or the Arab countries (National Library of Cairo and the 'Abd al-Wahhāb Collection in Tunis). There is no precise indication of the dates of these specimens, of which the majority are amulets. According to Moritz, six printing-plates in the collection of the ancient Khedival Library of Cairo date from the Fāṭimid period. A study of xylographed Arabic manuscripts would be a worthwhile undertaking, rendering it possible to observe whether the Arabs confined themselves to plates or whether whole books were composed according to this process. See G. Levi Della Vida, An Arabic block print, in The Scientific Monthly, lxxi (December 1944), 473-4; F. Bonoda Bey, Note sur l'origine de l'imprimerie arabe en Europe, in BIE, 5th series, iii (1909), 75; A. Demersseman, L'imprimerie en Orient et au Maghreb, in IBLA, xvii (1954), 21-3; R. W. Bulliet, Medieval Arabic tarsh: a forgotten chapter in the history of printing, in JAOS, cvii (1987), 427-38.

B. Printing and lithography

1. In Europe.

Arabic printing with mobile characters originated and developed, through a curious combination of circumstances which have yet to be fully explained, in Europe in the 16th century. It was in fact with the purpose of publishing Christian religious texts in Eastern languages and in Arabic in particular, that the Cardinal Ferdinando de' Medici, on the advice of Pope Gregory XIII, in 1585 entrusted to the orientalist Giovanni Battista Raimondi the task of establishing and administering the Typographia Medicea in 1585, the book in question being the Kitāb Nahzat al-muhājīt by al-Idrisī [q.v.].

There exist, however, numerous works printed well before the Typographia Medicea began to operate, such that printing in Arabic characters must be deemed to have emerged at the beginning of the 16th century, or even in the final year of the 15th. The first book in Arabic characters seems in fact to have been a Kur'ān printed in Venice by Paganino de' Paganini (the dates given vary between 1499 and 1530); many authors speak of this work but no specimen of it survives, all copies having been destroyed by fire (see Maria Nallino, Una cinquantesima edizione del Corano stampata a Venezia, in Atti dell'Istituto Veneto di Scienze, Lettere ed Arti, cxxiv, Classe di scienze morali, lettere ed arti [Venice 1965], 1-12).

The earliest Arabic text that has reached us is a book of Christian prayers, the Kitāb Salāt al-sawa'i (or Horologium brevium). It was produced at Fano, in the region of the Marches which constituted part of the States of the Church, in 1514, by the master printer Gregorio de' Gregori (or de' Gregorii). Two years later, in Genoa, the typographer Pier Paolo Porro printed the trilingual Psalterium (Greek, Hebrew and Arabic), or else the Book of Psalms (Kitāb al-Mazāmîr) with an Arabic preface. In 1556, in Rome, the Collegium Societatis Jesu produced an anonymous religious treatise in Arabic (probably to be attributed to the Jesuit Gianbattista Eliano or Romano) with the Latin title Fidei orthodoxae brevis et explicata confesio and the Arabic title fī bikhāl al-amānā, which was to be reprinted many times during the same century and in the following century.

The first work of a non-religious nature was printed, again in Rome, by the Venetian master printer Domenico Basa at his Roman printing-press in 1585, the book in question being the Kitāb al-Bustān fī ṣuqūʿ al-ʿarḍ wa l-buldān, a work of descriptive geography by al-Idrisī. Again nothing is known but his name, Salâlah b. Kundudjī al-Salîhī.

Outside Italy, worthy of note is an Arabic grammar
by Guillaume Postel, printed in Paris, probably in 1538, of which the Arabic characters are unfortunately almost illegible. At Neustadt in 1582, with characters engraved on wood, there was published an Alphabetum arabicum by Jacob Christmann, professor of Arabic at Heidelberg. The same characters were used in Heidelberg, the following year, for the printing of a translation by Ruthger Spey of the Epistle to the Galatians of St. Paul.

Again at Rome, in 1627, there began the intensive typographical activity of the press of the Sacra Congregatio de Propaganda Fide, responsible for the printing of two particularly monumental works. The first is the Arabic translation of an abridged version of the Annales ecclesiastici, or history of the Church edited in twelve volumes by Cardinal Cesare Baronio, published between 1653 and 1671, and the second, the Biblia arsica ad usum Ecclesiastum orientalium, in four folio volumes.

At least three other presses, active in the 17th century, are worthy of mention. The first is that of the Collegio Ambrosiano of Milan where, in 1632, there was printed the Latin translation of the well-known Kāmūs of al-Fīruzabādī, made by Antonio Giggei under the title of Thesaurus linguisticarum in four large folio volumes.

The second is that of the Seminary of Padua, in the state of Venice, which ceased to operate in 1698 after printing, in two large volumes, the Arabic text of the Kur’ān, with Latin translation, an introduction and a commentary (drawn from as yet unedited Arabic works) by Ludovico Maracci, confessor to Pope Innocent XI, at the latter’s request.

The third is the Reale Stamperia of Palermo, in Sicily, which published the first collection of accounts relating to the Arab occupation of Sicily intitled Rerum arabiarum, quae ad historiam Siculam spectant, ampla collectio, the Libro del Consiglio d’Egitto, or Klub Dīwān Misr, by the notorious forger, the Abbé Giuseppe Vella, and finally the first Italian edition of the Grammatica arsica of Erpenius.

It is extremely difficult to establish even a rudimentary list of the Arab presses of Europe (nevertheless, see J. Balagué, L’imprimerie arabe en Occident. (XVIIe, XVIIIe et XVIIIe siécles), Paris 1984). Documentation is often fragmentary, sometimes non-existent. Certain presses are known only because they are mentioned in the works that have survived from them and available for study. Four editions of the Kur’ān, published in Europe between the end of the 17th and the first half of the 19th century, indicate the existence of other Arabic presses in Germany and in Russia. The first is that of Hinckelmann, produced in the Free City of Hamburg in 1694. Two Russian editions represent the first two Kur’āns published by Muslims: the first in 1787 in Saint Petersburg, the then capital of the Tsarist Russian Empire; and the second in 1803 in Kazan, in the region of the Volga, today the capital of the Tatar Republic. Finally, in 1834, at Leipzig in Saxony, the centre of the book trade, Gustav Flügel published the first edition of his Kur’ānic text, later to be used by several generations of orientalists.


In Eastern Europe, it should be noted that towards the end of the 17th century, at the request of the Melkite patriarch of Aleppo, Athanasius Dabbās, the Voivode of Wallachia (a tributary of the Ottoman sultanate in the kingdom of Rumania) Constantin Bassaraba Brancovenanul, installed at Sinagovo an Arabic press which edited numerous liturgical books in Arabic. This press seems to have ceased production in 1704, when Athanasius returned to Syria (see below, Syria) and took the initiative of installing a printing-press in the city of Aleppo, his patriarchal seat. See J. Nasrallah, Les imprimeries Melkites jusqu’à la fin du 18e siècle, in al-Maṣarrat, 34th year (1948), 438-40.

2. In the Near East.

a. Lebanon. The Lebanese claim the honour of having printed the first book in an Arab country. The work in question is a Psalter printed in 1610 at the Convent of Saint Antony of Qozhaya (Dayr Mār Anūniyūs or Dayr Qîshayyā). The pages are divided into two columns, that on the right being for the text in Syriac, and that on the left for the Arabic text in kāhirī script [q.v.]. According to a note appended to the work, the printing was done under the supervision of the master (mu’allim) Pasquale Eli, a native of Camerino in central Italy. This edition marked a short-lived enterprise. More than a century was to elapse, and numerous unsuccessful attempts were to be made, before the šamās Abū Allāh Zākhīr, with his second experiment in typography (the first having been in Aleppo) established a press at the Convent of Mār Yūhannā al-Sābhīgh in 1734. Subsequently, other presses were founded, invariably among religious communities.

The American Press and the Imprimerie Catholique deserve special mention, particularly for their editing activities. The Protestant Mission of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions had installed an Arabic press in Malta, where it functioned from 1822 to 1842. When the Mission transferred its headquarters to Beirut, on 10 July 1823, the decision was taken to move the Arabic press to the Lebanese capital. This was accomplished on 8 May 1834.

The Imprimerie Catholique was founded to some extent with the object of counteracting the activity of Protestant missionaries. Its operations commenced in 1848, but the press soon developed into one of the best-equipped publishing houses of the Near East. See J. Joseph Nasrallah, L’imprimerie au Liban, Beirut 1949, 160.

b. Syria. In Syria, it was the same Melkite Patriarch, Athanasius Dabbās, who, on his return from Europe, undertook to install a press in the city that was his patriarchal seat, Aleppo, and with the aid of the šamās Abū Allāh Zākhīr the press operated from 1706 to 1711. More than a century was to pass before a Sardinian printer, Belfante (?), came, in 1841, to establish a lithographic press at Aleppo. Curiously, the first book printed under his supervision was the Diwān of Ibn al-Fārid. See Kh. Sābat, Taʾwīl al-Tibāʿa, ch. iv, 96-128, and Wahid Gdoura, Le début de l’imprimerie arabe à Istanbul et en Syrie, Tunis 1985.

c. Palestine. Palestine—and Jerusalem in particular—has throughout history been a centre of interest for all the revealed religions. As early as 1830, a Jew, Nessim Bāk (?) had opened a press in Jerusalem for the printing of religious texts in Hebrew. (The Jews were the first Ottoman subjects to use printing for this purpose; in Constantinople their typographical activity dates back to 1490.) In 1840, it was the turn of the Franciscans, encouraged by the
young Emperor of Austria, Franz Josef, through the intermediary of a monk of Austrian origin, Frotchner, to establish the Tipografia dei Padri Francesciani di Gerusalemme. Again in 1846, a printing press was founded, called the London Press, by Protestant missionaries whose aim was the propagation of the Gospel among the Jews. Within a short time, the city of Jerusalem was full of presses producing works in Arabic and other oriental languages including Russian, Armenian, Greek and Turkish, invariably operated by religious organisations or on their behalf.


d. Jordan. Jordan did not become an independent Arab state in the form of an emirate until after the First World War, in 1921 (even though it was subject to British Mandate until 1946). It was in fact in 1922 that a printing-press belonging to the typographer Kâhîl Nakr, who had founded it in Haila in 1909, was transferred to Amman. It was used for printing the journal al-Urdunn. Three years later, the Government Press was established. See Şabat, op. cit., ch. vii, 325-6.

e. 'Irâk. Historians do not agree as to the date at which printing was introduced to 'Irâk. According to Razûk Ilsîa, the first 'Irâkî lithographic works were founded at al-Kâzîmiyya and the first and only work printed was Davâbat al-unzarahî fi ta'rikh wakîdî al-'Irâkî by the Sharîf Râzuk lîrâkî, in 1247/1829, according to others, in 1246/1830. Rûfîl Bîtî (?), states that Dâwâd Pâshâ al-Kurdî, the last independent Mamlûk, published in Baghdâd in 1816, by means of lithography, an official bilingual Turkish-Arabic journal intitled Dîwanî al-'Irâk. Although no copy has survived, Bûtî claims that the existence of the journal was mentioned by foreign travellers who visited 'Irâk in this period.

After the creation of another lithographical press, this time in Karbalâ', the first press using movable characters was established by the Dominican Fathers in Mawṣîl in 1859. One year later, it received sets of Arabic, Syriac and Latin types offered by the Institut des Sciences et des Arts d'Egypte. When the National Press began to function in Egypt in 1798. The Arabic characters used were those of the official Press of the French Republic, in addition to those of the Arabic Press of the Propaganda of Rome. The latter also supplied a number of its staff, to serve as overseers, typographers and printers. The first French and Arabic printed works were produced on board the flagship Orient, the headquarters of Bonaparte and his staff, and bear the mention "printed on board the Orient by the naval military press". After disembarcation at Alexandria, a press was installed there and given the name of the "Imprimerie Orientale et Française". A second press was established in the Demidoff square in Cairo, and this was known as the Imprimerie Nationale. Alongside the latter, there existed for some time a private press belonging to the Kunstmar Emmanuel Auré, a printer and bookseller from Valence (France) and a friend of Bonaparte. His press was entrusted with the printing of the Courrier d'Egypte, a journal of local information, and of the Décade Egyptienne, a literary journal reporting the activities of the Institut des Sciences et des Arts d'Egypte. When the National Press began to operate at full capacity, this put an end to the activity of Marc Auré, who sold his press and returned to France in 1800.

It should be noted that, among the administrative or political texts published, the orientalist Jean Joseph Marcel, who was responsible for the supervision of these presses, published the Arabic text of the Fables of Luskmam, accompanied by a French translation. The activities of the expedition's presses ceased in 1801 with the evacuation of the French troops.

Official typographical activity was revived some twenty years later, on the instructions of Muhammad ʿAlî Pâshâ, with the establishment of a press at Bûlûk. This began to function ca. 1822. The staff consisted partly of Egyptians, including a certain Nicolas Masabki (Masabki) who had been sent for training to Milan, Italy, and partly of Europeans, among them some French typographers who had worked in the presses of the French expedition and remained in the country.
The significance of this event is immense; the inauguration of this "Press of the Pasha" in fact marks the primary introduction of printing into Egypt. It is well known that printing was not established on an official level in this country (1820-85), at a date which is not known in detail, but it is known that it was closed with the establishment of the primacy of Egypt in the great process of evolution which the Nubia was to be.


b. Sudan. It was during the Turkish-Egyptian occupation of this country (1820-85), at a date which cannot be fixed precisely, that a lithographic work was introduced with the object of responding to the needs of the administration. It is known that it was used by Gordon Pasha, when he was appointed Governor of Sudan, to print paper money as a replacement for the metal coinage which gave out during the siege of Khartoum, between the end of 1884 and January 1885. After the capture of the town, the press fell into the hands of the Mahdists [see al-Mahdiyya], who used it to print the *khâbat al-dâ'wa* (messages for religious dissemination) of the Mahdi and other books of a religious nature. See Muhammad Ibrahim Abu Salim, *al-Huraka al-fikriyya fi'l-Mahdiyya*, Khartoum 1970, 58-62; idem, *Tâ'ab al-Khartum*, Khartoum 1971, 212.

5. In the Maghrib.

a. Libya. The first press was the official one introduced by the governor of the wilaya of Tripoli in 1866. Installed in the fortress of the town, it possessed lithographical and typographical facilities. It was here that the first issue of *Tasâbulus Qâzr*, the official Turkish-Arabic journal of the local Ottoman administration, was printed. According to R. L. Playfair, *The bibliography of the Barbary States, Pt. I.*, *Tripoli and the Cyrenaica*, London-Royal Geographic Society Suppl. Papers, ii, 1889, 557-614, in 1827, a journal entitled L' *Investigateur Africain* was published in Tripoli. However, researches, especially by E. Rossi, have shown that the work involved was in fact a manuscript journal, a sort of ante litteram newsletter, composed by the Swedish Consul, Grâber de Hemsâ, with the collaboration of his European colleagues resident in Tripoli. See also M. Scaparo, *La stampe di Tripoli turca* (1866-1911), in *Tripolitania*, iii/3-4 (1933), 10-20; idem, *La stampa di Tripoli* (1866-1933), in *ibid.* iii/7-8, 13-21.

b. Tunisia. Tunisia is one of those instances where printing was not introduced at the official level. Under Ahmad Bey (1837-55), the Abbé François Bourgade, with the aid of a refugee from Leoglobh, Pompeo Sulema, opened in Tunis, in the first months of 1845, the St. Louis College, to which a small lithographical press was attached. It was here that there appeared in 1849, the first Arabic text printed in Tunisia, a translation into Arabic by Sulayman al-Harâ'û, Arab secretary to the French Consulate, of a text by the Abbé Bourgade, of which the French title is *Soirées de Carthage ou dialogue d'un prêtre catholique, un mufti et un cadi*. The subsequent history of this press is not known in detail, but it is known that it was closed by the Ottoman authorities in the wake of a scandal involving forged banknotes.

The official lithographical press was founded in 1857. The first text was, according to Demeerseman, the *4th al-ânâm* (see Dustûr. i. Tunisia) solemnly promulgated at the Palace of the Bardo by Muhammad Bey on 9 September 1857.

On 7 November 1859, a decree of the Bey authorised an English merchant, Richard Holt, to establish a press and to publish a gazette in Arabic and Italian which would provide "commercial news, statistical information and extracts from other publications, with the exception of anything of a political nature". Following difficulties raised especially by foreign representatives, Sadok Bey decided on 18 July 1860 to establish an official press. This was to print al-Râ'id al-tunisi (a title rendered in French by L' *indicateur tunisien*), the first issue appearing in fact on 25 July of the same year. See A. Demeerseman, *Une étape importante de la culture islamique. Une parenté mécénate de l'imprimerie arabe et tunisienne: la lithographie*, in *IBLA*, xvi/68 (1953), 347-89; idem, *Une étape décisive de la culture et de la psychologie sociale islamique. Les données de la controverse autour du problème de l'imprimerie*, in *ibid.*, xvii (1954), 1-48, 113-40.

c. Algeria. The first journal printed in Algeria was the *Estafette d'Alger*, which first appeared at Sidi Ferruch on 14 June 1830, produced by French troops who had landed in this small bay to the west of Algiers and who used a field printing-press. Apparently the same press was used to print the *Moniteur Algérien*, a bilingual French-Arabic journal, two years later. It is interesting to note that the Arabic text was lithographed. Almost a hundred years were to elapse before, in 1925, the founder of the Islamic orthodox reformist movement in Algeria, Ibn Bâdis, was able to establish an Algerian press in Constantine, al-Matba'a al-islamiyya al-djazairiyya, subsequently known as *Matba'a al-Qâzî* after the name of the monthly magazine which it published until 1939. See Christian Souriento-Hoebrechts, *La presse maghrébine*, Paris 1975; Abd al-Malik Muratu, *Ma'âlim al-adab al-'arabi al-hadith fi l-Qâzî*, in *Al-Adab*, xiv/11 (1979), 44-51 (*Inshåd al-matâkhî al-arâbiyya fi l-Qâzî* 45).

d. Morocco. The first press in Morocco was a state foundation, founded on the instructions of the Filâlî Sharîf Muhammad b. 'Abd al-Rahmân (1859-73). This was a lithographical press (matba'a hudâjr) supervised by an Egyptian master printer, Muhammad al-Kabbânî, which operated from January to August 1865 at Meknès, and was subsequently transferred to Fès. The first book printed seems to have been *al-Šârîfî al-Muhammadiyya* (according to Ayache, "The portrait of the Prophet") by the author, compiler of one of the six canonical sunan, died at the end of the 3rd/9th century, Muhammad b. Isâ al-Tirmidî. See G. Ayache, *L'apparition de l'imprimerie au Maroc, in Hespéris-Tamuda*, v (1964), 143-61; M. Ben Cheneb and E. Lévi-Provençal, *Essai de répertoire chronologique des éditions de Fès, Algiers 1922.*

General bibliography: There exists no gener-
al work covering all the Arab countries. The most important works concerning the various regions are mentioned at the end of each section. On printing with movable characters, the most complete survey remains that of Kahlil Sāhām, Tīrūh al-tibīha 5° 17 dahr al-'arabi, Cairo 1966, 378 ff., with an ample bibliography of works in numerous languages; the Maghrib is however completely excluded. Other countries, including Oman, the United Arab Emirates and South Yemen, also pass without mention in this work.

On the question of the slow pace of the diffusion of printing in the Arab countries, see, besides Demeerseman (cited in the bibliography relating to Tunisia), T. F. Carter, Islam as a barrier to printing, ch. xv of The invention of printing in China, in MW, xxiii (1943), 213-16.

Finally, on the Arabic works published in Europe, reference may be made to the bibliographical works of C. F. de Schurrer, Bibliotheca arabica, Halle-a.-S. 1811, covering the period from 1505 to 1810, and V. Chauvin, Bibliographie des ouvrages relatifs aux Arabes publiés dans l'Europe chrétienne de 1810 à 1885, Liège 1892. (G. Oman)

2. In Turkey

Books in Turkish, primarily grammars and dictionaries and phrase-books, were printed in Western European countries within a century or so from the beginning there of printing in Arabic characters by means of movable type, whilst the Christian (Greek Orthodox and Armenian) and Jewish communities of the Ottoman empire also at an early date took the new invention in the production in their own languages and scripts.

The printing of books in Arabic characters from Italian presses (see section 1 above) soon began to acquire an additional motive to that of the interests of Arabic and Italian scholarship in the West, 

...
Oxford, in 1622, started a business in London for printing religious books and with the financial backing of his merchant brother. These books were probably printed under Metaxas’s supervision by William Jourdain or at the Elliot’s Court press, and it may be that the first book published by Metaxas in Istanbul was printed in London at the latter press (Roberts, 19-24; Layton, 155). The Oecumenical Patriarch Cyril Lucaria (1572-1638), who held views similar to those of Calvinism, invited Metaxas to Istanbul in order to use his press against Jesuit Roman Catholic propaganda, to educate the Orthodox and to reform his Church (Roberts, 45). Arriving in 1627 on a Levant Company ship, he brought with him his Greek font, the books he had printed in London and two skilled Dutch printers (Layton, 145). His printing house began in rented premises near to the English and French embassies, and the first book produced there in 1627 was a treatise against the Jews (Legrand, no. 166); but Jesuit intrigue aroused the Janissaries against the innovation of the press, and the latter destroyed it in January 1628 (Hadjiantoniou, 80-3).

The first Turkish text printed in the Greek alphabet (originally written by the Patriarch in Greek and then translated into the Turkish dialect of Karaman, Karamanlılığı), was the profession of faith of the first post-Ottoman conquest Orthodox Patriarch, Gennadios Scolarios, addressed to Sultan Mehemed II Fâthî, the Piskäde-nâme, the Sultan requested that it be translated into Turkish and it was also printed by Martin Crusius in Turco-Graeciae libri octo, Basel 1584, 109-20. Another religious work in Karamanlılığı is the Gülär-i imân-i Meşhû, no press or place of printing is mentioned in it, but it may have been produced at the Armenian press in Istanbul by Panagogiots Kyriakides (Salaville and Daldegio, 3-4).

In all these cases, the presses of these minority faiths had to be imported from outside, and none of them were able to construct them within the Ottoman borders. One inevitably wonders why no Turkish press existed at this time, when printed books imported from Europe were sold in Turkey and when the non-Muslim communities were printing books. A section on printing in Pečewî’s Ta’rîh, Istanbul 1283/1866, 1, 107, argues that the printing press was no longer an alien thing and that Turkish society was slowly accepting it, because of the great speed with which a large number of books can be produced once the tedious work of type-setting has been done; clearly, this historian approved of printing; yet it was to be 78 years after Pečewî’s death before the first Turkish Muslim press was to be established. The reason for the Muslims’ aversion from printing doubtless included motives of religious conservatism but also the vested social and economic interests of the professions of calligraphers (khattât) [see Katta], book illustrators, binders, etc.; and when printing eventually was established in the 18th century, only small numbers of books were produced and demand remained at a low level.

Ibrahim Muteferrika and his press. Some eight years before the establishment of his press in 1144/1730, Ibrahim Muteferrika had 1132/1719-20 printed a map of the Sea of Marmara, probably dedicated to the Vizier Dâmdâb Ibrahim Paša and presented to him, since a note on the map’s bottom right-hand corner reads “If Your Excellency my master so commands, larger ones can be produced. [Dated] year 1132”. It seems therefore that attempts at setting up a printing press dated 1132 by some years (see Kortoğlu, 14-15). A second map, of the Black Sea, followed in 1137/1724-5, and a third one, Mermîdî-i Irân, in 1142/1729-30. A fourth map, Hikhl-i Mişr, was known to have existed (Ersoy, 37), but remained lost until it surfaced recently for sale (see Brit. Museum, Turcica catalogue no. 484, June 1976, 16).

Concerning Ibrahim Muteferrika’s Transylvanian origins, his conversion to Islam, his career in the Ottoman service as a diplomat and as an author, see the article İebraîm Mûteferrika. Here is mentioned too his written proposal, the We’let al-tibâ’â, to the Grand Vizier Dâmdâb Ibrahim Paša of 1139/1726-7 on the benefits of printing: the benefits for the masses needing instruction and for the ruling classes alike, the perpetuation of books by printing when manuscripts could and had been destroyed by war (as in the Christian Reconquista of al-Andalus and in the Mongol invasions) and the general usefulness of the new technique for Islam (this opuscule was printed as the first five pages of the first book which he printed, Wankulî’s Turkish version of al-Djawhartî’s famous dictionary, the tibâ’â). He feared religious opposition, and made a formal approach to the Vizier, requesting a firmân from the Shaykh al-Islâm on the licitness of printing and asked Sultan Ahmed III for a firmân authorizing him to print books, promising that the first work undertaken would be Wankulî’s dictionary, enclosing a few specimen pages of this already printed, explaining the process of proof-reading, setting forth how he had been working towards the project for eight years with the patronage and financial assistance of the high official Sa’îd Efendi and promising that at the end of each book printed the sale price would be given (see the specimens from this application at the end of Gerček, and also Sungû).

With the help of Sa’îd Efendi, the Grand Vizier Dâmdâb Ibrahim Paša and the Shaykh al-Islâm ‘Abd Allâh Efendi’s firmân, Ahmed III was persuaded to issue a firmân to Sa’îd and Ibrahim Muteferrika in Dhu ‘l-Ka’dâ 1139/1727 authorizing the opening of a printing-works and enjoining the printing of books not on such subjects as fikr, hadîth, tefsîr, kalâm, but on practical subjects like medicine, crafts, geographical guides, etc., based on the authority of the fatwa of the former kâdis of Istanbul, Salonica and Qhalata and of the Shaykh al-Islâm (whose names were recorded in the written petition to the sultan); these last are to take charge of the proofreading, for which great care is to be exercised.

With this security behind them, Sa’îd and Ibrahim went ahead with the setting-up of the dâr al-tibâ’â (popularly known as the basma-îhane) in Ibrahim’s own house in the Sultan Selim neighbourhood of the Fatîh quarter. Documents dated 29 Rabî‘ II 1140/14 December 1727 and 2 Dümâda 1140/16 December 1727 show that the press had begun work on Wânkûlî’s dictionary, and this was completed and the book ready by 1 Radjab 1141/31 January 1729. In the 16 years up to Ibrahim’s illness of 1156/1743, only 17 books were produced, explicable partly by his own carefulness but also by an apparent lack of enthusiasm for printed books in Ottoman society. The Patrona Khalil revolt of 1143/1730 which led to the Sultan’s abdication did not affect the progress of Ibrahim’s work, but the idea of printing does not seem to have made a deep impression on society. In this same year, that of the new Sultan Mahmûd I’s [q.v.] accession, a pamphlet on military organisation, Uṣûl al-hikâm fi nizâm al-unâm, was printed, and on 11-20 Sha‘bân 1144/14 February 1732, Mahmûd renewed the firmân originally granted to Sa’îd and Ibrahim by Ahmed III, but this time to Ibrahim only. Ibrahim’s 13th book, the History of Na’mâ
[q.v.], was printed in two volumes in 1147/1734-5. Then followed five years of inactivity, till between 1153/1740-1 and 1156/1743 four more books were produced, bringing the total to 17. In this last year, Ibrahim fell ill and died in 1158/1745. 

The books printed between 1141/1729 and 1156/1743 are as follows:

1. Kitâb-i lughat-i Wânkuli—1 Radjab 1141/31 January 1729
2. Tuhfat al-kâbir fi ašfar al-bihâr—1 Dhû ’l-Ka‘da 1141/29 May 1729
3. Ta’rikh-i sayyâh dar bayân-i suhr-i Aghâvînî wa sahabâ-i tanmâni bi-dinst-i da‘ala-ı Şahâr-i Şanfawaînî—1 Safar 1142/26 August 1729
4. Ta’rikh al-Hind al-Gharbi al-musamûl bi-hadîth-i nâw—middle third of Ramadan 1142/17 June 1730 (illustrated)
5. Usul al-hikâm fi nizâm al-umâm—middle third of Muharrâm 1143/16 August 1730
6. Ta’rikh-i Na’âmî—vol. i, middle third of Muharrâm 1147/middle late June 1734, vol. ii, Şümâdî 1147/middle October 1734
7. Ta’rikh-i Rabî‘î Efendî—1 Dhû ’l-Hijdja 1153/17 February 1741
8. Ta’rikh-i Şehrî Efendî—1 Dhû ’l-Hijdja 1153/17 February 1741
9. Ahvâl-i ghaşarât dar diyar-ı Bosna—1 Muharrâm 1154/19 March 1741
10. Farhang-i Şahrî—1 Şabâ‘i 1155/1 October 1742

With the exception of no. 8, Holdermann’s Grammaire turque, the size of the editions of these books printed at the dâr-i tiyân-i şâmîra is given at the end of the second volume of Na’âmî’s History: 1,000 each for nos. 1 and 2; 1,200 for no. 3; and 500 each for the rest.

After Ibrahim’s death, his former kâbir Ibrahim Efendi (who is thought to have been his son-in-law also) and Kâdî Ahmed Efendi got a firman from Mehmed I, but for unknown reasons were unable to start printing. (Getek, 92). At the beginning of Rabî‘ II 1168/1755 they got a new firman from Əth’iimâni and started printing, their first publication being a second edition of Wânkuli’s dictionary, but soon after this, Kâdî Ibrahim Efendi died and the press was abandoned. Subsequently, two secretaries of the Sublime Porte, the Wâdâ‘-nâzîvî Râşid Mehmed Efendi and the Wâdâ‘-nâzîvî Wâsîl Efendi, bought the press from Ibrahim Müteferrika’s heirs, obtained a firman from Sultan Əbd al-Medjid I and in 1198/1783-4 printed the histories of Şâmi, Şubbi and Şakîr in one volume; in the following year they printed the history of İazzî, a sequel to the preceding three. After the grammatical work Pîrî al-Kâfiyya of the next year, no book was printed, and then between 1207/1792-3 and 1209/1794-5 three books on military topics were produced. Râşid Mehmed Efendi died in 1212/1796-7 and the press was closed down. It had hardly been a shining success in its 64 years of existence; for only 18 of these it had been actually operated, and it had printed just 24 books (including the second edition of Wânkuli).
Turkish, Arabic and Persian, the majority however being in Turkish (Heyworth-Dunne, 334-5). Cayol's lithographic press. Lithographic printing, invented in 1798 by Alois Senefelder of Munich (1771-1834) and further developed after Sencedler in 1818 published his technical manual on the process, was in use in Istanbul not much more than 30 years after its invention. Henri Cayol (1805-65) of Marseille and his cousin Jacques Cayol came to Istanbul and under the patronage of Khüsrew Pasha set up a lithographic press in the grounds of the Ministry of War, at a location whose exact spot cannot be traced today (Geçek, 13), with machinery ordered from Paris. Fifty soldiers were assigned to the Cayols to work with them and learn the trade, and for five years books on military subjects, including drill, were produced, the first book printed by lithography being Mehmed Khüsrew Pasha's Nûhbadât al-tâlim in 1247/1831-2 and with 79 illustrations.

On Khüsrew Pasha's removal from office, the Cayols moved in 1836 to Kulekapı and opened a press there on the basis of a firmâns from Sultan Mahmûd II (Zellich, 47). On 27 Rabî‘ II 1267/1 March 1851 Henri Cayol applied to the Meflîs-ı Wâlâ Presidency and received permission to print books in any language, as well as printing the Armenian monthly journal Panacer ("The Philologist") (Khâyîr al-Dîn Nefîm, 73-4). In January 1852 he printed the only issue of the Journal Asiatique de Constantinople in 1268/1852-3 (Bianchi, 248-9), but in mid-1852 the printing-works were burnt down during type-casting. It re-opened on 1 November 1855 in Beyoğlu at the corner of the street leading to the French Embassy (Zellich, 52). Henri Cayol died of cholera on 18 August 1856, and after his death, his family worked the press in his name but under the management of Antoine Zellich. In 1840 the Djerld-khâne press was opened to print in Arabic characters. To a Latin system for the writing of Turkish, Turkish Arabic and Persian, the majority however being in Turkish (Heyworth-Dunne, 334-5).

On Khiisrew Pasha's removal from office, the Cayols moved in 1836 to Kulekapî and opened a press there on the basis of a firmâns from Sultan Mahmûd II (Zellich, 47). On 27 Rabî‘ II 1267/1 March 1851 Henri Cayol applied to the Meflîs-ı Wâlâ Presidency and received permission to print books in any language, as well as printing the Armenian monthly journal Panacer ("The Philologist") (Khâyîr al-Dîn Nefîm, 73-4). In January 1852 he printed the only issue of the Journal Asiatique de Constantinople in 1268/1852-3 (Bianchi, 248-9), but in mid-1852 the printing-works were burnt down during type-casting. It re-opened on 1 November 1855 in Beyoğlu at the corner of the street leading to the French Embassy (Zellich, 52). Henri Cayol died of cholera on 18 August 1856, and after his death, his family worked the press in his name but under the management of Antoine Zellich. In January 1852 he printed the only issue of the Journal Asiatique de Constantinople in 1268/1852-3 (Bianchi, 248-9), but in mid-1852 the printing-works were burnt down during type-casting. It re-opened on 1 November 1855 in Beyoğlu at the corner of the street leading to the French Embassy (Zellich, 52). Henri Cayol died of cholera on 18 August 1856, and after his death, his family worked the press in his name but under the management of Antoine Zellich. In January 1852 he printed the only issue of the Journal Asiatique de Constantinople in 1268/1852-3 (Bianchi, 248-9), but in mid-1852 the printing-works were burnt down during type-casting. It re-opened on 1 November 1855 in Beyoğlu at the corner of the street leading to the French Embassy (Zellich, 52). Henri Cayol died of cholera on 18 August 1856, and after his death, his family worked the press in his name but under the management of Antoine Zellich.

In 1840 the Djerld-khâne press was opened to print the official newspaper Serif-i-Yi Hyâdîlî; and in 1299/1881-2 the Ebu ‘l-Diya (Ebiizziya) press, which was to have a special place in the history of Turkish printing, was opened by Ebu ‘l-Diya Mehmed Tefwîn Bey in Şişli at the corner of the street leading to the French Embassy (Zellich, 52). Henri Cayol died of cholera on 18 August 1856, and after his death, his family worked the press in his name but under the management of Antoine Zellich. In January 1852 he printed the only issue of the Journal Asiatique de Constantinople in 1268/1852-3 (Bianchi, 248-9), but in mid-1852 the printing-works were burnt down during type-casting. It re-opened on 1 November 1855 in Beyoğlu at the corner of the street leading to the French Embassy (Zellich, 52). Henri Cayol died of cholera on 18 August 1856, and after his death, his family worked the press in his name but under the management of Antoine Zellich. In January 1852 he printed the only issue of the Journal Asiatique de Constantinople in 1268/1852-3 (Bianchi, 248-9), but in mid-1852 the printing-works were burnt down during type-casting. It re-opened on 1 November 1855 in Beyoğlu at the corner of the street leading to the French Embassy (Zellich, 52). Henri Cayol died of cholera on 18 August 1856, and after his death, his family worked the press in his name but under the management of Antoine Zellich. In January 1852 he printed the only issue of the Journal Asiatique de Constantinople in 1268/1852-3 (Bianchi, 248-9), but in mid-1852 the printing-works were burnt down during type-casting. It re-opened on 1 November 1855 in Beyoğlu at the corner of the street leading to the French Embassy (Zellich, 52). Henri Cayol died of cholera on 18 August 1856, and after his death, his family worked the press in his name but under the management of Antoine Zellich.

In January 1852 he printed the only issue of the Journal Asiatique de Constantinople in 1268/1852-3 (Bianchi, 248-9), but in mid-1852 the printing-works were burnt down during type-casting. It re-opened on 1 November 1855 in Beyoğlu at the corner of the street leading to the French Embassy (Zellich, 52). Henri Cayol died of cholera on 18 August 1856, and after his death, his family worked the press in his name but under the management of Antoine Zellich. In January 1852 he printed the only issue of the Journal Asiatique de Constantinople in 1268/1852-3 (Bianchi, 248-9), but in mid-1852 the printing-works were burnt down during type-casting. It re-opened on 1 November 1855 in Beyoğlu at the corner of the street leading to the French Embassy (Zellich, 52). Henri Cayol died of cholera on 18 August 1856, and after his death, his family worked the press in his name but under the management of Antoine Zellich. In January 1852 he printed the only issue of the Journal Asiatique de Constantinople in 1268/1852-3 (Bianchi, 248-9), but in mid-1852 the printing-works were burnt down during type-casting. It re-opened on 1 November 1855 in Beyoğlu at the corner of the street leading to the French Embassy (Zellich, 52). Henri Cayol died of cholera on 18 August 1856, and after his death, his family worked the press in his name but under the management of Antoine Zellich. In January 1852 he printed the only issue of the Journal Asiatique de Constantinople in 1268/1852-3 (Bianchi, 248-9), but in mid-1852 the printing-works were burnt down during type-casting. It re-opened on 1 November 1855 in Beyoğlu at the corner of the street leading to the French Embassy (Zellich, 52). Henri Cayol died of cholera on 18 August 1856, and after his death, his family worked the press in his name but under the management of Antoine Zellich. In January 1852 he printed the only issue of the Journal Asiatique de Constantinople in 1268/1852-3 (Bianchi, 248-9), but in mid-1852 the printing-works were burnt down during type-casting. It re-opened on 1 November 1855 in Beyoğlu at the corner of the street leading to the French Embassy (Zellich, 52). Henri Cayol died of cholera on 18 August 1856, and after his death, his family worked the press in his name but under the management of Antoine Zellich. In January 1852 he printed the only issue of the Journal Asiatique de Constantinople in 1268/1852-3 (Bianchi, 248-9), but in mid-1852 the printing-works were burnt down during type-casting. It re-opened on 1 November 1855 in Beyoğlu at the corner of the street leading to the French Embassy (Zellich, 52). Henri Cayol died of cholera on 18 August 1856, and after his death, his family worked the press in his name but under the management of Antoine Zellich.

(GÜNAY ALFAY KUT)

3. In Persia

1. Under the Mongols.

Wood-block printing was introduced into Persia in 693/1294. In that year Gayhbatu Khân ordered the printing of paper money (ca'â; Persianised as basma, *bâsma*) in imitation of Chinese practice. The paper money was printed in Tabriz and circulated for the first time on 19 Shawwal 693/12 September 1294. The paper money was probably printed with wooden blocks, which were manufactured by Chinese artisans living in Tabriz. Despite the threat of capital punishment in case of refusal to accept paper money, the population's reaction was one of outright rejection. Gayhbatu Khân was forced to abandon his experiment in Dhu 'l-Hajjâja 693/November 1294, as a result of which the art of printing was momentarily lost to Persia (see Jahn, 125-35).

2. Under the Safawids.

Although the Torah was printed in Persia (with Hebrew characters) in Istanbul in 1594, it was not until 1629 that printing was reintroduced to Persia, this time in the form of typography. For in January 1629, Carmelite friars received a printing press from Rome. It had matrices of 349 Arabic letter types and two instruments to set up type. It is not known whether the press produced any actual books. The Carmelites certainly tried, but “because of the dryness of the country” they failed, according to Fr. Angelus (Gazophylacium). Their printing (basmâ, *bâsma*) experiments took place between 1629 and 1642, when Fr. Bernard of St. Theresa handed the printing press over to the Vicar-General of the Carmelites in Isfahan. From 1648 till 1669 the press was kept in storage by the Dutch East Indies Company, which in 1669 handed the press over to Fr. Raphael Du Mans. In 1676 Fr. Angelus reports that the Carmelites still had the press, but from the context it is clear that it had not been used for a long time (Floor, *The first printing press*).

About the same time that the Arabic-Persian printing press was introduced in Persia, an Armenian press also was established in Qâlifâ (q. e. in Suppl.), the Armenian suburb of Isfahan. This was done at the initiative of Bishop Khac'atur Kesaraci in 1637. After 17 months of trial and error he succeeded in printing the Psalms in 1638. The Bishop's main problem was how to produce good quality paper and ink. Moreover, his type was not made out of lead, but of wood, copper and iron. He preserved and printed another two religious books, one in 1641 and the other in 1642. Both the letter types and the books can be seen in the Armenian museum at Qâlifâ (see Richard, *Un témoignage*...).

Despite his success, Bishop Kesaraci was troubled by technical problems. He therefore sent one of his pupils, Hovhannes, to Europe to obtain the required technical expertise. In 1644 Hovhannes printed a book in Armenian in Leghorn. He returned to Persia in 1646 to continue the work of Bishop Kesaraci, who had died in that year. To that end, Hovhannes brought lead types and a printing press with him. It was his intention to print the Bible, but “not having the way of making good Ink, and to avoid the ill consequences of the Invention, he was forc'd to break the press. For on one side the Children refus'd to learn to write, pretending they wrote the Bible themselves, only to get it sooner by heart: on the other side many persons were undone by it, that got their living by writing”, according to Tavernier. The latter argument also had constrained the introduction of the art of printing in the Ottoman empire, the Ottoman empire (see section 2, above). Tavernier was wrong in believing that the Armenian press had been broken, for in 1687 it was used again and this time nine books were printed. For unknown reasons, it fell into disuse again. It was only in 1771 that an Armenian printing press was established in Echmiadzin, in 1786 in Naghlevan and in 1796 in Ashtarak (Râ'în, *Armanian Armenians*).

3. Under the Kâdîrâs.

The art of printing was thus lost for a second time. Although the printing of the Armenian language was resumed fairly quickly, printing in Persian took somewhat longer. Persian language books were regularly printed since 1639, when in Leiden the first books in both the Persian language and characters were printed. After that date, both in Europe and towards the end of the 18th century also in India, many books in Persian were printed. The generally accepted date for the first book printed in Kâdîrâ Persia is 1233/1817, when in Tabriz the Dikhâdiyya by Mirzâ ʻIsâ Kâ'în-Mâkâm was printed on a typographic press. Because there is no thorough analytical study on Persian incunabula, it is impossible to settle the question of the earliest printing date. The author of the *Mašrûh al-mamâlik* ascribes the introduction of the art of printing (ʿalam-ʿal-tîfâ'â or *basma*) to ʻAbbâs Mirzâ, the heir-apparent and governor-general of ʻAdharbâyjân. Iʿtimâd al-Sâlîmâna (Mašrûh wa ʿalâther, 100), mistakenly, ascribes this initiative to Manûcîr Khân Mu'tamîd al-Dawla, an influential Tehran courtier. The early books were printed by Mullâ Muḥammad Bâqî Tabrizî, who in 1241/1825 also printed ʿAbd al-Razzâk Dunbulî's *Mašrûh al-sulâniyya*. In 1825 another printer in Tabriz, ʿAll son of ʿHâdîjî Muḥammad Husayn, printed the Nasâb al-sâbyân a well-known school text by Abû Naṣr Farâhî. By 1825, Tabriz therefore boasted already of at least two typographic printing presses (dâp-i surâh).

In that same year, Mu'tamîd al-Dawla established a typographic press in Tehran, which was operated by Mirzâ Zayn al-ʻAbîdîn Tabrizî. With the support of Muţâfî Muhammad, he printed 8,000 copies, he printed many books, mainly religious, which were known as “Mu'ta- madîs”. In 1815 ʻAbbâs Mirzâ had sent seven students to Great Britain to learn modern techniques. One of these students was Mirzâ Šâhîr Shîrâzî, who apprenticed himself in London to a master printer (dâp-sâr) who specialised in printing (dâp-sâd) the Bible in Persian, Hindi, and Arabic and other languages”. Mirzâ Šâhîr returned to Persia in 1234/1819, where he established himself as a printer in Tabriz. He shortly thereafter (1829) was sent to Russia as member of an embassy, from which he returned with a printing press. He was later engaged in printing in both Tabriz and Tehran.

Mirzâ Šâhîr in his turn sent a certain Mirzâ Asad Allâh to Russia to learn the printing trade. On his return to Persia in 1835, Mirzâ Asad Allâh stayed in Tabriz and, together with Akâ Ridâ, operated the first lithographic press (dâp-i sângî) in Iran. In that same year, Fath ʻAll Šâh summoned Mirzâ Asad Allâh to Tehran to start working there.

Because “printing in types is not relished by Persians, the characters being necessarily stiff and uncouth, and very displeasing to an eye accustomed to the flowing written hand” (Binning, i, 312),
lithography became very popular in Iran. Especially, the fact that lithography permitted Iranian artists to practice both calligraphy and illustrations in their normal way was an important advantage. Moreover, illustrated printed books became popular, which an increasing number, after the first items printed in 1259/1843, were produced in this way.

By 1850 there were five lithographic presses in Tehran (Sheil, 201) and in 1845 not less than 15 in Tabriz (Schwarz, 85). However, books also continued to be published "both in types and lithograph; but the execution is rather coarse; in the latter style in particular," Binning observed in 1851 (i, 312, ii, 217). In 1256/March 1840, American missionaries in Urmiya printed the first text in Syriac; moreover, this press could also print Persian and English (Perkins, 456).

Other presses followed in Shiraz, Isfahan, Bushehr, Maghād, Enzeli, Raqqh, Ardabil, Hamadan, Köhy, Yazd, Kazwin, Kirmānšah, Garrus and Kāshān (Māhūbū Ardaḵānī, i, 217). The list of early printers shows that a great variety of books were printed. Apart from religious texts, there were historical texts, popular works such as the Tawīl al-tawāniḥ, Iskandār-nāma, and a comic text such as Duzd wa Kādī. With the establishment of the Dār al-Funūn (q.v.) in 1852, a great number of scientific texts were printed on the school’s own printing press. The publications were in the field of engineering, chemistry, physics, mathematics, biology, medicine, geography, military science and music. With the establishment of the government press (dār al-tibā’i) and the state translation institute (ddr al-‘a), hundreds of translations were made from European authors. Further, Persian and Arab classics were printed, while contemporary official chronicles were solicited and published, such as the Rauṣūl al-safat-ī Nāsīrī and the Ṣafī-šāh al-taṣawwīrī. Under the direction of Ṣimāyā al-Saltana, who was in charge of the state press, translation, and censor’s bureau, many of these books were published. He himself also published a great many useful official chronicles, such as the Mirzāt al-buldān (3 vols.), the Mun’aṣṣam-nāsīrī (3 vols.), and the Muqta’ al-dālam (3 vols.).

A separate development was the publication of newspapers (kāhghāt-ī akhbār), of which the first listed Arabic newspaper was printed by Mirzā Ṣāḥib in Tehran on 25 Muharram 1253/1 March 1837. This paper had no special time, but only a long general heading, a shortened rendering of which is "Current news from Tehran" (Akhbār-ī Wākāyī). The paper, which lasted three years, offered foreign and local news, the latter focussing on the reforms initiating the latter part of the 19th century, occasional court activities. More effective in disseminating new political ideas were Persian newspapers printed outside Persia such as Kānīn (London), Akhār (Istanbul), Hālāb al-Maṭīn (Calcutta) andTHRAS (Cairo), which often had to be smuggled into Persia because of their unsettling contents. It was only with the advent of the constitutional movement in 1906 that newspapers started to play a very important role in political and cultural life of Persia.


### 4. IN MUSLIM INDIA

South Asia below the Himalayas remained beyond the diffusion of xylography from the Far East. Printing reached the subcontinent as European movable type technology introduced by Portuguese Jesuits who set up the first press in the College of St. Paul at Goa in 1556. In 1580 the Mughal emperor Akbar was presented with a copy of the Royal Polyglot Bible printed by Plantin at Antwerp, one of the finest products of the 16th-century European press, but the Mughal court did not adopt printing technology, being well served by its studio of calligraphers and artists. From the 1570s to the 1670s vernacular printing by the Portuguese in India to aid conversion was confined to Tamil, Konkani and Syriac, and that of the German and Dutch missionaries in the 18th century to Tamil and Sinhalese. Until the early 19th century, Christian literature in Arabic, Persian or Urdu was imported from Europe, such as Benjamin Schulze’s Urdu New Testament printed at Halle in 1758.

The earliest known specimen of Arabic printing in
India is a small woodcut New Testament quotation on the title-page of *Dialogus inter Moslimum et Christianum*, a Tamil polemic against Islam printed at the Tranquebar Mission Press in 1727. But Arabic, Persian and Urdu printing in India really began in Calcutta under the East India Company from the 1780s onwards. Of the three languages, Persian was paramount to the Company's interests and the medium of the law-courts and the land-revenue system inherited from Mughal Bengal. In the late 1770s the Governor-General Warren Hastings engaged Charles Wilkins, a Company servant with a gift for oriental languages, to manufacture Bengali and Nastā'īk types. With the Nastā'īk, Wilkins in 1780 printed Francis Gladwin's *A compendious vocabulary, English and Persian at Malda in north Bengal. In 1781 he became first superintendent of the Honorable Company's Press in Calcutta which issued a plethora of Persian translations of the regulations, notices and blank-forms required for the administration of Bengal. The first of these was a selection of Diwânī A'dālat regulations translated by William Chambers in 1781. From 1793 until 1837, when Persian ceased to be the language of the courts, Persian translations of Company regulations were reprinted in annual volumes. At Madras also Persian translations of local Company regulations were printed from 1802 onwards. Persian historical works valuable as sources on the Mughal system of government were printed at Calcutta, such as William Davy's edition of *Tuzukdt-i Timūr* (1785), Muhammad Sākhī's *Muntakhabdt-i A'limtgīn-i nāma* prepared by Henry Vansittart (1785) and Amir Haydar Bilgrāmi's *Risāla*, a treatise on land-revenue and tenure with Gladwin's translation (1796). A Sīvākāt fount (the earliest such?) was specially cast for printing Gladwin's *A compendious system of Bengal revenue accounts* (1790 and 1796). Some linguistic works were printed to help Company servants master Persian, Gladwin again preeminent with *A vocabulary, English and Persian* (1791, 1800) and *The Persian guide* (1800). As the classical literary language of Muslim India, Persian was studied by the British orientalists forming the nucleus of the Asiatic Society of Bengal (founded 1784). The first work of Persian literature printed was *Badshih-ye Harkaran* edited by Francis Balfour (1781). Other important texts printed were Gladwin's edition of Sa'dī's *Pānām-nāma* (1788) followed by Kuliyyāt-i Sa'dī prepared by J. H. Harington (1791-5), Sir William Jones' edition of Hāfīzī's *Laylī Magdān* (1788), the *Diwan* of Hāfīz (1791) and Nakhshabī's *Tūtī-nāma* with Gladwin's translation (1792). Arabic printing was far less extensive, but one important text printed before 1800 was *Al-Ṣajjadiwīdī's al-Sajjadiyah* (1792), published as part of Jones' digest of Hindu and Muslim law. A concordance to the Kur'ān was printed at Calcutta in 1811, but the Arabic text (together with 'Abd al-Kādir's Urdu translation) was not printed till 1829. The most famous translation of the Kur'ān printed in the subcontinent was Shāh Wāli Allāh's Persian rendering (Dihīl 1866, etc.). The leading scholar of Urdu in 19th-century Calcutta was John B. Gilchrist, who published *A dictionary, English and Hindostanee* (1760-7 to 1790), *A grammar of the Hindostanee language* (1796) and *The Oriental linguist* (1798). In 1789 *The new Asiatick miscellany* contained the first Urdu literary text to be printed, a *Rākht* of Wali Dakhani. In the same year, W. H. Bird's *The oriental miscellany* also printed the words and music of several Urdu songs. From 1793 onwards, Urdu translations of Company regulations in Bengal were required to be printed as well as Persian. At Madras in 1790 the physician Henry Harris published *A dictionary, English and Hindostany*, but his grammar was never printed.

Fort William College, founded at Calcutta in 1800, provided a further stimulus for the printing of Arabic, Persian and particularly Urdu texts. The Company published numerous translations in those languages. Gladwin presented Nastā'īk types to the College, and these Ghikrist used as Professor of Urdu to equip the Hindoostanee Press, which issued many celebrated Urdu works: Mir Ammān's version of "The Four Derivatives", *Bagh-o-bahār* (1802); Mir Shīr 'All Asīna's *translation of Sa'dī's Gul斯坦*, *Bagh-i Urdu* (1802); Mir Shīr Musān's *Hasān* (1803); Mir Shīr Haydārī's *Totakāhān* based on the *Tātī-nāma* (1804); etc. The largest book issued by this press was Kulliyāt-i Mir Tākī with 1,085 pages (1811). Besides some forty Urdu works, by 1820 about twenty Arabic and another twenty Persian texts were also printed for the College's use at various Calcutta presses: John Baillie's *Arabic syntax* (1801), Joseph Barretto's edition of *The Shāhān al-lughāt* (1806); Wali al-Dīn Muhammad al-shāhī's *A grammar of the Arabic language* (1813) and the *Diwan al-Mutanabbi* (1814); *Anwār-i Suhayli* (1805); Lumbden's *A grammar of the Persian language* (1810); Nizâmī's *Sikandar-nāma* (1812); Mirzā Abū Tāhī Khān's *European travelogue Masīr-i Tālībī* (1812); etc. At Madras, the equivalent College of Fort St. George also stimulated the printing of texts, as the *Anwār-i Suhayli* issued by the College Press in 1822.

The *matshīf* of Fort William College and the Rev. Henry Martyn were equally important in early missionary printing in Islamic languages in India. Mirzā Muhammad Fitrat's translation of St. Matthew into Persian and of the Gospels into Urdu (edited by William Hunter) were both calculated at Calcutta in 1805. In 1809 the Persian St. Matthew prepared by Nathaniel Sabat under Martyn's direction was printed at Serampore, the complete New Testament at Calcutta in 1816, and the Old Testament in parts (1828-38) by the Calcutta Auxiliary Bible Society. Sabat's Arabic New Testament was printed at Calcutta in 1816. Martyn's own translation of the New Testament into Urdu (the basis for all subsequent editions) was printed in 1814 at Serampore, where the Sindhi St. Matthew was issued in 1825. The mass of early 19th-century evangelical literature in Urdu, Persian, Panjabi, Sindhi, etc., was mainly printed by the various Christian tract and book societies formed (those of Calcutta, Benares, Agra, North India, Punjab, Madras (for Dakhani), Bombay, etc.).

The East India Company introduced lithography to India in the early 1820s, which rapidly displaced typography for Islamic printing as presses were established right across Northern India: Patna 1828; Kānpur 1830, Dīhlī and Meerut 1834, Āgra 1835, Lūdhiāna 1836, Mirzāzpār and Allāhhābd 1839, Benares 1844, etc. The earliest Urdu works listed were medical treatises by Peter Breton, the first being *Bāyān zaharīn kā* on poisons (Calcutta 1826), and in Persian editions of Sa'dī's *Gul斯坦* and *Bayān* (Calcutta 1827, 1829). The development of Lakhnaw as a major centre of Urdu and Persian printing exemplifies the transition to lithography. Nawwāb Ghāzī al-Dīn Haydar set up the royal press about 1817, its most famous product being the type-set Persian dictionary *Haft kulzum* (1820-2). His successor Nāṣīr al-Dīn Haydar brought Edward Archer's Asiatic Lithographic Press from nearby Kānpur to Lakhnaw in 1830, and the Arabic dictionary *Tātī al-lughāt* begun by typography was then completed (vols.)
iv-viii) lithographically. Under Wadjid, all lithographic presses in Lakhnaw were closed because the Nawwáb disliked a history of his family lithographed by one Kamál al-Dín Haydar. Some presses moved to Kánpur, while others continued surreptitiously and books were often issued without details of printer, etc., so that many early Lakhnaw and Kánpur imprints are indistinguishable. The single most important Lakhnaw press was that of Munshi Nawal Kháhór founded in 1858. By his death in 1895 he had issued about 500 titles, mainly religious, historical and poetical texts, particularly Urdu translations from Arabic, Persian and Sanskrit, subsidised by his newspaper and his printing for government. Sikandar Dihj, Nízám of Haydarábád (Deccan), acquired a press as a curiosity of western technology during Lord Minto's vice-royalty (1807-13), but did not apparently use it.

Bombay was not important for Persian printing until the introduction of lithography, although the Dastgír of 1818 printed with Náshik types deserves mention. Among the earliest works lithographed there were the Anwr-i Suhaylí and the Diván of Hádí, both in 1826. Bombay and Kárcáí were the twin centres of early Sindhi printing, one of the first Sindhi books lithographed being Sádasukh Lála's drawing manual Cita jí páj (Kárcáí 1852). Kárcáí had been the first city in what is modern Pakistan to acquire printing in the mid-1840s. The American Presbyterían Mission Press Calcutta, which had been printing extensively in Panjabi (as well as Persian and Urdu) since the 1840s, but the main centres of Muslim Panjabi printing were Láháwar and Síválkút, from the 1860s issuing kisáas and other popular literature. The first press in modern Bangladesh was at Dháká in the 1850s, but printing became widespread in East Bengal by the 1870s at Sylhet, Rajsháhi, Barisál, Jessoré, etc., and Calcutta also remained an important centre of Muslim Bengali printing. A number of Pashtó works were printed in Díhí, Pesháwar and Láháwar in the 1870s.
Muhammad and the deer (Abbottabad 1883) and T. C. Plowden’s Idiomatic colloquial sentences, English-Pakhto (Jal Press, Derā Gāzī Khan 1884).

According to Abd al-Rahmān Khān’s autobiography, he was the youngest of nine children of his parents (24). His family background was not exactly known when he became Amīr in 1880. But the first lithographic press (Matbā‘a-‘yi Muṣṭafawi) was set up under his predecessor Amīr Shīr ‘Allī Khān whose Persian polemic against the Wāhabīs, Risāša-yi ʿabīh-ī ʿabīh, was printed at Kābul in 1288/1871, followed by ‘Abd al-Kādīr Khān’s religious tract Tuhfāt al-ʿulamā‘ in 1292/1875. ‘Abd al-Rahmān attributed the introduction of printing to Mānūgī ‘Abd al-ʿAzīz dātī of Dīhlī who trained many Kābulī lithographers before dying of fever. Several of the Amīr’s own works in Persian were printed, including Nāṣīṭ-nāma, advice on Afghanīstān’s relations with Russia (1303/1886), and Mīra‘īt al-‘ulā‘ī, on human intelligence (1311/1894). Most famous of all was his tract advocating ḥiḥad, Kalimāt Amīr al-bilād fi ‘l-taḥdīth (1304/1887), printed at the Huṣaynī Press which also issued an almanac in the same year. The press was also used to promulgate laws, e.g. ʿAbd al-Rahmān’s desire to modernise his army is reflected in several military tracts printed, e.g. ‘Abd al-Muṣṭafawi’s id-i risāla on gunnery manoeuvres (1303/1885) and Kānātī-yi riṣāla on cavalry drill (1304/1887).

Bibliography: Given in the article.

(G. W. SHAW)

MATBAKH (Persian) (abū, kitchen, cookhouse, a noun of place, defined by lexicographers as “the cook’s house” (bayt al-matbakh) from the verbal root meaning “the cooking of flesh meat”. The root b-kh is common to the Semitic family. Already in Akkadīan, OT Hebrew, Syriac, and post-Biblical Hebrew we find the further, related connotation of “slaughtering” in addition to that of “cooking”. Undoubtedly, the mediaeval domestic matbakh combined both these functions. By extension of the root meaning, the matbakh was the place where every conceivable kind of food, including flesh meat, was transformed from its raw state for consumption at the table.

1. In the mediaeval caliphate.

The kitchen has been described as the “birthplace” (Forbes) and the “foster home” (Needham) of innumerable terms, operations and apparatuses in the early stage of man’s development of technology. Laboratory operations employed by the ancient pharmacists and cosmetician reveal their origin in the preparation of food; so too do the techniques of crushing or disintegration (pressing, grinding, impacting), the technology of fermentation, the methods for the preservation of perishable organic material and, the oven. The chemistry and technology of cooking were thus realms of practical knowledge which the Islamic world inherited from the ancient centres of Middle Eastern civilisation. This inheritance was not, however, shared equally by all the population. Techniques which had perhaps originated or else been refined in the kitchens of the ancient temple and the palace were appropriated by the mediaeval urban cook, whereas the rural and nomadic populations retained the more primitive methods of food preparation. The technological gap between the urban and rural domains can be explained as a function of the distribution of power in the economic sphere and ultimately of social stratification and its ramifications in the political sphere.

Data relating to the kitchen in the classical period (ca. 200-800 A.H.) are found most abundantly in the specialist culinary treatises. Few of these, unfortunately, are extant. The social milieu reflected by the cookbooks is, however, that of numerous urban households, although it would be safe to assume that both palace and domestic kitchens shared a culinary lore and a range and type of utensils in common. Apart from this we know little of the operations and personnel of the palace kitchens in particular, except that they were of a far greater scale than those in the domestic sphere. For example, Hīlāl al-Ashāb narrates that in the time of the Mughals (ca. 289/902) the imperial “cook houses” (matbākh) were separate from the bakeries (matbāḥāz) and the caliph was served from his own private kitchen while the public’s needs were catered to from a different one. (Tuhfāt al-ʿumāra‘, fi taʾrīkh al-uẓarā‘, ed. ‘Abd al-Sattār Farādī, Cairo 1958, 20-2). Domestic households of a comfortable standard would have had their bread baked and food cooked in the same complex.

The concept and design of the kitchen in a traditional open courtyard house has probably remained unchanged from mediaeval times to the last surviving examples in modern-day Baghdad. Indeed, the essential characteristics of the mediaeval open courtyard house in Iran are said to be the Mesopotamian in origin and inspiration (see Suhib al-ʿAzzāwī, A descriptive, analytical and comparative study of traditional courtyard houses and modern courtyard houses in Baghdad, Bartlett School of Architecture and Planning, University of London Ph.D. thesis, unpubl.). The kitchen (the contemporary expression bayt al-matbakh being equivalent to the lexicalists’ bayt al-tabbakhā and matbakh) in multi-courtyard dwellings was a whole complex comprising the kitchen proper, opening on to its own courtyard with adjoining ancillary areas such as store rooms, latrine and bathwell, and possibly a cook’s room. The upper part of the courtyard, level with the first floor of the house, was surrounded by blank walls and open to the sky. The kitchen of a single courtyard house faced directly on to the courtyard itself and had either fewer or no ancillary areas attached to it. Larger multi-courtyard houses might have a second kitchen adjacent to the rooms where guests were entertained. Palaces of the caliph and the four-ASF princes were doubtless fashioned on a much larger scale but along essentially similar lines. Contrast this special function kitchen complex with Lane’s description of a peasant’s house in Lower Egypt in the 19th century, in which one room generally had an oven (Eg. farn) “at the end farther from the entrance and occupying the whole width of the chamber. It resembles a wide bench or seat and is about breast high: it is constructed of brick and mud, the roof arched within and flat on top.” During the cold months, the inhabitants would sleep either on top of a warmed oven or on the floor of the same room (Manners and customs of the modern Egyptians, London 1837, i, 30). Along the social spectrum, therefore, food preparation was performed in areas ranging from greater to lesser specialisation: from the separate public and private kitchens and bakehouses of the palaces to the shared kitchen-habitable area of the peasant’s dwelling.

The well-equipped kitchen in an urban household generally contained two major appliances. One was the baking oven, the tanārū, of Mesopotamian origin (Akkadian tiniru; see A. Salonen, Die Omen der alten Mesopotamier, in Baghdader Mitteilungen, iii [1964], 100-14). Another was the tāโหลด, which generally took the appearance of a large, inverted pot, from which it probably evolved. Fuel, preferably good charcoal, was
inserted through a side opening, ignited, and when the oven was sufficiently hot, baking could commence. The oven’s temperature could be adjusted to some extent by closing its open top, the so-called “eye” or “mouth” of the oven, and its other apertures, aithkab (see Fawzi Rasul, al-Tannūr wa-sinā’atuhu fi ‘l-Kitābih, in al-Turāth al-Shā‘īrī, iii/12 [1972], 95-116). The earliest extant culinary manuscript, of late 4th/10th century Ṭrājī provenance, provides a list of implements specifically used in baking bread in a tannūr (see Kūsh al-Tahābīi uwa-taṣlīh al-asfāhiyya al-maṣḥūdī al-ṣinā’atī al-maṣḥūdī, by Abū Muhammad al-Muzaffar b. Naṣr b. Sayyār al-Warrak, Oxford, Bodleian, ms. Hunt. 187; now ed. K. Öhrnberg and S. Mrouch, Helsinki 1987). These include a dough board (lawḥ); a small rolling pin (ṣhawbak) for the ordinary loaf (ragḥi) and a large one for the thin rikdā; a feather for coating the dough in certain preparations; a wooden bowl (ṣafna or mīṭqin) in which the dough was mixed and a metal scraper (mahfik) for cleaning it afterwards. Yeast was kept in a wooden container called a mkhab. A cloth (mamidī) was used to wipe a loaf clean before baking and another was used for wiping down the oven to remove unwanted moisture or condensation. A poker (ṣinā’āra) was used to remove the loaf from the oven if it fell upon the floor inside, and a metal instrument (mihruk) was used for raking out the embers and ash from the oven when baking was finished.

The tannūr was not used exclusively for baking bread. A recipe for a kind of chicken pie made in a pan (miklāb) is described as being lowered into the oven to cook and another dish, a meat, rice and vegetable casserole made in a pot (kidr) was placed in the oven to finish cooking. Both these dishes were called tannūrā; or oven-dish, which were often left to stew gently overnight in a slowly cooling oven and served the following day (al-Warrak, ṣab 87).

The second major cooking contrivance found in the kitchen was the so-called simply as the “fire-place”, mustaunikad. This was designed to accommodate several cooking pots and/or pans side-by-side at the same time. It was erected to about half-a-person’s height, giving easy access to the cooking food and was provided with vents allowing for an intake of air over the coals and for the expulsion of smoke. It is evident that many dishes required more than one pot in their preparation, hence several “elements” might be used in the preparation of a single meal. Another, apparently independent, type of mustaunikad was recommended for the preparation of sweetmeats. Its single element accommodated a miklāb or tangīr, the vessels in which sweetmeats were commonly made. These dishes required long cooking over a low heat accompanied by vigorous stirring of the pan’s contents. The shape and position of this mustaunikad would have made it easier to hold the pan and to control the heat (al-Warrak, fol. 13a).

Al-Warrak’s depiction of the mediaeval batterie de cuisine continues with a list of utensils employed in the preparation of the innumerable main dishes. Cooking pots (kudār, sing. kidr) made of stone, earthenware, copper or lead came in various sizes. The largest pots were reported to hold the carcasses of four goats (al-Mas‘ūdī, Mursūdū, viii, 54 = §3173). Such cauldrons, however, were more apt to be found in the palace kitchens or an army field mess than in a domestic kitchen; contemporary recipes do not suggest such crude bulk of ingredients. Judging from certain archaeolog- ical and textual data, it appears that the “pots” and “casserole” types appear more modest in size. Remains from a Byzantine pottery factory in Cyprus reveal that the largest restored cooking pot item was 0.27 m high and 0.31 m at its greatest diameter; the smallest was 0.135 m high and 0.21 m at its greatest diameter. Casseroles with lip-edge type rims which were probably provided with lids were smaller still, the largest restored item being 0.11 m high and 0.27 m in diameter. (H. W. Cadloug, An early Byzantine pottery factory at Dhosiros in Cyprus, in Levant, iv [1972], 1-82). These vessel sizes seem appropriate to the needs of even large domestic households.

Pans (sing. mīkhāl or mīkhālit) generally used for frying fish and the like were made of iron. A stone-made mīkhāl was used for other purposes, although the distinction between it and the former is unclear. Other utensils found in the kitchen were roasting skewers (sing. sāffūd); a copper basin (nudra) for washing smaller containers and vessels in hot water; a large copper rod-like instrument (mihabak) for stuffing intestines; a large knife for jointing meat and smaller ones for cutting up vegetables; several kinds of strainer (mīṣāf) made of wood or metal; a ladle (mīghara) and a mallet (mīshāb). Spices were crushed or powdered in a mortar (ḥā‘un) and kept in glass vessels. A similar but larger stone mortar (dajā‘un) was used for pounding meat or crushing vegetables; while meat was cut up on a wooden table or large wooden surface (djiwān).

As with bread-making operations, al-Warrak lists separately implements for making sweetmeats (haṭırat). Frequently these dishes were served shaped in the form of a fish or bird fashioned thus by means of a mould (kālab, pl. kāwédīb). In other cases sweetmeats were presented at a table decorated in a manner appropriate for the occasion. The thick syrupy substance which was the base of many kinds of halwā was stirred slowly in a pan over the fire with utensils called an ṣī‘ām and a kathā fāṭiriyā. Some preparations were rolled out after cooking on a marble slab (rūkdhīmā) before being cut into individual pieces. (The above data may be compared with Athenian household utensils in the classical period in B. A. Sparkes, The Greek kitchen, in. f. of Hellenic Studies, lxiii [1962], 121-37.)

The separate lists of utensils for different tasks mentioned in al-Warrak’s work suggests that at least in the larger, prosperous households both a baker and possibly a sweetmeker might have been retained in addition to a cook and other assistants. It may indeed be the case too, as Pellat has proposed, that the baker’s (al-DAQIBH) initial function evolved into that of a chief kitchen steward or even household majordomo (al-Dajāb, Buchjud, tr. Ch. Pellat, Le livre des astres, 213, 258). The sweetmeker, on the other hand, may have been more often a market-based specialist commissioned to make his wares in people’s kitchens when the need or occasion demanded. By and large, therefore, a household’s status was marked socially, in part, by its degree of independence from the commercial cooked food establishments of the market which catered more to the needs of other sections of the population. Despite allusions in the Thousand and One Nights to “sending out” for food cooked in the market, the ṭisha manuals convey the impression that such fare was to be regarded with some suspicion. This impression is underlined by the existence of one market institution which must have served many urban households. Dishes initially prepared in the kitchen could be taken to the communal oven (furn), cooked there and returned to the kitchen to be garnished and served. To be cooked in the oven as adjoin spices. Preparation of such a dish in the kitchen ensured a control over its quality; for its part, the furn
served the needs of households which possessed neither adequate kitchen space, equipment or labour for meal preparation or else catered for a household’s special tastes or catered for a very affluent establishment’s needs in terms of confidentiality and security. The facilities served the needs of the Sultan’s palace, to the elite and to the charitable institutions. By fulfilling charitable duties as prescribed by Islam and by leading to the accumulation and redistribution of wealth, these organisations played a crucial role in Ottoman social life and in the economy in general.

a. Special feasts and foods. Feeding people or giving public feasts had an important ritualistic-ceremonial and political function among the pastoral nomads of Eurasia. In the Kök-Türk inscriptions dated 732–5 A.D. (ed. H. N. Orkun, IC 10, ID 16, 17), the primary task and accomplishment of a Kaghan was described as “the feeding and clothing of his people”. In the Katadug bilig, a royal advice book written in 1070 in Turkish, being generous and “entertaining people with food and drink” were counted among the chief virtues of a prince (tr. R. Dankoff, 107; Inal-Paşa, Katadug Bilig de’er...). Later references to this custom indicate that “feeding his people” was institutionalised within the state organisation. To give a public feast was a privilege and a duty of the ruler. The institution was known as toy in Turkish (in Mongol toyilgan: Manghel-un an toy, a “royal advice book” written in Turkish). In this context, people were invited to eat in the palace, and the custum was then repeated at the same or similar organsations.

Finally, the kitchen or kitchen complex of the single or multi-court yard house (hast mutfak) allowed a sheep or goat and several fowls to occupy the yard awaiting slaughter and the cooking pot; thus meat could be kept and cooked fresh. Fruits, herbs and certain vegetables were also dried and then stored in the kitchen’s ancillary area along with food prepared by pickling and special condiments such as mum. Homemade beer and wine could be stored there as well. The wide range of activities associated with the transformation of food into “raw to cooked” state (clearly reflected in the treasury of contemporary recipes) indicates the central importance of the kitchen and its management not only to the smooth running of day-to-day family life but also to the broader social and political aspects of food preparation and consumption which existed within the enclosed world of the domestic compound.

Bibliography: In addition to works cited in the article, the following items have been selected which contain data more closely related to kitchen technology than to cooking as such: R. J. Forbes, Food and drink, in A history of technology, ed. C. Singer et alii, Oxford 1957, ii, 103-45; idem, Chemical, culinary and cosmetic arts, in ibid., i, 270-85; J. Needham, Science and civilisation in China, Cambridge 1980, vi/4, 1-210; M. M. Ahsan, Social life under the Abbasids, London 1979, 76-164; Margaret Arnot (ed.), Gastronomy: the anthropology of food and food habits, The Hague 1975; D. Waines, Prolegomena to the study of cooking in Abbasid times, in School of Abbasid Studies, Occasional Papers, no. 1, St. Andrews University 1986, 30-9. (D. Waines)

2. In Ottoman Turkey. In Ottoman society, matbaakhir, in vernacular Turkish mutfak, the kitchen, had a central importance not only because the members of the ruling elite had to feed their large retinues but also because, as a social institution, it served to establish and symbolise patrimonial bonds in society. Feeding people gave rise to a variety of formal organisations related to the Sultan’s palace, to the elite and to the charitable institutions.
been the case in ancient Iran (Dhabih Allah Safa, Gah-
shumdn wa djashnhd-yiIrdniydn, n.d., n.p., 43-5, 51, 55, 81-102; I. Hüzmærş, Saray, 366, 371, 507). The festivals of Iranian origin were, in the course of
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work involved in the procurement of provisions and the preparation and distribution of food within the Palace was under the responsibility of the kilerdji-bashi, also known as sar-kilari-i khasia, or the Head of the Imperial Larder. He was the chief of the third of the Imperial Chambers which were in direct contact with the Sultan. The staff under the kilerdji-bashi grew considerably over the course of time, from 20 in the early 16th century to 134 in 1090/1679 (Uzunçarşı, 315). The number of cooks in the ten Imperial Kitchens also increased considerably, as follows:

Table I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Number (includes staff of storerooms and ovens)</th>
<th>Salary</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>916/1510</td>
<td>260 (50 of the usta)</td>
<td>654,900</td>
<td>IFM, xv, 308-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>933/1526</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>2,536,056</td>
<td>IFM, xvii, 333-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>978/1570</td>
<td>1570</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The cooks, ashdjisi or tábbaḫkısı, were organised in an odjak (corps), which was divided into bołaks, in the same way as other military corps at the Porte. The corps was headed by the sar-tábbaḫkısı-i khasia, also known as baş-ı ashdjiğ-i-başı with the rank of ashdjiğ. As in other corps, the ashdjisi was assisted by a kdtib, or the Head of the Imperial Chambers which were in direct contact with the Sultan. He was the chief of the third of the Imperial Chambers which were in direct contact with the Sultan. The staff under the kilerdji-bashi grew considerably over the course of time, from 20 in the early 16th century to 134 in 1090/1679 (Uzunçarşı, 315). The number of cooks in the ten Imperial Kitchens also increased considerably, as follows:

Table II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>900/1494</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>IFM, xv, 308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>916/1510</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Cantacassin, 70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ca. 920/1514</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>IFM, xv, 313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1018/1609</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>Ayin 4Ali, 97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1079/1668</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>IFM, xvii, 228</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Sultan’s cooks competed to please the Sultan by preparing special dishes of their own cooking. The Sultan showed his pleasure by giving a reward (inşâm) (records in Belğeler, ix, 300, 305). Thus the Ottoman Palace was considered as a centre where Ottoman Turkish cooking excelled and where creative chefs were trained (see A. Muhtar, Ay-er). Detailed records on the ingredients used are to be found in the kitchen expenditure books (see the registers called Muhasebesi i kilerdjiğ-i khasia published by O. L. Barkan, Belğeler, ix, and the Bayekkâlet Archives, Istanbul, K. Kepeci

tasmifi, Mattabakh-i Âmira muhasıbe defterleri; for Ottoman cookery in the mid-17th century, see Seyyid Mehmed, Sobhet-nâme, Topkapı Sarayı Library, Hazine K. 1425 and 1418). Provisional palaces were to be supplied regularly to the imperial kitchens under the supervision of a mattabakh emini, who organised their delivery. Also responsible for book keeping and accounts, he was assisted by a kâtib-i khasi, two kâtibs (scribes) and a larder attendant (kilerdji). A bureaucrat of the rank of kilerdji was nevertheless a dependant of the kilerdji-bashi (for the functions of the emini, see, e.g. Muhasebe defteri, BA, K. Kepeci no. 7921). Provisional palaces were supplied either from the market or as sülüsye or odjogli (see MUKATA[N] regularly procured from the resources under the control of the finance department. The tremendous amount of meat consumed at the imperial palaces give rise to a vast organisation under a kásába-bashi, who was financially dependent on the mattabakh emini. For the kitchens of the Topkapı Palace alone, the annual consumption of lamb was about 1,270 tons, costing 12 million akças. The other three palaces consumed 458 tons annually (IFM, xvii, 295-8). The kitchen expenditures of the temporary embassies were met by the Porte. In 1079/1669, e.g., the Russians received provisions worth 347,000 akças.

Table III

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Salary</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Table III (in gold pieces)</th>
<th>Under Süleyman I</th>
<th>Selim II</th>
<th>Murad III</th>
<th>In 1072/1661</th>
<th>In 1164/1750</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Million akças</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>369,000</td>
<td>328,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The organisation of the kitchen in the houses of the elite was a miniature replica of the Sultan’s one. It included two separate kitchens, one for the lord and the other for the servants. Both had master cooks (usta) and apprentices or assistants (şâfiyân). In 1082/1671 a vizier-governor, 'Umar (Omer) Paşa’s kitchen personnel (see M. Kunt, 15-22) consisted of one mattabakh emini, also known as wakil-khârî, six cooks, six pantriesmen (kilârî), two shopping boys and one butcher. Expenditure for provisions through the wakil-khârî amounted to about 8,600 gold pieces or 16.7% of the Paşa’s total expenditure. Members of the élite spent an unusual amount of money for kitchen expenses, not only because they had large retinues to feed (in 'Umar Paşa’s case, 220 persons) but also because they were expected “to keep the house open” to visitors. In the houses of the élite and well-to-do, the mattabakh and the furun (oven) were to be found often as separate constructions in the courtyard. c. The 'Imâret and Zâviyes. The 'Imârets functioned as an extensive network of social aid in Ottoman society, particularly in the cities. Numerous
'imaret provided food for thousands of people who did not have an independent source of income. Charity, materialised through the institution of 'imaret, was a key component of a more general system of public soup kitchens, which, in the wake of the religious and political turmoil caused by the Ottoman expansion and settlement, when hundreds of 'züveyes and similar institutions were established throughout the empire; in 936/1530 there were 626 'züveyes and 145 'imarets, 1 kolonizer-kâhi and 1 meceler-kâhi in the province of Anatolia (western Asia Minor).

As a rule, a 'züvey encompassed two sections, a tekke (convent), where the dervishes performed their religious rites, and a mabâkh or ikâ-roi, where food was prepared and distributed to the dervishes, to travellers and to the needy. The mabâkh was considered so important that in the early eleventh century it was elevated to a single religious structure, and took up by far the largest share of the 'züvey's revenue (see Faroqui, Der Bektashi-Orden, 48-75). In the urban 'züveyes, the residents of the quarter where the 'züvey was built set up additional ikâfs to supplement the salaries of the servants or to pay for the preparation and distribution of food on holy days (sandals). Thus the 'züvey, like the mosque of the quarter, constituted a common religious centre as well as a charitable institution (see Istanbul vakiflar, ed. Ayverdi and Barkan) in the mahalla (q.v.).

Bibliography: Bayvekâlet Archives, Istanbul: Sarây-ı Hümnayın Matbâkh-i 'imâre ve Kiler defterleri, K. Kepeci Tasm. no. 7270-7388; Mâliyeden Mûdevver Defterler, nos. 214, 15907; O. L. Barkan, Istanbul saraylarina ait mubahede defterleri, in Belleten, xi (1979), 430; idem, Yunan imperatorluğunun materiali daiär nillar, in Istanbul Üniversitesi İktisat Fakültesi Mecmuası (abbrev. IFM), xv, 304, 308, 311-13; xxii, 228, 233, 253, 286, 295-98, 308, 311-13, 334-35; idem, Saray mubahedânın 894-895 (1489-1490) yılına ait mehalle bilançosu, in IFM, xxiii, 308-98; idem, Fâthi camii ve imaret-i teşvîkâtîn tarihine giris, in ibid., 296-341; idem, Edirne ve çevresindeki bazı imaret taksirâtının tarihine giris, in IFM, i, 235-377; Istanbul vakiflarî tahrît defterleri, eds. E. H. Ayverdi and O. L. Barkan, Istanbul 1970; O. Nuri (Ergin), Meğêlî-ye umârî belediyeye, Istanbul 1922, 393-878. Food cults and rituals of the Turks: Abdulkadir İnan, Oran ve ülüs mesâleleri, in Makakeler ve inceleme, Ankara, TTK 1968, 241-54; idem, 'Aşık ve Kırkşim'da 'Yeşilık hakikî' ve konuk aşır mesâleleri, in ibid., 281-91; idem, Hâr-i Yâma deyimîn kemî, in ibid., 645-48; B. Ögel, Türk kültürü tarihine giris, iv, Istanbul 1978; idem, Türkiye halkının kültür kökenleri, in Bestemle teknikleri, Istanbul 1976; idem, Kurut, eki bir turk âzîzî, in Folklor Arast. dergisi, v. xiiii, 306-41. For better service, a tawzî-i-nâmâ, or regulation for distribution (ed. A. S. Unver, Fâthî aşkânîn tezî-nâmîsî, Istanbul 1953) was drawn in 952/1545. The food, when left over, was further distributed among the poor in the neighbourhood, with widows and orphans getting priority. Those benefiting from an 'imaret are listed, in order, as the fakûn (destitute) coming first, and then masûfîn (those unable to make a livelihood) and musâfirîn (travellers). Sometimes poor orphans (yatîn) and school children are also mentioned in the 'imaret deeds among the beneficiaries. Der-"vîzî 'züveyes are included in the category of establishments which offered food and shelter to travellers and the needy. In the documents granting arable land as mulki-'âzkâf to the 'shâykh of a 'züveye, it is always stipulated that his primary duty is to provide food and shelter to travellers (see Vakıflar Dergisi, iii, 304-53). In the countryside, the 'züveye was thought indispensable for people travelling and a factor promoting settlement and prosperity. Anyway, helping travellers was included among the zakât [q.v.] duties and the performance of this duty in the name of the Sultan was given to the care of a dervish community, as an old Islamic tradition. The 'züveyes of the aâhîs [q.v.] were particularly active during the first period of Ottoman expansion and settlement, when hundreds of 'züveyes and similar institutions were established throughout the empire; in 936/1530 there were 626 'züveyes and 145 'imarets, 1 kolonizer-kâhi and 1 meceler-kâhi in the province of Anatolia (western Asia Minor).
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i, Turkish tr. A. Temir, Istanbul 1954, 306-9. See also Dhabihallah Sağaf, Gidhshumdri wa-djashnhd-yi ghi ... fluctuations in prices); the livestock would be fattened under the care of the cooks; a kitchen-garden was also


established to provide a continual supply of fresh vegetables. Livestock was slaughtered outside the city or camp by a river or tank, and the meat washed and sent to the kitchen in sealed sacks; within the kitchen it would again be washed in selected water taken from sealed vessels before being cooked. During the cooking processes, in which every dish would be under the supervision of one of the sub-bakāwals, awnings would be spread and lookers-on carefully kept away; the finished dishes, after being tasted by the cooks and the bakāwals, would be served in utensils of gold or silver, tinned copper or earthenware, tasted by the mīr bakāwāl, tied up in cloths and sealed, with a note of their contents, before being sent to the table; as an additional precaution a storekeeper would send also a list of the vessels used, so that none of the dishes might be substituted by an unauthorised one, and the used vessels had to be checked against the list when they were returned. As the food was carried from the kitchen by the bakāwals, cooks and others, guarded by mace bearers, a similar procession would be sent from the bakery, the ābār-khāna, and the mēwā-khāna, all dishes again sealed by a bakāwāl. Some dishes from the Imperial table might be sent, as a mark of special favour, to the queens and princesses; but of course the kitchen was kept busy the whole time, apart from the meals required for the emperor’s table, in providing meals for the zamāna.

As remarked above, s.v. Ganga, the water of the Ganges had a special reputation for purity, and here perhaps pre-Mughal usage is perpetuated in that Muhammad b. Tughluk is known to have used special couriers to bring Ganges water to his court; Akbar while at Agra or Fatehpur Sikri is said to have obtained Ganges water from Suron (miscalled Sarun in Blochmann’s tr. of Akbar, a’un 22), a town of some antiquity now no longer on the main channel of the Ganges, and while in Lāhowr from Hardwār. His practice was followed by later Mughal rulers. This was used for drinking water; but even water for cooking purposes had a small amount of Ganges water mixed with it. Trustworthy persons drew the water and despatched it to court in sealed jars. Drinking water was at first cooled in sealed containers stirred in a vessel containing a solution of saltpetre, although after the court moved to the Pandjab, ice was regularly used, brought from the Pandjab hills by land or water. For all these arrangements the ābār-khāna was responsible, and also for the provision of shrabat when required; indeed, in the reign of Džahāngīr the ābār-khāna was known as the shrabat-khāna. On the march or in camp, drinking water was cooled by being carried in a tinned flask covered with a cloth wrapping which was kept constantly moist, so that the contents were cooled by evaporation from the surface, as in the modern army water-bottle (the evidence of Mughal paintings shows a simpler method, still in use): the water is kept in a large earthenware vessel (suraḥ), only lightly glazed or unglazed, mounted on a simple stand and placed so as to catch any breeze.

The mēwā-khāna received much attention from the Mughal emperors. Bābur, in a touching passage in the Tāzuk, recalls the delights of the grapes and melons which had been brought as presents from India; but such luxuries were later regularly imported after the conquest of Kābul, Kandahār and Kashmīr, and Akbar settled horticulturists from ‘Irān and Tārān’ for the cultivation of fruit trees in India. Abu ‘l-Fadl, ā’in-i Akbari, ā’in 28, gives a list of some two dozen imported fruits and nuts, three dozen native Indian sweet fruits, and a score of sour and sub-acid fruits. A special ‘fruit’ described in this section is the pān, a heart-shaped green leaf smeared with lime and catechu, to which is added slices or granules of betel-nut with aromatic spices, sometimes camphor, musk, or costly perfumes, and rolled into a bōrī, which may then be finished with silver or even gold leaf. A pān was often presented to a courtier as a mark of royal favour, and Mughal brass pandāns, with compartments to hold the leaves, nuts and other requisites, were also presented as gifts.

Abu ‘l-Fadl’s account shows further what kinds of dishes were prepared for the Imperial table, and he gives thirty specimen receipts—or rather lists of ingredients, since there is no information about the cooking processes involved. These are divided into three categories: bēg-yātī (meatless), ‘commonly called sufyaṇa’; gōlij hi-birdānd, meat with rice; and abāzīr, spiced dishes. The categories, however, do not seem to be mutually exclusive. There is already ample evidence for the Indianisation of the Mughal fare, in both the ingredients (including cardamoms, cinnamon, saffron, ample fresh ginger root, asafoetida, turmeric and others among the spices; chilies are conspicuously absent, and sumāk, a favourite Persian condiment, appears only once) and the nomenclature (dāl, lentilts; sāg, a spinach dish; čapāšt among the breads; kēhīrī among the rice dishes). Abu ‘l-Fadl’s list of current market prices for common commodities (ā’in 27) refers to many by Indian names (e.g. mūng and mōth among the lentils) and includes such Indian favourites as mangoes-in-oil and lemons-in-oil, among the pickles.

The large number of meatless dishes calls for comment. Akbar declared a number of sufyaṇa days in which he ate no meat, including Fridays, Sundays (because, according to Džahāngīr, it was the day of his birth), the first day of each solar month, and throughout the month of Aḵān and at least part of Farwārdīn, and on many other days detailed by Abu ‘l-Fadl; he increased the number of sufyaṇa days each year, and on these days no animals were permitted to be slaughtered. Džahāngīr, whose Tāzuk shows him to have been a connoisseur of good food, ate sufyaṇa meals on Sundays in his father’s memory, and on Thursdays to commemorate his own accession.

The kitchen department had also obviously to provide for the wine and other intoxicants used in the court, for although the official chroniclers are too freely, to judge by the fate of Akbar’s sons Murād and Dāniyāl, and many others!)

Since the ingredients (including cardamoms, cinnamon, saffron, ample fresh ginger root, asafoetida, turmeric and others among the spices; chilies are conspicuously absent, and sumāk, a favourite Persian condiment, appears only once) and the nomenclature (dāl, lentilts; sāg, a spinach dish; čapāšt among the breads; kēhīrī among the rice dishes). Abu ‘l-Fadl’s list of current market prices for common commodities (ā’in 27) refers to many by Indian names (e.g. mūng and mōth among the lentils) and includes such Indian favourites as mangoes-in-oil and lemons-in-oil, among the pickles.

The large number of meatless dishes calls for comment. Akbar declared a number of sufyaṇa days in which he ate no meat, including Fridays, Sundays (because, according to Džahāngīr, it was the day of his birth), the first day of each solar month, and throughout the month of Aḵān and at least part of Farwārdīn, and on many other days detailed by Abu ‘l-Fadl; he increased the number of sufyaṇa days each year, and on these days no animals were permitted to be slaughtered. Džahāngīr, whose Tāzuk shows him to have been a connoisseur of good food, ate sufyaṇa meals on Sundays in his father’s memory, and on Thursdays to commemorate his own accession.

The kitchen department had also obviously to provide for the wine and other intoxicants used in the court, for although the official chroniclers are too freely, to judge by the fate of Akbar’s sons Murād and Dāniyāl, and many others!

A subordinate kitchen department, not part of the household, existed to provide food in the langar-khāna, soup-kitchen, established as a charity among many of the royal courts to provide simple food for the poor.

Bibliography: The most complete information is to be found in Abu ‘l-Fadl’s Aḏālī, ā’in-i Akbari, i, ā’in 22-8. Sporadic information in Tāzuk-i Bābur, Gubaldan Begam, Humayun-nāma; Kḥān- damīr, Kāṁūn-i Humayūnī, Tāzuk-i Džahāngīr. Occasional light is thrown by the accounts of European travellers, especially Manucci, Storia do Mogor; Monserrate, Mongolicae legationis commentarii, Eng. tr. J. S. Hoyland, 1922, 199; Bernier; Tavernier; Peter Mundy; and Sir Thomas Roe, Embassy;...

MATERIALISTS [see DAHRIYYA, MADDIYYA].

MATGHARA, the name of a Berber tribe belonging to the great family of the Butr [q.v.]; they were related to the Zanāta and brethren of the Banū Fatin. Like the other tribes belonging to this group, the Matghara originally came from Tripolitania; the most eastern members of the Banū Fatin, the Matghara of the Central Atlas do not seem to have played any part in politics; but they nevertheless retained their independence. From the 11th/17th century, they seem to have been supplanted on their territory by invaders from the south. As to the Matghara of the shore, settled in the region of Nadrūma, their alliance with the Kumiya gained them considerable political importance, when the latter became supporters of the Almohads. It was at this period that they built the fortress of Tawunt. They then rallied to the Marinids [q.v.] but this brought upon them the wrath of the ruler of Tlemcen, the celebrated Yaghmurās, who finally crushed them.

Ibn Hazm, Djamharat ansāb al-'Arab, ed. Lévi-Provençal, 496, and Ibn Khaldūn use the form Madghara instead of Matghara; in Moroccan texts of late date we also find Madghara.

Bibliography: Bakrī and Idrīsī, indices; Ibn Khaldūn, Kitāb al-Sībar, tr. de Slane, i, 237-41; Leo Africanus, Description de l'Afrique, tr. Épaulard, 303, 4, 353 and index. (G. S. COLIN)

MATHAL [A., pl. mathalū] proverb, popular saying, derives—similarly to Aram. maṭḥa, Hebr. madghara, and Ethiop. mesē, mesāt—from the common Semitic root for “sameness, equality, likeness, equivalent” (cf. Akkad. msqal “equality” mèsqal “half”). In Arabic, to create a proverb is fa-arsala(th), or dja(sal)th maṭṭal, fa-larabah(t) bihi l-mathal; to become proverbial is dušbah bihi l-mathal, mathalū yadrubu fa-djababah(t), or djanā’gara l-mathal, or, simply, fa-sara maṭṭal.

I. IN ARABIC

1. Definition

2. Arabic proverbs

(1) Earliest layer

(a) fables
(b) stories
(c) inscriptions, verse
(d) hikma

(2) Second layer

(a) ‘Ali
(b) turns of speech
(c) Islamic forms

(3) Third layer

(a) mouths of people
(b) parallels

(4) afab min
(5) muwalla‘a
(6) NT and OT, etc.
(7) stories
(8) only locally current
(9) quoted verses
(10) Kur‘ān and hadith

(a) ‘wisdom’

iii. Arabic collections

(1) Abū ‘Ubayd
(a) al-Mufaddal
(b) Mu‘arridj

(2) Muhammad b. Habib

(10) Ibn ‘Asim

iv. Modern collections

(1) European
(2) Oriental
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The Arabic philologists have since Abū ‘Ubayd (d.224/838) repeatedly defined the concept of mathal.
They have discerned and set forth its three essential characteristics: comparison, sc. the metaphorical way of expression (taṣḥīḥ); brevity (ṭāqāz al-lafs); and familiarity (ṣābīr). They have established (a) that amthāl are based on experience and therefore contain practical wisdom, e.g., guidance (kīmās); (b) that by their use facts can be stated pointedly and intelligibly in an indirect way (kinnāyā); and (c) that by making use of amthāl it becomes possible to communicate matters that it would be difficult to communicate in a more straightforward way. This quality of the mathāl is owing to the fact that it can be used individually to represent all, even only remotely, analogous cases and can always remain unchanged in the process, even though the origin of the mathāl may long be forgotten. Abū ʿUbayd stresses the fact that the mathāl “accompanies” the discourse; in doing so he exactly defines the etymological meaning of proverb, nazzūqa in Greek (cf. also the more recent ṣayf al-ḥālāq), and in the Latin adagio, adagium as well as in the later proverbia. Al-Zamakhshāri (d. 538/1144) correctly remarks, that—corresponding to its true etymological meaning—ṣirāf should be considered to be the basic meaning of mathāl, cf. R. Sellheim, Die klassisch-arabischen Sprichwörtersammlungen, insbesondere die des Abū ʿUbayd, Ph.D. thesis, Univ. of Frankfurt am Main 1953, The Hague 1954, 8-20; idem, Arabic, revised and enlarged edition, al-Amthāl al-arabiyah al-kadima, tr. R. Sellheim, Beirut 1971 (repr. 1979), or A. Abd al-Tawwab, Beirut 1391/1971 (repr. in „Oriental wisdom, six essays of the sapiental traditions of the Arabs”, and its pre-Islamic times were very much alive in the centres of urban civilisation and much in demand at court and in various offices. Whatever in them ran counter to Islamic notions, laws and bans, was excused as having happened in the Dāhiliyya and as being worth preserving. In the struggle for survival under desert conditions, solidarity at any price among tribesmen is insisted upon: wāf al-ʿamthāl min al-mashaf “as your brother whether he is right or wrong.” (Abū ʿUbayd [see below, iii, 1], no. 397: 519, further references here, as for all the following quotations); the father sets an example for the son: marʾan wa-l-khadramu wa-mā zalama “who does as his father does, cannot be wrong—whatever be the merits of the deed” (ibid., no. 408, 833), and the daughter admires him and his exploits unreservedly: kalīb faṣīd bi-abīhā ma-ṭaṣbih (ibid., no. 402). In the permanent search for new pastures for his never-satisfied livestock, the Bedouin must necessarily be irked when he stumbles on pasturages without having his camel with him: ṣubḥān wa-l-ṭārīm “fresh herbage and no camel” (ibid., no. 581); of course, he knows how to appreciate the quality of the fodder, so he measures a normal pasture with the ʿaʾdān plant, which is optimal for camels: marʾan wa-l-kaʿa ‘l-ʿaʾdān (ibid., no. 370). Figurative and metaphoric speech has with great tenacity held its ground among the Semites and especially among the Arabs, and plays an important part even in the higher forms of literature. To the Bedouin, illustrations taken from the animal world around him most easily come to mind. He knows the habits and the reactions of wild animals from his own lifelong experience and observation: ma yajdumu ʿayna ʿl-ʿardat wa-l-ʿamān “what could bring a mountain goat and an ostrich together?” (ibid., no. 898), if two things are incomparable, for the goat lives among the rocks and the ostrich on the desert plain! Allusions to human beings are expressly added: innā huwa ʿl-ṣināʿa min ḍabbīn “he is trickier than a hunted lizard” (ibid., no. 1229; cf. no. 597), or ʿayna kalan maḥīk kušaʿya “a kite-fire is not like a ʿaṭāʾ-ṣibyan” (ibid., no. 993), or al-ṣādīr wa-sāʿiš li-ṭāʿūsh “the wolf waylays the gazelle” (ibid., no. 180), or, expressed in the earthy Bedouin style: la-ḥabīla man bālat ʿl-ṣayāt “be more watchful, or shining, or sharp-eyed than a raven!” (ibid., no. 319), the comparison involving a comparative (cf. below, ii, 4) as a figure of speech is widely used (ʿaṣrī min ṣaḥīh) “sleepier than a c奇特” (ibid., no. 1215 [see FAHĐ]), or innahu ʿl-ṣaḥīḥūr, ʿaṣār, ʿaṣār min ḍarrūhū “more: watchful, or shining, or sharp-eyed than a raven!” (ibid., no. 1210ff); cf. T. Fahd, Psychologie animale et comportement humain dans les proverbes arabes, Revue de Synthèse, iii série, liii-lixiv (1971), 5-43; bx-lxvi (1972), 43-63; lxxv-lxxvii (1974), 233-56; xcii (1978), 307-56.

(a) Some such amthāl about animals occur in connection with a fable. In these, different kinds of animals customarily are assigned well-defined parts: the hyena (dhabū), e.g., appears as stupid (ibid., nos. 77-80), and the lizard (dabb) as clever (ibid., nos. 296, 597, 1229); cf. C. Brockelmann, Fabel und Tiermärchen in der älteren arabischen Literatur, in Islamica, ii (1926), 96-128 (cf. below, i, 1, b); Gholam-Ali Karimi, Le conte animalier dans la littérature arabe avant la traduction de Kalila wa Dimna, in BEU: OR., xxviii (1975), 51-6; M. Ullmann, Das Gespräch mit dem Wolf, Munich 1981 (= SB Bayer. Ak., 1981, 2).
(b) Much more numerous than these fables with animals for characters are the stories of the type of the *akhir* of the *ayyám al-‘Arab,* which are rendered with preference according to al-Mufaddal al-Dabbi or Ibn al-Kalbi; cf. the lists of *ayyám al-‘Arab* in al-Fāghrī (see below, iii, 4), no. 442 (360), and al-Mavdānī (see below, iii, 12), ch. xxix. The "heroes" in these stories are sometimes known from tradition or genealogy, as e.g. al-Basūs [q. e.], whose she-camel triggered a forty years’ war between the Banū Bakt b. Wā’il [q. e.] and their kinsmen, the Banū Taghlīb b. Wā’il (ibid., no. 1260), or al-Mundhūrī, or al-Nu’mān b. al-Mundhūrī, the prince of the Lakhdīmīs, who had the innocuous poet Ḥibīb b. al-‘Arabī [q. e.] killed in order not to break an oath (ibid., nos. 1048, 1150), or the nameless poor butcher dealer, who was violated by a ruffian after he had caused her to close tightly the necks of two butter-filled skins with both her hands at the same time (ibid., no. 1278). Many of these mostly short stories may have originated in an actual happening. Time and place however remain, as a rule, undefined. Their etiological character is obvious: the storyteller is interested in the question of who used the saying first, or of how it came to be coined at all, that is, in the *awā’il [q. e.]* problem. The information which they contain can be exploited to answer questions concerning names and genealogies, but they are not historical, at the most anecdotal; cf. esp. the *Kitāb al-Amdahl* of al-Mufaddal al-Dabbi (see below, iii, 1, a; Sellheim, op. cit., 47ff., 75ff., and 27-39, 50-63). Many of them are overgrown with myths, legends, and fairy tales; internationally disseminated themes have thus found their way into them, most likely by way of the Lakhdīmī court at al-Hira as an intermediary: the letter of Uriah (sahīfah al-Mutalammis [q. v.]), the legend of Zenobia, the reward of Sinimmar (cf. Sura XVIII [Lukman], 18), and its original meaning had long been forgotten, as e.g. the proverb of al-Nabīgha al-And., xxxvii [1972], 249-323). It ought in the verse of pre-Islamic times, as e.g. "you cannot pluck grapes from thorns" (sheep, bull) who digs up his own slaughtering knife out of the ground with his hooves, in Greek: ζυγός οὐ πλάκας. Abu ’l-‘Ubayd gives four different versions: ῥακτικα καὶ ταβάθανα ὑποκείμενα τοῦ μῦθου (Abu ’l-‘Ubayd, nos. 106, 107, 110, 113), p. 166). Furthermore *fa-dqadat* “like the one (ostroch) who wanted horns and ended up with cut-off ears” (ibid., no. 796; cf. no. 527 and al-’Askārī [see below, iii, 7], no. 47), a *mathāl* which has equivalents in Greek (camel): ἡ κυρήκυς ἐπιθυμοῦσα κεριῶν καὶ τὰ δωδεκάδεκα, in the Talmud (Sanhedrin, 106a) and in the different versions of Kalīya wa-Dimna (ch. x. 2: ass for camel). Zuhayr b. Abī Sulmā was wont to insert *amthāl* into his verse, and Kābī b. Sā’d b. Ḥagāwī, who already extends into early Islam, was for the same reason called Kāb’ār al-Amthāl. In their majority, these *amthāl* belong to the category of gnomic sayings, as e.g. the *jawāl* verse of Zuhayr: ... *wa-man lā yaqālīm* ‘l-nas *yaslihū* “and whoever does not wrong his fellow-men, will be wronged [by them]!” (Abu ’l-‘Ubayd, in no. 282); cf. A. Bloch, Zur allarakischen Sprachrichtung, in Weststatische Abhandlungen (Festschrift R. Tschudi), ed. F. Meier, Wiesbaden 1954, 181-224.

(d) *Amthāl* of this kind are likely to have been written down already in ancient times as *kikīm* on, e.g., small scraps of leather or parchment (*madqāla*), papyrus, or palm-leaves (sahīfā), bone, wood-tablets, or on stones (see below, iii). In the Kur‘ān, these dicta of ethic content usually are ascribed to the legendary Lukmān [q. e.] (cf. Sura XVIII [Lukmān], 16), and all the more in later literature (cf. Solomon’s Book of Proverbs in the Old Testament!). The paroemiographers have joined to him the no less legendary umpire of the ancient Arabs Akīmā b. ʿAyīs [q. e.] (cf. al-Maṣūrī, x/3-4 [1402/1981], 161-8); small collections of his *amthāl* can be found in books on *adab,* e.g. in the *Kitāb al-Mu‘ammadī* of Abu Ḥātim al-Sijdīstānī (ed. I. Goldzīher, Leiden 1899, 9-18), or, together with *amthāl* of the equally legendary Sāsānīd wa‘zīr Buzurgmīr [q. e., see x̄awwāljan khirād in Suppl.] in the *Kitāb al-‘Ilāmad al-farid* of Ibn ʿAbī Rabbīh (ed. A. Amin et alii, Cairo 1372/1952, iii, 76-80; cf. E. García Gómez, in der Al-ānd., xxvii [1972], 249-523). It ought to be stressed that among the sayings of Akīmā can be found Matt. vii, 16, innaka lā tagāni min ‘l-‘tashqīk *‘l-adhab* ‘you cannot pluck grapes from thorns’ (Abu ’l-‘Ubayd, nos. 949, 970; cf. Ibn Ḥāshim, 124f.). This and related material, e.g. "beam in thine own eye" (Matt. vii, 3) quoted by
Abū Ubayd (no. 152; cf. below, ii, 6), seems to have been in circulation as amthdl al-huk amd*. In the ... 65, 146, 560, 636, 954, 1058, 1068). Some examples: asmacu
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but I see no flour” (Abū Ubayd, no. 1057), in English “much talk and little wool”, or inna 7-bulaghdth a... regard
to me like nits, whilst there is in his own eyes some-
thing like ajar” (ibid., ii, 254, 17/ch. xxviii, no. 78),

(5) It can be said in a very general way that parallel-
isms in the Arabic proverbs in other languages
and related cultures can be shown the more frequently
to occur the younger these are, the question whether
any particular mathal has in fact been newly coined,
or borrowed, or modelled on an existing proverb must be
left unanswered in most cases; for, as concerns the
social surroundings against the background of which
the amthal must be observed, there are scarcely any
differences any more (cf. above, ii, 1, c). In the case
of similes and comparisons which spontaneously offer
themselves to the mind, foreign models must not
always be sought, much as they may obtrude on our
attention, e.g. man hafara mughawawa = uka’a fisāh
(ibid., no. 872; al-Tabari, ii, 1142), in English “hoist
with one’s own petard”, a proverb which can already
be found in Ps. vii, 16 and Ivī, 7, as well in Prov.
xxxi, 6 and al-Fd’khir, 94 (modern). To this category
belong, even if not expressly identified as
amthdl muwallada,

(2) There is a high degree of likelihood that the well-
known Latin saying re ad triarios redit, redit, or venit,
that is, in order to arrange a completely bungled
affair, is at the bottom of the mathal: šara ‘l-amr ilā ‘l-
naza’at (ibid., no. 438). The question is more difficult
to answer in the case of a mathal like the following one:
man stars ‘l-ili ‘l-zalam a = ‘he who makes the wolf a
shepherd, is in the wrong” (ibid., no. 759). A saying
familiar to the Greeks as of old: λόγος ποντρίου.
The Romans know the simile of the hawk who is entrusted
to answer in the case of a...

(6) In al-Mudānī’s collection of amthal can be
found anonymous sayings from the New Testament;
among these is a saying, familiar to the Gentiles as of old,
that is, “if you talk of the wolf, he

(3) An example of an internationally
known Latin saying is not far off, is probably present in the “new” say-
ings found anonymous from the New Testament; e.g.,

(4) Amthal in the form of af’al min. Reminiscences of Penelope come to the surface in akhrak min nātikatīg ha’zlihā “stupider than a woman who con-
tinually undoes her spinning (weaving)” (Hamza [see below iii, 6], no. 204), a simile that certainly has its
source in Kurān, XVI, 92, or of Sisyphus, aima’s
min kalīm “the one who is more covetous than the one who
turns over the rock” (Hamza, no. 431). As a matter of
course, both persons, female and male, from the
pre-Islamic past are designated by their names and
genealogies! How much or how little account can be
taken of this so-called “historical” tradition becomes
still more evident in the following instance: amthal min hadīl Qurūf “fuller of artifices than the stories
of Khūrāfā” (Hamza, no. 641). Here ēghara (‘fairy
tale” (actually “nonsense”, cf. EP, iii, 369 b, s.v. HIKĀYA), is personified, as happens, too, in the
proverbs and sayings of other peoples (cf. Sellheim,
op.cit., 35-8, 59-62). Even the Prophet is reported to
have told his wife the story of Khūrāfā (al-Fd’khīr, no. 280: typical fairy tales)! This group of amthal of the
af’al min type, in which—like in Greek—attributes
from “intelligent” to “stupid”, from “cleansighted” to
“trustworthy”, etc., and names—among them that of the
Owl’s character Ēdūhā [q.v.] (Hamza, no. 125)—pseudo-names, animals, plants, etc. can be
exchanged indiscriminately, has proliferated into our
own times.

(5) Amthal muwallada. The widely Latin say-
ing labūs in fahāla, that is, “if you talk of the wolf, he
is not far off; or, the probably more metaphorical
expression idhā dhaltara ‘l-dhib ‘a ṭa’āfu (al-Mudānī [see below, iii, 12], i, 57/uFreytag, ch. i, no. 436), which
already Abū Ubayd knows in its abstract form
-urlūsh ‘l-dhib ‘a yaktarib; or, urlūsh ‘l-dhib ‘a ṭanīh (Abū
Ubayd, nos. 140f.), in English “speak of an angel,
and you hear his wings”. Of internationally-known
sayings we may list inna li ‘l-hārī ‘alāram (am-
thdl al-Mudānī, i, 57, 21/ch. i, no. 427), just as, e.g., in
the Midrash, in Persian (cf. M. Grūnbaum, op.cit., 43)
and in English “walls have ears”; or idhā kunta sin-
dānī fa ‘shir wa-udhku ‘l-djicttfa ‘l-mu^tarid? fi
-awesdīj (ibid., i, 58, 18/ch. i, no. 465), in English “hammer and anvil”;
or farra mina ‘l-maitar wa-ka’ada tahtā ‘l-mizāq
(‘fleeing the rain he is sitting under the drippings
(from the roof)’ (ibid.), ii, 25, 5/ch.xx, no. 112; just
as in German; cf. R. Jente, German proverbs from the
Orient, in Publs. of the Modern Lang. Assoc. [of America],
xxviii [1933], 17-37), in English “he jumps out of the
frying-pan into the fire”; or al-harakat barakatīm (ibid.,
i, 155, 20/ch. vii, no. 244), in English “bliss is in
action” (Pope) or “action gives satisfaction”
(modern). To this category belong, even if not
explicitly identified as amthal muwallada, e.g. in kutna
kāt2 ‘a kut2 sūrīt fa-awedīj (ibid., i, 49, 15/ch. i, no. 366),
in English “his liar must have a good memory” (just as
in Latin); or ka l-sāhik bayna ‘l-firāshgīyēn (ibid., ii, 64,
7/chxxii, no. 89), in English “between two stools one
sits on the ground” (just as in Latin); or ka-anaku kādān ‘ala ‘l-rafdī (ibid., ii, 74, 18/ch.xxii, no. 197),
in English “to be on tenderhooks” (cf. above, ii, 1, c;
3, b, 4).

(4) Amthal in the form of af’al min. Reminiscences of Penelope come to the surface in akhrak min nātikatīg ha’zlihā “stupider than a woman who con-
with a verse that renders the NT text word by word; cf. I. Goldziher, in ZDMG, xxxi (1877), 765ff.; idem, Mino. Studii, ii, 191; furth. A. Müller, in ZDMG, xxxii (1877), 519ff., 4524. There is Matt. vii, 15, with its generally-known simile of "the wolf in sheep's clothing", in dhi'bas fi maski sagkulat (ibid., i, 192, 23/ch. ix, no. 70). There are several versions of Matt. vii, 16, the "parable of the "grapes picked from thorns"", an older one (ibid., i, 34, 8/ch. i, no. 210 = Abu 'Ubayd, cf. above; cf. ii, 120, 8/ch. xxii, no. 350), and a younger one (ibid., i, 336, 31/ch. xviii, no. 255, according to Ibn Jan. [no. 490], with further variants, one of them in verse — ibid., i, 182, 4/ch. xxiv, no. 367). Matt. xix, 24, with its well-known parable of the "camel and the ear of a needle" (ibid., ii, 113, 23/ch. xii, no. 316) was known already to Muhammad (Kur'an, VII, 40; cf. above). Matt. xxiv, 24—"...the parable of the "straining at gnats and swallowing camels"—is known in a slightly changed form as a mathal: ya kulu 'l-fil yaqulu 'l-fil (ibid., ii, 73, 2/ch. xxii, no. 185; cf. Ibn Hisham, 124f.; cf. above, ii, 3, b). As for wise sayings that can be shown to have parallels in the Old Testament, see Matt. (cf. al-Maydani, Abu '1-Hasan al-Bayhaki, proves a great exception (see below, iii, 14).

(8) At times the paroemiographers make note of the fact that a certain mathal is currently locally, e.g., in Syria (Abu 'Ubayd, no. 1070), or in 'Umayn (Hamza, no. 443), or in Medina (Hamza, nos. 56, 224, 340, 397), or in Mecca (Hamza, no. 115), or in al-Baṣra (al-Maydani, i, 145, 16/ch. vi, no. 149; cf. Abu 'Ubayd, no. 1144; below, iii, 8). It is interesting to learn by way that in Syria in the 3rd/9th century the Greek fileri "says he" was much used by the Arabs (al-Fākhrī, no. 137), a fashionable expression then, similar to today's American "O.K." of worldwide acceptance. Already Abu 'Ubayd (no. 1349) has recorded: ʻayr ʻl-barnaṣ—or ʻl-barnaṣa—hawa (cf. al-Djawālī, al-Mu'arrab, Cairo 1361/1942, 45), in other words, the Aramaic barāṣa ʻbn Sōn (cf. al-Iṣāṣī, no. 239); one finds this expression recorded: ʻayr ʻl-barnaṣa—or ʻl-barnaṣa—hawa (cf. al-Dhubaib, [cf. below, ii, 135]; in its closest parallel, one may cite ʻl-barnaṣa ʻuwa-lā 'l-kīl ʻl-hayḍaha (a free woman starves herself rather than eats for the price [she is paid for] her breasts') (ibid., no. 569), i.e., she prefers starving to hiring herself out as a wet-nurse, which becomes distorted into the quite meaningless ʻl-kīl ʻl-hayḍaha "and does not eat her breasts". From a misunderstanding of a verse of al-Farazdak in which the way the "free woman" is depicted (ibid., no. 1127; Yākūn and Lane, s.v.) is mentioned, this expression became typical of taking the wrong way (cf. al-Fākhrī, no. 496; Hamza, no. 423).

(9) The few examples adduced here show that for the majority of the amthal a certain formative process can be shown at work, and that includes the inner form—the shaping of the thoughts—and an outer form which exists in the shape of linguistic, stylistic, and metrical peculiarities. Both these phenomena cannot be pursued here (cf. al-Dhubaib, Study [cf. below, iii, 12]; Ch. Pellat, Sur la formation de quelques expressions proverbiales en arabe, in Arabica, xxxii [1976], 1-12). Well-known, appreciated and much-quoted verses, so-called abya size s'ara, were compiled in special collections, e.g., Hamza al-İsfahani's_Kisāb amthal al-İsfahani (an bayda al-dahr) (Brockelmann, i, 132; Sezgin, viii, 20f.; a Cairo edition is under way). Poets like Şāhīb b. Šāhīb al-Ďuddūs or Abu '1-Atāyah have also made use of many amthal in their verse (cf. above, ii, 1, c); the figurative sayings which can be found in al-Mutanabbi's_divān, were, e.g., already extracted and arranged in the poet's own century by al-Ďalālī (d. 1385/995). Such abya size s'ara and countless amthal are spread far and wide across the whole body of Arab literature. This is amply proved when it is noted that literature from al-Ďalālī to al-Ďabīṣ (cf. Mahmūd Ghānīyām, in

nightly storm, which frightened the Baghdādis out of their wits and provoked the caliph al-Mahdī and his retinue to do such penance (al-Maydānī, i, 176/ch. vii, no. 140), is not to be pursued here (cf. al-Dhubaib, [cf. above, ii, 135]; in its closest parallel, one may cite ʻl-barnaṣa ʻuwa-lā 'l-kīl ʻl-hayḍaha (a free woman starves herself rather than eats for the price [she is paid for] her breasts') (ibid., no. 569); the "free woman" is depicted in the way of al-Farazdak (ibid., no. 1127; Yākūn and Lane, s.v.) is mentioned, this expression became typical of taking the wrong way (cf. al-Fākhrī, no. 496; Hamza, no. 423).
In no other branch of classical Arabic literature—cause us to look at later assertions, as e. g. in the Fihrist of Ibn al-Nadim (d. 380/990), that well-known early philologists, as for instance Abu Amr b. al-‘Ali, Yūnus b. Ḥabbā, Abu Zayd al-Anṣārī or al-Asma’ī also wrote books of amthāl, with a wary eye. Information of this kind is all the more doubiful, as also later authorities on the matter, as, e. g. al-‘Irākī (Pseudo-al-Wakidi; see below, iii, 11), expressly speak of a book “ascribed” (al-mansīb) to him in the case of the Kitab al-Amthāl of al-Asma’ī (see below, iii, 1, b; 2, 5, a). Amthāl become available in book form—and moreover in the original draft of their author himself—only in the Kitab al-Amthāl of Abu ‘Ubayd al-‘Irākī (d. 474/1083). It is needed for his plentiful materials—in so far as he has not gathered them himself (cf. above, ii, 3, a)—to the tradition, chiefly according to his teachers, among others, to the above-named philologists. This clearly results from instances where he writes “I do not know from whom I have heard the maθal (nos. 349, 1088), or “I have heard it from somebody other than Abu ‘Ubayda, I think, from Ibn al-Kalbi” (no. 59), or similarly (nos. 1228 and 134, 253, 492, 744). His quotations in the name of al-Mufaddal which he uses to introduce in an impersonal way, e. g. hukma an..., ruzzya an..., mā balaghantu anku..., or correspondingly, can only partly be found in the Kitab al-Amthāl of the author in the version of al-Ṭūsī (see above); of his quotations in the name of Mu‘arridj, whom he always introduces with kalā— as he also does with the other philologists (see above)—none at all can be exemplified in the Kitab al-Amthāl of that authority in the version of al-Yazidī (see above). The kutub al-hikma quoted by Abu ‘Ubayd once (no. 663; cf. nos. 152, 250 and 48, 250, 271, 658; above, ii, 1, d) probably stand for nothing but loose leaves (kitāb [q. v.] on which wise sayings were written, for the purpose, e. g., of being stuck up on the wall of a room. His contemporary al-Dhahīrī (q. v.) knows his haqīqa allāh that with sayings only of the caliph al-Manṣūr which was familiar to the scribes of Baghdaḍ (al-Ṭaṣābur, Cairo 1368/1949, iii, 367). Ibn al-

In the air” (al-Hamadhānī, Rasā’il, Cairo 1368/1949, iii, 367). Ibn al-‘Aṭīf, Haifa, vi (1985), 165-87; U. Marzolph, in OC, ibis [1985], 121-63 and al-Thā’labī (regarding al-Suyūṭī and Bāḥā’ al-Dīn al-Maṣūr) which was familiar to the scribes of Baghdaḍ (al-Baydāwī, Cairo 1368/1949, iii, 367). Ibn al-‘Aṭīf, Haifa, vi (1985), 165-87; U. Marzolph, in OC, ibis [1985], 121-63 and al-Thā’labī (regarding al-Suyūṭī and Bāḥā’ al-Dīn al- Maṣūr) which was familiar to the scribes of Baghdaḍ (al-Baydāwī, Cairo 1368/1949, iii, 367). Ibn al-
Mu'tazz's collection exists in the form of his Kitāb al-Amthdl, ed. I. Kratchkovsky, in Le Monde Oriental, xviii (1924), 56-121. Wise usage of this kind was also called al-ţıkār, not only by Abū ʿUbayd (nos. 153, 794, 795), and philological explanations, together with verses commenting on the amthdl in the stricter sense of the word muḥāwarāt, conveys in its loose, unsystematic form the atmosphere of spontaneous lecturing and conversation. In the madżālis of this generation, the roots of the pseudepigraphic collections of the time of the Umayyads must be looked for, e.g., Abī b. Ṣahrya al-Djurhum, ʿĪlākā b. Kurhum (Karīm) al-Kīlābī, Suhār b. al-ʿAbbās (al-ʿAyāsh) as-Ṣāḥibī and the somewhat younger al-Shārī b. al-Ḳutāmī; cf. Orens, ix (1956), 135; below, iii, 12 and 14; to the early philologists, above, iii (rectify Sezgin, i, 260ff. and xiv, 7, etc.).

(2) A small fragment containing 7 amthdl of the qa‘al min type, allegedly by Muhammad b. Ḥabīb (d. 245/860) of whom—as the literature about proverbs and bibliographical literature maintains—a Kitāb al-Amthdl al-sāli‘a al-ʿal ‘el min as is said to be containing 390 amthdl, is known; ed. Muhammad Ḥamidallah, in MMFT, Baghdād, iv (1956), 44 f. (cf. R. ʿṢeṣen, Nawdul al-maǧdlis, Beirut 1975, i, 68, no. 63). According to Ḥamza (see iii, 6), he owes his materials chiefly to the collection of Abū ʿUbayd and to the “books” (notes taken down in lectures, cf. iii, 5, a) of al-ʿAṣmā‘ī and al-Līḥyānī. For two further “quotations”, see Abī ʿI-lā‘ar ʿa-l-Ma‘ārrī, al-Fustā wu l-ʿayyāt, Cairo 1556/1938, 61, and al-Khālīfī, al-ʿalā‘ al-ghalīb, Cairo 1325/1907, 170.

(3) Aikrma Abī ʿImrān al-Dabbī (d. 250/864), Kitāb al-Amthdl, ed. Ramādān Abī al-Tawwāb, Damascus (1394/1974). 111 amthdl, chiefly muḥāwarāt, with many verses of reference, no system; quotations in the name of al-Muṣaddāl in only one instance in the text of al-Tūsī; judging from the introduction, the booklet was conceived as such and not dictated.

(4) Al-Muṣaddāl [II] b. Salama v. Ṣāḥīb al-Dabbī (d. after 290/909), al-Fāṭhir, ed. C. A. Storey, Leiden 1915 (here quoted according to nos.; repr. Cairo 1942/1982); ed. Abī al-Rahmān b. al-Nūrī b. al-Ḥasan, Tunis 1353/1934 (?); ed. Abī al-ʿĀlī al-Ṭāhwāwī and Muhammad ʿAlī al-Naḍdār, Cairo 1380/1960 (nos. identical, exception Storey 442 = Nadjarī, 360: 361-441 = 442; 443 = 443; cf. Storey 442 = 1-123; Gābiyy al-arab fi ma‘ānti ma ʿaydiṭi al-sāli‘a as-lum as-sīmma fi amthdlihim wa muḥāwarātihim min kālam al-ʿArab, in Khams rasāl, Constantinople 1301/1884, 232-63. A total of 521 amthdl, partly muḥāwarāt, mostly circumstantial amthdl stories (cf. above, i, b); quotations in the name of al-Muṣaddāl can, as a rule, be demonstrated in the text of al-Tūsī (cf. no. 123), likewise, the only quotation in the name of Muṣaddāl in the lecture-notes of 263/876. The author was the son of that Salama who glossed the amthdl of Abī ʿUbayd (see above).

(5) Abī Bakr Ibn al-Anbārī (d. 329/940), al-Zāhir fi ma‘ānti kalām al-ḥarṣ, ed. Ḥātim ʿṢāliḥ b. ʿĀdām, ii, Baghdād-Beirut 1399/1979. A total of 896 amthdl, similar to ii, 3, authorities are mentioned; the cited materials can, in part, be found in their works, e.g., in Abī ʿUbayd's G̣hārib al-ḥadīṯ and al-Qāhar al-muṣammāt, and in part they are derived from the oral madżālis-tradition, e.g., the quotations from Abū ʿIkrama. Cf. furthermore Ḥusayn ʿṢāliḥ al-Nāʿūnī, in MMFT, xxxi/3 (1400/1980), 383-97.

(a) The so-called Kitāb A‘fāl min kālṣa of Abī ʿAlī al-Kālī (d. 356/967) represents an example of the oral madżālis tradition, ed. Muhammad al-Fādil Ibn ʿAṣāhrūn, Tunis 1399/1972. A total of 363 amthdl al-sāli‘a al-ʿalā‘ min contained in notes taken in lectures (cf. above), no systematics; quotations, for instance in the name of Muhammad b. Ḥabīb (see iii, 2), diverge.
widely, in parts completely from the parallel tradition (cf. iii, 6 and 12). This fact shows that the oral handing-on of am†hl materials, too, was common practice still in the 4th/10th century, and that it was very variable and loose into the bargain; about particular ones, cf. Sellheim, Ab†`A†f al-Qalı`, in Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur des Vorderen Orient, Festschrift für Bertold Spuler, Leiden 1981, 362-74.

(6) Hamza al-Isfahānī (d. between 350/961 and 360/970) [q. e.], Kitāb `Abd al-M^aml al-`ajāf min or, cf. Durra al-fdkhirafi `l-amthdl al-sd^ira, [c.] Abd al-`A†f b. al-Fadl b. al-Muwashshah, Cairo 1391-219712; supplement, in al-Tha†`al bi Khat′s al-khäs, ch. 3, Cairo 1326/1908, 29-37. The author has enlarged the collection of Muhammad b. Habîb to more than 1,800 am†hyl of the qaf沐 min-type, amongst them more than 500 maw^dala, arranged alphabetically according to the first letter, augmented by 500 more linguistically special features (naawdir. compounds containing ab†, umn, tbn etc., and dual forms); partly circumstantial am†hyl stories; he distinguishes, occasionally, between al-mathal al-kadîm, al-isldmî and al-muwâsaal.

(7) Abu Hîlâl al-`Askarî (d. after 395/1005), Qumhart al-am†hyl, Bombay 1307/1889; edd. ii (printed in the margin of the text of al-Maydâni [see iii, 12]), Cairo 1310/1893; i-ii, ed. Muhammad Abu `l-Fadl Ibrâhîm and `Abd al-M^adjîd Kâtâmis, Cairo 1384/1964 (1389/1693) [quoted here]. Barely 2,000 am†hyl, including approximately 800 am†hyl `alâ `a†f al min, arranged alphabetically according to the first letter. The author proceeds from Hamza's work whom he, being a purist, reproaches with having included too many "new ones" (maw^dadala), and accumulates the materials transmitted from his teachers, and their authorities, in the maqâdisî, the only quotation in the name of Abu `Ikrîma (i, 296) is missing in latter book (see iii, 3); he takes pain to tighten the innumerable philological and "historical" annotations, rejects am†hyl which are linguistically incorrect and now and then distinguishes between alm^hyl al-kadîm and al-muwâsaal or al-mudâda. The am†hyl of his collection are largely "literary" ones and have not too much in common any more with everyday "oral" sayings.

(8) Abu `l-`Hasan `Abî b. al-Fadl al-Mu'ayyadî al-`Tâljâkâni, Risâïl al-`A†f al-am†hyl al-baghâdîsya, ed. L. Massignon, Cairo 1313/1911. The most ancient local collection with more than 600 am†hyl (maw^dâlala), in contrast to ii, 7, topical and not literary, arranged alphabetically according to the first letter, as a rule accompanied by short explanations, in many cases for the proper application of the maqâdisî in question; forerunner of later collections containing am†hyl in dialect; compiled by the author and read during lectures in Baghdad in 421/1030; cf. too `Abd al-Rahmân `Abîd al-Qâfbar Tâlîb, in Sumer, xxxii (1936/1976), 237-338; al-`Abî, above, ii. 9.

(9) Abu `l-Fadl al-Mîkâlî (d. 430/1040) [q. e.], Nasîbî `alâ am†hyl al-am†hyl al-Mâikiîîî, edition in preparation. A small collection (ca. 250 nos.), arranged alphabetically, divided up into sub-chapters, each one beginning with one or more sayings from the Kûr`ân and hadîth (cf. Oiens, xxxi [1988], 353 and xxixi).

(10) Anonymous (5th/11th cent.), Kitâb al-`A†f, Hyderabad 1351/1932. Just under 400 am†hyl; a "medium-sized al-`A†f" (see iii, 7). For no obvious reason, the catalogues, al-Mutâl al-M^amîrî-Osmania, and consequently Brockelman, I, 237, ascribe the book to Zayd b. Rîfâ` (d. ca. 400/1010), while Brockelman, S III, 1195, lists it among the writings of Ibn al-Sîkît (d. 243/857).
Europe already in the 18th and 19th centuries [see A.L.-ZAMAKHSHARI].

(14) Abu '1-Hasan al-Bayhaki (d. 565/1169), Ghurar al-amthdl wa-durar al-akwdl, ed. in part Hussain El-Saghir, Ph.D. thesis, Univ. of Frankfurt/Main 1984 (complete edition in preparation). About 2,900 amthdl, including the "new ones" (mawaddal), in alphabetical order according to the first letter. Al-Maydani’s pupil has retained a high degree of independence in regard to his teacher, clear grouping: matfiah, lugha, fbd, ma‘udna, sabah, dark, hal, hikjya; good philological comments; many of the amthdl are inserted into the context of "world", local and family personal experience by lively stories and reports; a revealing document of its time, esp. as regards Khurá ssín; at some time or other the author quoted pseudepigrapha (cf. El-Saghir, op. cit., 88-9, 97-8, 116-17; iii, 1, b and 12) and, like Hamza and al-‘Askari (see iii, 6 and 7), Persian proverbs. A second work containing amthdl in four volumes and two collections of sayings (?), which he itemises in his autobiography (Yákit, Udabá, v, 212) have not apparently survived; cf. Sellheim, Eine unbekannte Sprichwörteransammlung, in Isl., xxxix (1964), 226-32.

(15) Rafá al-Dín Abu Sa‘íd (Abú ‘Abd Alláh) Muhammad b. ‘Ali al-‘Iráki (d. 561/1166), Nuzhat al-amthdl wa-‘l-madhnd wá-‘l-madhnd (cf. above, ii, 1, b). It is arranged alphabetically according to the first letter. Al-‘Iráki’s pupil has retained a high degree of independence in regard to his teacher, clear grouping: ma‘am, fdb, madd, sabah, ofka, hikjya, wafer, and, often, quite frequently quite long-winded stories dealing with the awdil-problem (awwáb man kášhu) (cf. above, ii, 1, b). It is arranged alphabetically in 29 chapters. The author, a pupil of the well-known philologist Abú Zakaryáyá al-Tibriti (v, q.v.), draws from the ‘Iráki madhílí tradition. Only one manuscript, damaged at the beginning, is known to exist (Gotha [Penzak], no. 1290; cf. Brockelmann, I, 333); an edition is being prepared. Al-‘Iráki’s Kitab al-Wasit fi l-amthdl is mainly only an abridgment of the Nuzha, comprising about a quarter of its volume. Its editor (cf. iii, 11) has erroneously ascribed this "median" collection to Abu ‘1-Hasan al-Wáhidí (d. 468/1076), the teacher of al-Maydání, following in this (?) the defective unicum in a Maghribí hand (Khartoum [Penzak], no. 8729; cf. A. M. Haddad, Abú ‘Abd Alláh al-Maghribí: Mawdúd fi l-Andalus, ed. in part Hussain El-Saghir, Ph.D. thesis, Beirut 1402/1982; a revealing document of its time, esp. as regards Khurásán; at some time or other the author quoted pseudepigrapha (cf. El-Saghir, [Berlin], no. 8729) little can apparently survived; cf. Sellheim, Eine unbekannte Sprichwörteransammlung, in Isl., xxxix (1964), 226-32.

(16) Abu ‘l-Máhásín al-Shaybí (d. 837/1433), Timghál al-amthdl, i-iii, ed. As‘ad Dhibyán, Ph.D. thesis, Lebanon University, Beirut 1402/1982; printed in part as First half of the book Timghál al-amthdl of Jamál al-Din al-Sághi, ed. Muhammad Bahá al-Máqhdí, unpubl. Ph.D. thesis, Punjab Univ. Lahore 1961. The majority of the 441 amthdl in alphabetical order were extracted by the author from the two collections of al-Maydání and al-Zamakhshari; the remainder he owes to literature as, for instance, to the Kitab al-Aghámi, or to the verses of poets; only in a few cases is the source not mentioned; not infrequently, he reproduces stories at length.

Of other collections of this time and of later times (cf. the list in A.W. [Berlin], no. 8729) little can be expected to be forthcoming in regard to the classical amthdl—witness the work of al-Shaybí, or Mušafí b. Ibráhím’s Zubdah al-amthdl of 999/1591 (Khartoum [Penzak], no. 631; one of the 200 amthdl are nos. 339), and Ibráhím Sárkis’ (d. 1302/1885) al-Durrá fi l-yatíma fi ‘l-amthdl al-kádim, Beirut 1288/1871. In any case, the Maghíl al-‘akwíd fi ma‘únî l-amthdl of Muhammad b. ‘Abd al-Rahmán b. Abú ‘l-Baká, hence the grandson of the noted Baghdadí philologist Abú ‘l-Baká al-Uktári (d. 616/1219), deserves the attention of the researcher. Of his work in six volumes, parts are preserved in the author’s autograph of the year 665/1267; he makes use of 30 sources which are conscientiously identified by characters the meaning of which is given in the preface; cf. A. J. Arberry, in JAL, i (1970), 109-12, and in reference to that, Sellheim, in Isl., i (1973), 341ff. New and revealing are the collections of amthdl in dialect form which date from the 7th/13th century onwards:


iv. Modern collections.

In Egypt, the interest in printed Arabic proverbs was aroused towards the end of the 16th century (cf. Sellheim, op. cit., 1-7, 13-20). These literary amthdl survived for generations into the 19th century in readers and exercise-books, especially for the supplementation of Hebrew studies. E. Pocock’s plan of 1761, to edit the whole of al-Maydání’s collection, was only realised by G. W. Freytag in the years 1839-43 (cf. above, iii, 12). Since that time, European learned travellers and linguists have recorded and published Arabic proverbs—mostly in dialect form—in great numbers. They have been succeeded by Oriental collectors, especially after the end of the Second World War. The following deserve to be quoted:


2. In Persian

Persian, despite its elegant literary uses, has always remained a true speech of “the folk”, the language (until very modern times) of an essentially simple, unlettered society based on agriculture and pastoralism, crafts and trading. It is therefore hardly surprising that it should be extremely rich in idioms and proverbial expressions. Most of these are brief and pithy, but some are fairly elaborate in both content and construction. The high-culture literature itself—particularly ethical works and such edifying-enteraining writing as Sa’dī’s Golestān—abounds in proverbial material, and (as, for example, with Shakespeare) it is often virtually impossible to determine if the author himself invented a proverbial story or coined an aphorism which subsequently gained general currency, or whether he merely appropriated anecdotes and saws already in common use. Even such ostensibly remote literature as the ghazals of Hāfez lend themselves, by their often atomistic, line-by-line structure, to easy sententious quotation or divinatory employment.

Overall, at least until affected by a marked modern tendency towards updating, the corpus contains obviously archaic features of vocabulary, grammar and style, most of which are undoubtedly genuine, though some may have been more or less consciously manufactured in an urge to offer authenticity of the “ye olde” type. Part of the material seems to have been rendered from Arabic (probably in the early centuries of Islam); other items have parallels or equivalents in Turkish, and the traffic may not always have been from Persian to the latter language. A considerably body of proverbs is dialectal, with the most generally attractive and appropriate instances being also rendered into more or less standard Persian at some point. Given all these varied factors, as well as the rapid transformation of Iranian society and the decline of traditional education over the last 50 years, the same tendency has arisen as in Western culture for many proverbs no longer to be perfectly understood, accurately cited, or rightly applied. Fortunately, individual scholarly (and even amateur) initiatives have assured their survival, at least in libraries both in Iran and around the world.

While there must inevitably be a certain common humanity to all proverbial literature, generally considered, it is rarely true that any given adage in Persian will exactly match an item in almost unvaried use
across the broad spectrum of Western languages. A good sampling of the uniquely Persian flavour and idiosyncratic reference-frame can be gained from the following works, where it is possible to compare translations, parallels, and originals: R. Levy, *Persia viewed through its proverbs and apologies*, in *BSOS*, iv/3 (1952), 540–9; L. P. Elwell-Sutton, *Persian proverbs*, London 1954; L. Bonelli, *Deti proverbi shi persiani*, Rome 1941; S. Haim, *Amthâl-i Farsi–Inglîsi*, Tehran 1354/1955. As usual, stupidity, incompetence and dishonesty are deprecated, but the terms used extend to such items as donkeys. Islamic religious functionaries, minarets and water-melons; resignation to modest station is enjoined by the consideration that a grand house demands hard work to clear its vast, flat roof of the winter snows that fall on the Iranian high plateau; everything should be in season, like a sheepskin cloak worn for the month of Day (December–January), and not at the sudden arrival of the Persian spring; and so on. As in other cultures, many of the proverbs contradict each other if taken too literally.


Additional minor or peripheral items can be found at the head of the article by Levy cited above.

(G. M. Wickens)

3. IN TURKISH

In Turkish, *Mathâl*/Modern Turkish *mesel* is often used in the phrase *durâb-i meselî* (pl. *durâb-i emthâlî*), this pejorative form which may be translated as "stated by an example"; has also passed into the spoken language.

The terms *mesel* and its variants *metel, matal, metal* are also used to designate a riddle, and *masal* is a story. Other terms attested in the written sources, in oral tradition and in learned terminology to denote a proverb are: *sce* (Karâkhânîd Turkish), *atalarsozi* (plural *atalasîleri*, old Osmanli, Azerbajjani, Turkmên and Karâkapak as well as in the modern terminology of Turkey), *sim-söz* (dialect of Chinese Turkestan), *ulgârsos* (Altay), *ulgârs-söz* (Nogay), *tensîl, makal* (Karâkapak), *sarpmelesi* (Karâyîm of the Crimea), *nakîl* (Turkmên), *hikmet* (plural *hikâm*, Iranian Azerbajani) and *deşîet* (dialect of *Icel* in Turkey).

The proverb being the concise and stereotyped enunciation of a rule of conduct, an axiom or a statement and the fruit of long experience, is used as a means of giving speech a greater persuasive force; this being the case, it has no independent existence, but is integrated into speech. Besides its frequent usage in day-to-day conversation, it constitutes a corroborative and ornamental element of literary, scholarly or popular creation. In the epic tradition, for example, a series of linked proverbs, often alliterated or rhymed together and in the metre adopted for the epic narration, serve as a kind of preamble to the story proper.

Through this functional characteristic, the proverb is distinguished from the other genres of oral literature. It has been noted, however, that among the Karâyîm of the Crimea and in the popular tradition of *Icel* in Turkey, the proverb is used independently as the essential element of a verbal game. This is in the context of a competition in the course of which two teams (or two persons) confront one another; each in turn utters a proverb beginning with the same letter of the alphabet; the winning team—or person—is the one who succeeds in reciting the greatest number of proverbs.

Classified according to their themes, a first category of proverbs contains those which pronounce a simple judgment; among them, some imply a moral or suggest a rule of conduct. In a second category, are those which make a statement, on daily life, on human nature, on natural phenomena, or on "works and days", sometimes implying criticism or practical advice. Finally, a third category, of exclusively local or regional origin and usage, consists of the opinions regarding one another held by various communities—ethnic, religious, etc.

In the formal and stylistic context, there are four categories to be distinguished: (1) Proverbs stated in simple prose; (2) Proverbs containing prosodic elements. In this category the texts are of various types: in one type, the proverb is stated in the form of a verse or a distich in traditional metre (the two lines are rhymed); in a second type, the text is composed with alliterations or internal rhymes between the various component parts. Finally, a third type is that where several proverbs of different themes, rhymed or alliterated together, are joined in sequence, such as are encountered in the epic texts, e.g. in the *Oghuz Kisdî-d Ded Korkut* and in the *Kîrîğ Manas* (*q. v.*). (3) Proverbs and proverbial statements which have an anecdotal structure. Sometimes, this is a "miniature narrative" without direct speech; elsewhere, the narrative is reduced to a minimum, or disappears completely, and the text takes the form of a dialogue. (4) The proverbs of this third group are to be distinguished from those which have an anecdotal "origin". The latter allude to a historical event, or to an anecdotal character; such are the proverbs and proverbial sayings which refer to one or another of the facetious stories of Narseddîn Hoca.

From the 2nd/8th century, some proverbs are attested in the Kök Türk inscriptions. Later, after the 4th/10th century, a greater number of examples is found in the *Uyghur* texts. As many as 290 proverbs, of which a large number have survived into the present day, are contained in the dictionary of Karâmûd Kâzîghârî (*q. v.* 5th/11th century). The two most ancient Ottoman Turkish collections, both the work of anonymous compilers, are the Risâle min kelmîmâl-i Oghuzsâmîn al-mesbîr bi-atalarsozi, undated, probably from the 9th/15th century; and the Kîdîbî-i Atalâr, compiled in 885/1480–1. The *Pend-nâme*, by the Ottoman poet Gûwâhî (*q. v.* 10th/16th century), is a collection of proverbs from oral tradition cast in the form of classical prosody. (For collections of more recent date, still in manuscript, see the bibliography in Aksîy, 1977, 1267–70.)

Numerous poets of the Ottoman era, including Thâbit (*q. v.* 15th/17th century) and Hîfîz (*q. v.* 12th/18th century), have a reputation for embellishing their poetry with proverbs. (For a more complete list of the proverbs used in literary works, see Eyüboğlu, 1973–5.) Others, including Rûbiî of Bagdâd (*q. v.* 10th/16th century), Nâzî (*q. v.* 11th/17th century), Rûhîb Pâçu and Kâni (*q. v.* 12th/18th century) and *Qâbi* (*q. v.* 13th/14th century), are, on the contrary, admired for...
their verses and couplets which, with the passage of time, have acquired the status and usage of proverbs.

It was in the second half of the 19th century that westernized Turkish intellectuals began to show an interest in the collection and comparative study of proverbs. The first anthology of this type is the Durūb-i emnāh-i ʿOṯmānīyye (1863) of Şinākī; in the second edition (1870), the number of proverbs and proverbial sayings amounts to 2,500; in the third, edited by Abu ʿl-Dīyāʾ (Bīzāzīyī, Thawfīk in 1865, 4,000. The collection of Ahmed Wefik Pasha, entitled Muntakhabat-i durūb-i emnāh-i turkīye (1871) contains 4,300 proverbs. (On later collections and studies, see the bibliography of the present article and that of Aksoy, 1977, 1271-1328, which included 716 titles.)

**Bibliography:** Omer Asum Aksoy, Ataşöleri ve deyimler, Ankara 1965; idem, Bolge azillerindaki atasöleri ve deyimler, Ankara 1971; idem, Ataşöleri ve deyimler sızılgızı, i. Ataşöleri sızılgızı, Ankara 1971; i. Deyimler sızılgızı, Ankara 1976; ii. Dizin ve kaynakça, Ankara 1977; Ilhan Bağcı and A. Tietze, Bilmence. A corpus of Turkish riddles, Berkeley-Los Angeles-London 1973; Ferit Birtek, D政务服务-i-Türk Dwdil-i dırısmaları, Istanbul 1973; the two main sources are the Qurdan and the Hadith. Scholars will quote the Kur’dan in Arabic, then inter-
pret its contents for the people in Swahili. Every quotation from the KurDan is accepted as an...considerable number of individuals and families. In addition, al-Mascudl (Muruaj_, v, 480-1 = § 2235) mentions a work and we vie in praising ourselves for our virtues"; Swahili translation in print. Especially popular are the quotation from the Kurth.l.b., which means "to criticise, to blame, to hurtful." Although it is not a Kurth., it had a specialised usage, for it was broadly applied to disgrace, etc. (see further, Wehr). hadiths", "forty...exploited by the enemy. Furthermore, even if malaedlib were not exclusively concerned with asil, it is not surprising that some relatively objective genealogists should be eager to take up the faults mentioned in them and make them more widely known, at the risk of attracting dangerous hostility (see, e.g., the case of 'Akil b. Abil Tilib, who was keenly disposed to take note of malaedlib, al-Djahiz, Bayan, ii, 323-4). Those who specialised in such descriptions were accused of nourishing deep hatred, and this became something of a proverbial expression (daghinah buflas al-malaedlib, in al-Djahiz, Risalla fi 'l-adid wa 'l-hazl, ed. Kraus and Hadjiri, 65; ed. Harun, Ras'il, i, 236). Goldzihder again refers to the relationship between malaedlib and genealogies when discussing the famous Daghfal (see al-Mas'udi, Murjud, index, s.v.). Among the authors of works which contain this term in their titles is 'Abd al-Malik al-Haytham b. 'Adi; these last remarks appear in the chapter on the Shu 'ubiyya and its different manifestations in Muh. Studen, i, 191, Eng. tr. i, 176-7. Although accusations are made against him (see Goldzihder, op. cit., i, 187, Eng.tr. i, 173), it would probably be wrong to count as an opponent of the Arabs and a supporter of the 'Adjajm the famous writer Ibn al-Kalbi (d. 204/619 [g.e.]). The author of the Kitdb Mathalib al-'Arab (Fihrist, ed., Cairo 141; Yskot, Udadla, ii, 191, where it is stated that "Allan (see below) used the same classification of the tribes; Brockelmann, S I, 212; Sezgin, GAS, i, 270, ii, 61). However, it should be noted that Ibn al-Kalbi had already used the same term as this of a work containing a severe criticism of the three first caliphs, the Kitdb al-Mathalib al-'Arab, in his Kitdb al-Mathalib al-'Arab, fihrist, Cairo, 80; Sezgin, GAS, ii, 272 in two versions (one longer, the other shorter, according to Ibn al-Nadim (Fihrist, Cairo, 145), as well as the Mathalib Rubin, the Arabs from the North. Abil 'Ubayda (d. ca. 209/624 [g.e.]) was vigorously criticised for having provided the Shu 'ubiyya with arguments for their cause, just as all the other writers of malaedlib were criticised, and even accused of Shu 'ubiyya doctrines. However, he does seem to have shown some objective judgement when he wrote not only a Kitdb Maedlalib al-'Arab and a Kitdb Maedlib Qotafin, but also the Manakkil Bihila in opposition to his Mathalib Bihila (Fihrist, Cairo, 80; Sezgin, GAS, ii, 61, 321). Al-Mas'udi (Murdv. vii, 80 = § 2765) refers to his Kitdb al-Malaedlib (cf. Brockelmann, S I, 162), and shows that recording the Arab genealogies with all the vices that were embodied in them naturally led him to make certain serious accusations which, by their very nature, must have displeased a considerable number of the tribal genealogists and families. In addition, al-Mas'udi (Murdv. v, 480-1 = § 2235) mentions a work
attributed to Abū 'Ubayda, "or to another Shu 'ubi," though the exact title of this work cannot be established. It must presumably have contained the manākib and the mathālib of the Arabs as well as the entitlements to glory and shameful deeds of the various tribes of the north and south of Arabia, as presented by their supporters and by their detractors in the meeting-room of Hishām b. 'Abd al-Malik, who apparently inaugurated discussions on these questions in the manner of those in which he made up the genre al-mathākin wa l-i‘rāsāt [q. v.].

A few decades earlier, Ziyād b. Abīhi, nicknamed "the just," was credited with having written a book of mathālib, which was used by some of the authors already mentioned (see Sezgin, GAS, i, 261, as well as 249, 257, 265, ii, 24, 60). According to Hammād ʿAdrij [q. v.], the zinād named Yūnus b. [Abi] Farwa sent a book (or a letter, kitāb) to the Emperor of Byzantium about the mathālib of the Arabs and the vices (‘ugāb) of Islam (al-Djahīz, Haywān, iv, 448; cf. al-Djahīshīyārī, 125; al-Huṣrī, Dām al-dāja’ārīk, 256; al-Murtadā, Amālis, i, 90; Ibn Ḥadījār, Lisan al-‘māzin, vi, 334; Brockelmann, S I, 109). This appears to be the one real case of treason which has been recorded; since the Persian ʿAllān al-Warrāk al-Shu ‘ubi, who maintained relations with the Barmakids as well as doing the job of court historian at Bāvest al-Ḥamdānī, ap. 55, had been subsequently for al-Ma‘mūn, cannot really be blamed for his work; he is indeed the author of a Kitāb al-Mahdānīn which collects together, tribe by tribe, all the mathālib of the Arabs, from Kuraysh to the Yemenis. The list of tribes and clans which have their shameful matters recorded occupies a whole page of the Fihrist (Cairo, 154), in which it is stated that the classification adopted there is the same as that of Ibn al-Kalbī. ʿAllān himself also seems to have been objective in his judgement, for he wrote other works, among which may be mentioned a Kitāb Fadā’il Kinnāna and a Kitāb Fadā’il Rabi’a (see Yākūt, Udbāb, xii, 191-6, with a passage borrowed from al-Djahīshīyārī, which does not appear in the Kitāb al-Wuzarā). But which has been reproduced by M. ʿArwād in Nasīrāt da’āt ‘am mīr Kitāb al-Ma‘mūn b. Ziyād b. Abīhi (Cairo, 1864, 24, 271, i, 61). Sezgin (i, 603) also mentions a Kitāb al-Mathālib of Ibn Bishr al-Ashīr (d. 260/874), and (ii, 62) the Mathālib Thakīf wa-sdīr al-ʿArab by someone named al-Daymarrī. Although it is likely not to have held that later authors continued to use the word mathālib in the titles of polemical works against some tribes, for the general situation hardly encouraged this kind of literature to survive. It must have come to an end quite quickly. We have seen that mathālib are to be contrasted with muṣḥīn, muṣḥīkh and manākib (see above); even so, it proved impossible for a parallel to be maintained between works devoted to the praise of groups of people and individuals and those which aimed at discrediting an enemy. The short list that has been given here and what we know of comparable works suggest that Godzihel was correct, for over the centuries the divisions between the tribes weakened so that a growing feeling of fellow-citizenship could develop. Moreover, writers seem to have heeded the hadīth which condemns al-ṭa‘āfī fī l-‘anādik wa l-nīsābī wa l-anwāüğ, and consequently they avoided the temptation of attacking genealogies. On the other hand, as a result of an understandable semantic evolution the term mathālib has been used in a meaning close to that of hidajī and has been applied to individuals; see e.g. the Kitāb Mathālib Abī Nuwās by Ahmad b. ‘Ubayd Allāh al-Thaqāfī (d. 314/926; see Yākūt, Udbāb, iii, 240) and the famous Mathālib al-wasannah by Abū Hayyān al-Tawhīdī (d. 414/1023 [q. v.]).

Bibliography: Given in the article. See also J. Sadan, Phénomènes et écris conceptuels Chahîliyya-Islam à travers les belles-lettres et les recueils de Mathālib, in From Jahiliyya to Islam, Jerusalem 1987. (Ch. Pellat)

AL-MATHĀMINA, the name given by the Yemenite historians to eight noble families of South Arabia who, before Islam, enjoyed important political privileges, either in the kingdom of Himyar (from the end of the 3rd century AD to 520 [or 525]), or under the Abyssinian and Persian régimes which followed. Mathāmina is a plural noun whose singular, which is not attested, could be *Muthman or *Muthman (since these participles mean "repeated eight times", "to the number eight") It is certainly from the Arabic number *thamantîya "eight," and not from the concept of price or value also contained in the root, that the name of these eight families is derived, since they could also be called al-Thamānīya ("the Eight"), as in al-Hamdānī, al-Dimgha, 64.

Mention of the Mathāmina is to be found in the works of only three authors, all Yemenite. The oldest is al-Hasan al-Hamdānī (280-after 360/893-after 971) [q. v.]. According to him, Nadjran b. al-Nahwān b. al-Hasanī al-Wazirānī, who died in Dār ‘l-Hijdājā 573/June 1178 (on this author see al-Akwa‘, Nasḥāā). The third is the Rashidūl ruler al-Malik al-Aghfrī Umar b. Yūṣūf b. Rāṣūl, who reigned from 694 to 696/1295-7 (Sayyid, Sources, 396). It is to be noted that the non-Yemenite Arab historians, notably Hishām Ibn al-Kalbī [q. v.] appear to ignore these Mathāmina.

The definition of the historians. These three authors give somewhat divergent definitions of the Mathāmina. Dealing with the descendent of Dḥū Djdān, al-Hamdānī (al-Bīlī, ii, 283 ff.) mentions incidentally that four of the sons of Shurāḥullī b. al-Ḥārīb lived as Mathāmina "eight lineages (abāf) between whom power was shared after the death of Dḥū Nuwās" (a phrase follows whose meaning is obscure). This scholar, like the other Yemenite historians, knew that Dḥū Nuwās [q. v.] was the nickname of a Himyarite king called Yūsuf (for al-Hamdānī, see for example al-Dimgha, 63-4, and al-Bīlī, x, 22; for Nashāā, we may refer to Mulūk, 147-8). The full name and exact title of this ruler are known thanks to a South Arabic inscription engraved by the commanders of one of his armies and dated 563/573 of the Himyarite era (July 518 or July 523 AD, since there is some question as to whether the Himyarite era begins in 115 or 110 before the Christian era): "Yūsuf Asʿar Yathār, king of all the tribes" (Yūsuf ʾasʿar Yaḥṭār kān al-fārāʾīn) (the name of the king should thus be corrected in the article Yūsuf [q. v.]).

The dates of the reign of Yūsuf, a ruler especially known for having persecuted the Christians of Najrān, which led to an Abyssinian intervention that challenged him and drove him to suicide, are not established with certainty. He came to power between June 516 (or 521) and June 517 (or 522) (according to the evidence of Ry 510 and Ja 1028/8-9) and was overthrown by the Abyssinians shortly after Pentecost 520 (or 525) (Beeston, Judaisms, 272 ff.; Huxley, Martyrdom, 51). After the death of Yūsuf, the kingdom of Himyar passed under the tutelage of Abyssinia for fifty years; then, in the year 570/1178, it was conquered by the Sāsānids and remained under Persian domination until it was won over to Islam during the lifetime of Muhammad. For al-Hamdānī, the Mathāmina were
thus the noble lineages who dominated Yemen after the fall of the Himyarite dynasty, that is, during the Abyssinian occupation and perhaps after that. This scholar in the meantime neglects to mention that the Himyarite throne did not remain vacant; the Abyssinians placed on it a Himyarite Christian, Samyafa (amldk), he adds: ‘Thamaniya: descended from him’. In 16, under the root ThMN, c gives two different definitions of the Mathamina. It is given in two pieces of verse. The first is that which Nashwan devoted to the annals of the Himyarite Empire. It is a compromise between the H1 and H2 versions: of the two innovations in H2, it retains only the replacement of Dhu Manakh by Dhú Hazfar. The author justifies his list by citing, in the commentary on his poem, ‘Alkama’s verses already encountered on his poem, to the genealogists, the “son” of Dhú Sabar (see notably Nashwan, Muluk, 156, and al-Hamdam, al-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>H1</th>
<th>H2</th>
<th>N1</th>
<th>N2</th>
<th>N3</th>
<th>M1</th>
<th>M2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dhu Sabar</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhu Tha'labān</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhu Khažl</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhu Ukhulān</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhu Diqādān</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhu Manakh</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhu Sirwāb</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhu Makār</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhu Ḥar</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhu Kayfān</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhu Murāthid</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhu Yazon</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhu Ma'shir</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(thesocrosses+indicate the number of occurrences of the list in the work of the author considered)

Awka', it is necessary to correct Dhu 'Ukhulān to Dhu Ukhulān; besides, the list only consists of seven names (in place of the eight announced in the text), without our knowing whether it is a case of an error by the editor or a deficiency in the unique manuscript. In fact, it is necessary to add Dhu Makār, as is proved by the five verses attributed to 'Alkama b. Dhi Diqādan, which al-Hamdānī cites to justify this list and which he takes from Muhammad b. Ibrāhīm b. al-Mahālī al-Kalāfī. In this fragment of 'Alkama (a great Yemenite poet who was a contemporary of the Prophet Muhammad: al-īkīl, ii, 300-1; on this poet, see also Löfgren, 'Alqama), the Mathamina are treated as if they already belonged to past times. Unfortunately, we cannot conclude anything from this, for the authenticity of these verses seems doubtful; al-Hamdānī himself did not find any trace of them in the work of 'Alkama.

H2 = al-Hamdānī, list no. 2: see al-īkīl, ii, 294-5. It is given in two pieces of verse. The first is that which serves as a justification for H1, but with some variants, notably the replacement of Dhu Manakh and Dhu Sirwāb by Dhu Hazfar and Dhu Kayfān; al-Hamdānī takes it from an Arab of San'a who attributes it, not to 'Alkama, but to a Himyarite. The second piece, which numbers six verses, is ‘the famous saying of ‘Alkama b. Dhi Diqādan on the Mathamina in his poem’; it gives the same names as the preceding.

N1 = Nashwan, list no. 1: see Muluk,156-7. It is provided by the Kasīda himyariyya, a nostalgic poem that Nashwan devoted to the annals of the Himyarite Empire. It is a compromise between the H1 and H2 versions: of the two innovations in H2, it retains only the replacement of Dhu Manakh by Dhú Hazfar. The author justifies his list by citing, in the commentary on his poem, ‘Alkama’s verses already encountered with the support of H1 (but attributed in H2's statement to a Himyarite), with new variants. The same list is found in a piece of three verses, without the author's name, that Nashwan cites in the encyclopedia dictionary that he composed entitled Shams al-īlām, under the root SHR, 48.

N2 = Nashwan, list no. 2: see Shams al-īlām, under the root THMN, 16. It follows N1, but replaces Dhú Sabar with Al Murāthid. This list is provided by a poem attributed to an Arab from the North (from the tribe of 'Attāk b. Aslam b. Yadhkur b. 'Anaza b. Asd b. Rābi'ā b. Nizār). It is a variant without real significance, seeing that Dhú Murāthid is, according to the genealogists, the “son” of Dhú Sabar (see notably Nashwan, Muluk, 156, and al-Hamdānī, al-

---

Thus, the noble lineages who dominated Yemen after the fall of the Himyarite dynasty, that is, during the Abyssinian occupation and perhaps after that. This scholar in the meantime neglects to mention that the Himyarite throne did not remain vacant; the Abyssinians placed on it a Himyarite Christian, Samyafa. In 16, under the root ThMN, c gives two different definitions of the Mathamina. It is given in two pieces of verse. The first is that which Nashwan devoted to the annals of the Himyarite Empire. It is a compromise between the H1 and H2 versions: of the two innovations in H2, it retains only the replacement of Dhu Manakh by Dhú Hazfar. The author justifies his list by citing, in the commentary on his poem, ‘Alkama’s verses already encountered with the support of H1 (but attributed in H2’s statement to a Himyarite), with new variants. The same list is found in a piece of three verses, without the author’s name, that Nashwan cites in the encyclopedia dictionary that he composed entitled Shams al-īlām, under the root SHR, 48.
Iklil, ii, 317-18). Al-Hamdani himself (al-Iklil, viii, 159) considers Dhu Murathid as one of the Mathamina, although this lineage does not appear in his own lists. The preference shown for Dhu Yazan among the Mathamina, not even in the root RThD, 40).

Dhu Yazan among the Mathamina, not even in the root RThD, 40).

It differs from Nl in one name, Dhu Murathid (a doublet of Dhu Murathid in this text of Nashwan may have a personal motive; this author claimed descent from Hasān Dhu Murathid b. Dhi Sahar (Shams al-ʿulām, under the root RThD, 40).

The Mathamina, mentioned in archaic poetry, and they knew, however, 7 of the 13 lines of Mathamina recorded above (Casket, Gamhara, index): Dhu Sahar (sic), Dhu Khallī, Dhu ʿUthkulan, Dhu Djadan, Dhu Makar, Dhi Hafṣar. So it is at a late date that the tradition of the Mathamina enjoyed a certain vogue, when the Yemenite scholars, beginning with al-Ḥamdānī, raised it from oblivion. It is probable that they only had at their disposal in order to dx> this some allusions from archaic poetry, which would explain the notable differences of definition from one author to another.

The interest that the Yemenites showed in these Mathamina from the 9th-10th centuries onwards probably has a political cause. The dissolution of the Ḥabbāsid empire left the field open to many ambitions, particularly in Yemen where the struggles for power became fierce. In this context, prestigious Himyarite ancestors gave an incontestable historical legitimacy, even if the religious authorities saw in it a manoeuvre against Islam. It was probably impossible to claim a royal ascendancy, whether it was owing to public knowledge that the rulers of Himyar had had Himyarite kings (on this, see Bāfakhī, al-Hārīṭī). It would seem that the traditionists had integrated in the same branch of this genealogy two bodies of traditions, on one hand that of the tribe of Ḥimyar in the strict sense, on the other that of the Saabaean ʿulāmāʾ of Maʿrib. Finally, we will observe that in Yemen in the 9th-10th centuries AD, numerous clans, lines and even villages were claiming descent from the Mathamina; an eloquent picture is supplied by the works of al-Ḥamdānī, notably in the genealogies of Ḥimyar.

The later vogue of the Mathamina. The tradition of the Mathamina is certainly ancient: it is based on some fragments of reputed archaic poetry, whose antiquity can be confirmed by the mention of Dhu ʿUthkulan, an authentic pre-Islamic Saabaean line which is known to the authors only from these fragments. We may assume that it dates back to the Himyarite period (end of the 3rd century AD - beginning of the 6th), after Ḥimyar had annexed Sabaʾ around 275 and at a time when the ancient noble Saabaean lines had to defend an authority that was being increasingly threatened.

Meanwhile, this tradition seems to have been neglected by the earliest of the great traditionists, whose work established the genealogical outline of the Arab tribes, notably Ḥishām Ibn al-Kalbī (around 120-204 or 206/around 737-819 or 821) and Ibn Durayd al-Azdl (223-321/837-933) [q.v.]. Ibn al-Kalbī knew, however, 7 of the 13 lines of Mathamina recorded above (Casket, Gamhara, index): Dhu Sahar (sic), Dhu Khallī, Dhu Djadan, Dhu Makar, Dhi Hafṣar, Dhu ʿUthkulan, an authentic pre-Islamic Saabaean line which is known to the authors only from these fragments. We may assume that it dates back to the Himyarite period (end of the 3rd century AD - beginning of the 6th), after Ḥimyar had annexed Sabaʾ around 275 and at a time when the ancient noble Saabaean lines had to defend an authority that was being increasingly threatened.

Meanwhile, this tradition seems to have been neglected by the earliest of the great traditionists, whose work established the genealogical outline of the Arab tribes, notably Ḥishām Ibn al-Kalbī (around 120-204 or 206/around 737-819 or 821) and Ibn Durayd al-Azdl (223-321/837-933) [q.v.]. Ibn al-Kalbī knew, however, 7 of the 13 lines of Mathamina recorded above (Casket, Gamhara, index): Dhu Sahar (sic), Dhu Khallī, Dhu Djadan, Dhu Makar, Dhi Hafṣar, Dhu ʿUthkulan, an authentic pre-Islamic Saabaean line which is known to the authors only from these fragments. We may assume that it dates back to the Himyarite period (end of the 3rd century AD - beginning of the 6th), after Ḥimyar had annexed Sabaʾ around 275 and at a time when the ancient noble Saabaean lines had to defend an authority that was being increasingly threatened.
Mašār owed their success, among others, to the prestige of these ancestors. The addition of ḏū Mašārī in list no. 2 of al-Malik al-Aṣghar could be explained in the same way; would the Rasulids not have needed a prestigious local ancestry in order to establish their power better? Mašārīs, even the modest ones, attempted to ennable themselves in the same way, by claiming to have one of the Mathamīnā for an ancestor.

To supply arguments for certain princes seeking historical legitimacy and roots, it is probable that some scholars did not hesitate to replace one name with another in the poetic fragments and in the list, to such an extent that the number of variants increased. We know the bad reputation that the genealogists had; was not al-Hamdānī himself accused of falsification for payment (Bāfakīh, al-Ḥārīth, 428)?

Finally, one should mention that the name Mathamīnā was also borne by a branch of the ʿAlīds of Yemen (see al-Malik al-Aṣghar, Tafsīr al-ʿaṣābī, 116).


CHR. ROBIN

AL-MATHĀNI [see al-kūrān].

MATHEMATICS [see MARR, HANDASA, ḢISĀB].

MATHNAWĪ (a.), the name of a poem written in rhyming couplets.

1. In Arabic literature, see muzuḏawīḏ.

2. In Persian.

According to the prosodist Shams-i-Kays (7th/13th century), the name refers to “a poem based on independent, internally rhyming lines (abyāt-i musīkīt-i musarrāt). The Persians call mathnawī because each line requires two rhyming letters.... This kind (nawī) is used in extensive narratives and long stories which cannot be treated in poems with one specific rhyming letter” (al-Muṣīqīd, ed. Tehran 1338/1959, 418f.). The first part of this definition mentions the single characteristic which separates the mathnawī from all other classical verse forms, namely its rhyme scheme aa bb cc, etc. Otherwise, the name is given to poems differing greatly in genre as well as in length.

Etymologically, it is often explained as a nisba adjective to the Arabic word mathnā, “two by two”; but mathnawī (according to al-Dīwānārī, the equivalent of the Persian da-baytī, “which is a song”) is mentioned as another possibility in the Tādī al-ʿarās (cf. Lane, s. v.). It is reasonable to think that the term was coined by the Persians in spite of its Arabic derivation. The Arabs used the term muzuḏawīḏ [q.v.] instead. By this they designated poems with rhyming couplets, usually written in the trimeter of the radāg which has either eleven or twelve syllables. Such poems were composed at least since the beginning of the 8th century A.D., but the verse form remained of little importance in Arabic literature (cf. G. E. von Grunebaum, On the origin and early development of Persian muzuḏawīḏ poetry, in JNES, iii [1944], 9-13, repr. in Islam and medieval Hellenism, London 1976).

The much more successful Persian mathnawī is first known from the Sāmānīd period (4th/10th century). Although it made its appearance at a much later date than the muzuḏawīḏ, the mathnawī is regarded by nearly all modern scholars as a continuation of an Iranian verse form and not of its Arabic counterpart. Yet this theory meets with a few thorny problems pertaining to the history of prosody in Iran. Prior to the Islamic period, rhyme—the most prominent feature of a mathnawī—was apparently not in use as a characteristic of a verse form. The metrical system of pre-Islamic Iranian poetry is still very imperfectly understood. The early opinion of modern scholarship was that it must have been governed by the principle of syllable counting. On the basis of this assumption, an Iranian origin of some Persian metres, which were frequently used in early mathnawīs, was held to be likely (cf. G. E. von Grunebaum, Islam. Essays in the nature and growth of a cultural tradition, London 1955, 177-80).

The syllabic principle was rejected by W. B. Henning and M. Boyce in favour of the theory that the pre-Islamic metres were accentual and allowed a variable number of syllables within certain limits. It has been shown more recently that a rather great irregularity in the length of verse lines was permitted, probably under the influence of the accompanying music (see S. Shaked, Specimens of Middle Persian verse, in W. B. Henning memorial volume, London 1970, 395-405, with further references). L. P. Elwell-Sutton, on the other hand, arguing in support of his thesis that the metres of classical poetry continue the system used in pre-Islamic Iran, opted for the principle of syllable quantity (Persian metres, 168f.). It has often been observed that the Persian mathnawīs are written in a restricted number of metres. These metres always have eleven or, more rarely, ten syllables. A verse form marked by such inflexible rules for its rhyme and the number of its syllables can only have developed in the early Islamic period. It is most likely, therefore, that the mathnawī came into being through a process of adaptation of pre-Islamic verse forms to the prosody of the Islamic period which was dominated by the
metric principles of Arabic poetry. The stages of this process can no longer be traced from the scant remains of pre-classical Persian poetry which have been preserved (cf. e.g. Chr. Remps, Die ältesten Dichtungen des orientalischen Islam, DZMO, Halle 1955; 235-8; Fr. Meier, Die schöne Makhtat, Wiesbaden 1963, 9ff.; G. Lazard, Les premiers poètes persans, Paris 1964, 10ff.).

In the view of the classical poets, the mathnawi was undoubtedly a part with other forms of poetry. To Gurgâni [q.v.], the treatment in a mathnawi of the story about Vis and Râmnî, known up to this day only in an unadorned "Pahlawi" form, amounted to bringing it to the level of poetic expression (Vis-i Râmnî, ed. Tehran 1337/1959, 20). The poems of Nizâmî [q.v.] show which heights of stylistic art could be reached in this form. In some respects, however, it was also akin to prose. The narrative and didactic contents of many poems could equally be dealt with in prose works. In principle, there were no limits to the length of a mathnawi. A few works of exceptional size like the Şâh-nâma, some of the later heroic poems, and the Mathnawi-yi ma'na'awi left aside, most of the better-known poems fall within a range of 2,000 to 9,000 bayts, but the form was also used for texts of a much lesser extent. Fragments of no more than a few lines with the rhyme scheme of the mathnawi can be found as inserted lines in prose works, for example in the work of Sa'dî [q.v.], who sometimes wrote an entire story on this scheme in 10 or 12 bayts.

Other poems were occasionally inserted into a mathnawi text, either with or without the use of their specific rhyme scheme. The first poet to do the former was, to our knowledge, Ayyûkî (fl. in the early 5th/11th century), who put short poems in monorhyme into the mouths of the protagonists in his work Aûlûglî (ed. by Dîh. Safâ, Tehran 1343/1964). This insertion of ghâzâl was also a characteristic of the Dâh-nâma genre and occurs sometimes in versions of the legend of Ma'dun Laylâ [q.v.], notably in the poem of Malikâbî (9th/15th century). Lyric poems adjusted to the pattern of the mathnawi can be found frequently in the works of Firdawsi [q.v.]; Gurgâni, Nizâmî and others.

Poetry and prose were in some cases used alternatively, e.g. in the Wâld-nâma of Sultan Walad [q.v.]. The Tuhfat al-Irâkîn of Khâkânî [q.v.] is in most copies introduced by a prologue in ornate prose; a similar prologue belongs to one of the early versions of the Hadîkât al-bakâa of Sanâ'î [q.v.], but was certainly not written by the poet himself. Dîhâl al-Dîn Rûmî [q.v.] therefore does not have a composition of this kind to each of the six books into which his Mathnawi is divided.

The composition of mathnawis shows the same variety as most of their other features. Yet certain conventions can be recognised in a number of poems and can be used therefore as the basis of a classification. A common type is exemplified in mathnawis with a clear distinction between introductory sections and the proper text of the poem concerned. The former (which are often collectively designated as the dibsâ, a term also applied to prologues in prose) deal with a series of topics, some of which can be regarded as obligatory whereas others were added at the pleasure of the poet. To the first category belonged praise of the One God and prayers (tawhid, munâdâ'î), a eulogy of the Prophet (na'î), which usually included the praise of his Family and his Companions, a dedication to the poet's patron, and digressions on the occasion for writing the poem, its subject matter, etc. Reflections of the value of poetry, usually referred to as sakhtan, meaning both "speech" and "logos" (see e.g. J. Chr. Bürgel, Nizâmî über Sprache und Dichtung, in Festschrift für Fr. Meier, Wiesbaden 1974, 9-28), and other sections of a moralising nature have frequently been added. A distinction of this kind can be found in the Şâh-nâma together with a series of sections on the origin of the world which form a prelude to the subject-matter of Firdawsi's epic. The obligatory part of the text was further enlarged by Nizâmî, who added it to the treatment of the mi'âdâ [q.v.] of Muhammad following upon the na'î. Stûfi poets like Amir Khûrâw and Dâmî [q.v.] inserted the praise of their spiritual guides. In some poems, a few sections of the dibsâ were placed at the end by way of an epilogue.

Less frequently found is a type of poem introduced by the description of one particular object treated as an emblem from which symbolic meanings relevant to the following poem are derived. This device may have been borrowed from the nasîb of kašânâ. Such emblems were: the wind in Sanâ'î's Kâr-nâma and Sayr al-'ubâdât 'l-ta'âf, the sun in Tuhfat al-Irâkîn, the flute in the Mathnawi-yi ma'na'awi, and the rabâb in Sultan Walad's Rabâb-nâma.

A distinction between an introduction and the poem itself cannot always be recognised. This is especially not possible in many of the shorter mathnawis and in some didactic works like the Hadîkât al-bakâa.

Several devices could serve to articulate the contents of poems. Firdawsi inserted passages of various kinds into the Şâh-nâma to introduce the major stories contained in the text. The night scene describing how the poet was inspired by a "beloved idol", who brought him a lamp, and the theme of the tale of Bîzâhân and Manîzâh, is the best known example. The genre of nature poetry provided Nizâmî with the means to mark transitions in the structure of his romances; reflective intermezzi could fulfill the same purpose. More systematic was his use of short addresses to the cupbearer (sâ'î) and the singer (mughânt) respectively in the two parts of the Iskandarnâma as introductions to each section of the narrative.

Didactic poems were often, like treatises in prose, divided into sections, the first being a kind of introduction. The larger poems nearly always contain passages of other genres than the one they are mainly concerned with. Sections dealing with ethical, philosophical or religious themes are hardly ever missing in narrative poems. The didactic poet, on the other hand, used both long and short tales to exemplify the ideas propounded in his works. They can be found already in one of the oldest specimens of the didactic genre, the Afgân-nâma of Abû Shâkîr Bahîlî [q.v. in Suppl.].

The mathnawi was also a useful tool to present factual information on account of its memotaxic advantage. An early example of this is Ḥâkim Maysarî's Dânîsh-nâma, the oldest integral text in rhyming couplets which has been preserved. It was completed in 370/980-1 and treats of medical matters (partial edition and translation by G. Lazard, Les premiers poètes persans, Tehran-Paris 1964, ii, 178-94; i, 163-80, see also 36-40). A wide range of subjects pertaining to the religious and the natural sciences, astrology, alchemy and the arts were treated in the same fashion.

The choice of a metre for a mathnawi was deter-
mined by convention and not by some intrinsic quality of the metre concerned. A clear example is provided by the metre mutakābāt-i maddamun-i maddahīf, which, because of its occurrence in the Shāh-nāma, was mainly chosen by most poets who subsequently wrote heroic maddawīs. Already in the time of Ferdowsī, however, it was used also in a didactic poem by Abū Shākir and in a love story by ʿAyyūkī. Similar divergences of use can be noticed in the case of other metres. A decisive factor was the tendency towards the imitation of authoritative models according to their most important characteristics of form and content. The classical poets tried to bring their originality to bear through the emulation of predecessors. This consisted both of repetition and of change. The former made it clear that they were following the example of a great master; the latter that they were clever enough to find new variations on one aspect or the other of their model. The long series of imitations based on the khamasa [q.v.] of Nizāmi provides the best-known instance of the workings of this artistic principle. The metre was usually among the features which were retained in an imitating poem. The metre of a genuine work was also carefully maintained in pseudoeuphorical forgeries as they were based, e.g., on the works of Sanāʾī and ʿAttār [q.v.]. On the other hand, a change of the metre could also serve to demonstrate a poet’s independence with regard to a model followed in other respects, e.g., in the case of maddawīs and ghazals, which were written from the beginning of the 8th/14th century onwards (cf. T. Gandjeī, The Genesis and definition of a literary composition: the Dāh-nāma (“Ten love-letters”), in Isl., xlvii [1971], 59-66). Another example is the even longer sequence of Sākī-nāmas which had its origin in the call of the cup-bearer used by Nizāmī in the c’s name. The didactic genre includes several masterpieces which were fashionable in the 10th-11th/16th-17th century, shahābīs or shahābigīs, poems dealing with the playful description of young craftsmen and artisans which also exist in the form of series of quatrains (cf. A. Gulīnī Maʿṣūmī, Shahshāhī dar ḥafs-i farsī, Tehran 1936/1967); sārābā, devoted to the description of an ideal human body “from top to toe”; sūr-ū gudz, the description of painful experiences (see for a specimen, Šāhīzād-e Amuī, Kulliyāt-i ażīr, ed. Tehran 1936/1967, 193-208); and Ḵādījāt u kadar, stories about the workings of fate (cf. Armaḡān, viii [1306/1927], 120-3; x [1308/1929], 458-64, 554-60: speciments by Rūkūn Maʿṣūmī Khānī and Muḥammad-Kuli Sālim). Biblical themes were taken as the subject of maddawīs in Judeo-Persian literature [q.v.].

In modern literature, the maddawi prove still to be a useful medium for the Persian poets as long as they were mainly interested in a renewal of contents. Imitations of the Shāh-nāma with a nationalist tendency were the Nāma-yi bāstān or Sāfār-nāma (1313/1895-6) by ʿAṭā Khān Kirmānī [q.v. in Suppl.], the Kayar-nāma by Abdīl ʿAbdīl Hāgīāūari [q.v. in Suppl.] and the Pahlavī-nāma, an unfinished history of Islamic Iran in heroic verses by Nawbakht, published in 1926-8. Social and political criticism was voiced in maddawīs by Amīrī [q.v. in Suppl.] and Parwīn [q.v.]. Ḵᵛājā Mīrzā (1874-1924) used the form for satire in his ʿArf-nāma and for a modern love story in Zuhra-va Manāwī. The Indo-Persian poet Muḥammad Ibsāl [q.v.] adopted it for some of his most famous works, like the famous and widely imitated Gafrul-ʿardī, an imitation of the short mystical poem of Muḥammad Shabistārī. The last major maddawī to be written by a Persian poet was the Kūr-nāma-yi zīndān by Malik al-Šīrāzī Bahār [q.v.]. It contains the account of the poet’s imprisonment and exile during the 1930s in the style of the great didactic poets of the past (Divān-i ažīr, ed. Tehran 1345/1966, ii, 2-126).

Other poetic forms—stanzic poems and even kasīdas—were however increasingly used for epic poetry, even by poets who remained faithful to the classical canons. The experiment with a maddawī-yi mustażād made by Bahār (op. cit., ii, 234-8) was not pursued. Under the influence of the theories of Nīmā Yūḥūsī [q.v.], the Ḵẖīr-i nay poets of the period after the Second World War abandoned the maddawī, mainly because the rigid isochronism of its verse was considered to be an impediment to the expressive use of metre (see e.g. Mahdī ʿAkhjavān-Ṭalīthī (M. Umid), Bīdātā va ba ṭadāt-i Nīnā Yūḥūsī, Tehran 1357/1978, 70 ff.).

Persian literary theory had little to add to the brief definition of the maddawī given by ʿShams-i Kāyā. A few remarks on the subject by later writers were assembled by H. Blochmann, The prose of the Persians, Calcutta 1872, 87-90. Works on maddawīs sometimes pay attention to the corrections of the dihāba of a maddawī (one of such works is quoted by Ahmad ʿAlī, Haft Ašrām or History of the Masnavi of the Persians, ed. Blochmann, Calcuta 1873, 41-2; ʿAlī’s book contains the introduction to an unfinished work on maddawī poets).
MATHNAWI


3. In Turkish.

The Turkish *mathnawi* developed late under the influence of that of Persia and alongside it. The oldest monument of Muslim Turkish literature that has been chanced to be preserved, the *Kutadgu Biliq* [q.v.], is a long didactic *mathnawi* (R. Dankoff, *Yüzaf Khâys Hâjîh. Wisdom of Royal Glory (Kutadgu Biliq)*, A Turko-Islamic Mirror for Princes, Chicago 1983). Turkish and Persian *mathnawîs* shared a great stock of authoritative models, ranging from the themes themselves to the choice of the appropriate metres (*mutâbakâb* for the heroic genres [see *Hâmasâ*], *ramât* for the religio-didactic type and *hâzâtrî* for the romance). Up to now, this division into three genres has served as the main principle of organisation. But more attention needs to be paid to the social and cultural context in which these works were written, and to the way in which the three genres overlap. Turkish *mathnawîs* had the same architectural framework as their Persian counterparts [section 2 above]. The authors' possibilities lay in the 'internal' significance of the details rather than in the 'external' aspects of plot and metre, the choice of the formal means being largely determined by the theme, for which terms as *kışna* [q.v.], *dâstân*, or *kikâyâ* [see *Hikîyâ*, iii] were used.

The chief element of the narrative *mathnawi* was the plot, turning on love between two chief characters, male and female, who gave it its title. Opening chapters dealt with the reason for writing and its true purpose, incidentally drawing the patron's attention to his skills as a poet. Structure and contents of the framework could be modelled on that of the *kisâda* [q.v.], without the tautness of that form. Changing metres could be used as structural boundaries dividing parts of the prologue. In his religious exordium, an author could combine the praise of the One God with a meditation on the works of creation. The eulogy of the prophet Muhammad and his heavenly journey [see *Mâtqâq*] have been treated in all Islamic poetry, whereas the praise of the four first caliphs would only be found in the *mathnawi* of a Sunni author. In the dedicatory passage, a local patron could be praised next to the ruler. If there was no response, the dedication might be removed and replaced with a complaint to Fate. Since it was the poets' desire to prove their own superiority, they hardly ever felt the need to mention their immediate predecessors. An attitude of reverence for the great classical models was present in the poets' reflections on the value and essence of poetry. A favoured way of expression was that of mystically-coloured love poetry, depicting the author in a dialogue with the 'speaker of the heart', the cupbearer, *sâtî*, or the pen, *kâtâm*. In the epilogue, the date and the author's name could be transmitted. The author would seek to disarm adverse criticism, justifying his adaptation of a foreign classic or an old 'native' story in the Turkish of his own time and environment. Disavowal of the vernacular in general need not prevent a poet from praising his own elegant idiom which he had substituted for the obsolete language of the original.

As for his narrative, the themes being familiar and spacious could be comprised in a medley, an author could trust his audience to appreciate the significance of his particular treatment. In this way, the *mathnawi* could combine religious teachings, offer historical truth, serve as tool of learning or simply offer entertainment. Chapter headings divided the more voluminous texts. Short *(jâhâr)* and *majâtâhî* belonged to poetry in the Ottoman Turkish literature, in *suppî* poetry acted as breathing spaces. Without shifting his point of view, the author presented the inmost thoughts of his protagonists, using lyrical monologues, dialogues of the lovers or the old technique of inserting letters; he could also express his own feelings in signed *gâhâl*, using mystical images (R. Dankoff, *The lyric in the romance*, in JNES, xii [1984], 9-25). Much research is needed into the great mass of Turkish *mathnawîs* in order to relate them to the social and cultural contexts which define their significance. Most of the old poems did not appear in print before the Republic. Only a fragment of this material has been translated into a modern language.

Mystic-didactic *mathnawîs* were introduced into Anatolia by *Djalâl al-Dîn Rûmî* [q.v.] and his son *SultânWalad* [q.v.]. The short *Çâhîh-nâmâ* seems to have been overvalued as compared with *Gûlîhên* [q.v.] *Manîfîk al-fâyâr* and *Ashîf Pasha* [q.v.] *Ghârîb-nâmâ* Sûleyman Celebi's *Weleît el-nâsjî* (*Melaîdî*) on the birth and miracles of the Prophet, completed in 1812/1409, has remained immensely popular (N. Pekocay, art. Sûleyman Celebi, in IA). *Khusrav and Şîrîn* (q.v.) was a popular romance, *Yûsûf and Zulaykha* were loved as moving romances; such compositions were often religious in their purport, even though the actions and emotions they displayed did not always accord with an orthodox ethical code.

In Çâghatay, Azeri and Ottoman literatures, great poets like Mir *Îlí Shir Nawâtî* [q.v.] and Fudullî [q.v.] deployed all the resources of Persian and Turkish literature in the perfection of this form. From the 8th/14th century onwards, Turkish poets supplied inventive translations and adaptations of Persian originals. The anonymous author of the *İcîk-nâmâ* (S. Yûkses, *Mehmed. İcîk-Nâmê Incelmé metin*, Ankara 1965) already made satirical use of the stock formulas of the epic with its exciting adventures in strange lands. The anonymous author of *Cenl-nâmê* [q.v.] composed early versions of the *Yûsûf-Zaîla* [q.v.] theme, to which *Kemâlâpasha-zêde* [q.v.] later was to contribute a *mathnawi*; *Kûbî and Fakhîrî* (both 8th/14th century), must now be looked upon as pioneers in the Turkish *Khusrav-Şîrîn* versions. Weighted with a heavily Persianised vocabulary, *Şeyyîtî* [q.v.] (F. K. Timurtaş, *Şeyh in Hüsref ve Şîrîn*, Istanbul 1963), in which Fakhîrî's verses can be traced, had a great influence on later poets. Under the Ottomans, new subjects were added to the répertoire. Dâfi [q.v.] contributed an allegorical *Ceng-nâmê* Lââmî [q.v.] dealt with comparatively new (Salâmân and Absâl) or nearly forgotten themes, such as *Vis and Râmîn* [see *Gurûgânî*], and *Wâmîk and Âdîrâh*. It is doubtful whether he ever saw a complete copy of the latter poem in the version of *Unsüry* [q.v.] who ultimately drew from a Greek source (see M. Nazif Salihoglu, art. *Unsu*, in IA; art. *Vâmîk u Azrâ*, in IA; B. Utas, in Orientalia Suecana, xxxiii-xxxv [1984-6]). Lââmî and Dâfi [q.v.] both composed a *Şehr in Persânê*, Fadîl [q.v.] introduced the Gûl ve Bûlbûl theme. Dja'Far Çelebi [q.v.] wrote an original *Hoez-nâmê*; to Meshîhî (d. 918/1512 [q.v.]) the first Ottoman *şehr eniniz* is attributed, a genre later to be elaborated as a social satire by Fakhîrî [q.v.]. Indeed, as in the *kâzîyê*, praise could turn into satire and invective; Ahmâtî [q.v.] in his medical *Târaîh el-erwaî* flung abuse at the people of Bursa who had obstructed his work; the *Khân-nâmê*...
by Sheykhi [q.v.] contains a vigorous satire on the bad luck of a poet who is robbed of his timdr (F. G. W., 1975, 540-41). Ahmedi appended the first versified chronicle of the Ottomans to his Iskender-nâme. The term ghâzâvât-nâme is used with reference to narrative poems celebrating the military triumphs of the Ottomans. Epics to honour contemporary sultans in Persian and Turkish in the 10th-16th century (see LUKMÂN; H. Sohrweide, ed. H. H. Roemer and A. ÖZALP, in Studia preottomani e ottomani, Naples 1976, 101-4; H. Ayan, “Books of victory” on the wars of the Ottomans to his Iskender-nâme. Some last passages in his written sermons on religious and moral subjects remain in demand. Nabi’s long didactic Khayriyye, completed in 1825. As late as 1874, Diva (Ziya) Pasha published a three-volume anthology of classical poetry, with a long and popular study (HOP, v, 78-83; NÂMÎK KEMÂL [see KEMÂL, NAME] responded in prose. The vitality of the maftüna was sustained right to the end of Ottoman literature; the Islamist poet Mehmed 3ÂKÎ [q.v.] Ersoy brought a new ease to it, using it for conversational verses as well as rhetorical passages in his written sermons on religious and moral subjects.


4. In Urdu

The development of the Urdu mathnawi falls broadly into three periods: early, middle and modern. The early period is associated mainly with the Dakkani phase of Urdu literature. In Dakkani verse, the mathnawi constitutes the most popular form, and is represented by a large output of both religious and secular poems. Many of these are long pieces comprising several thousand couplets. Often they are translated or adapted from Persian sources, but not a few of them are works of an original character. The mathnawi reached its most productive stage in the 10th/16th and 11th/17th centuries with the emergence of Bidjapur and Golkonda as the main centres of Dakkani literature. Hitherto, the mathnawi was more concerned with religious subjects, but subsequently stories of love and heroism began to find increasing prominence in their content. In Bidjapur, under the enlightened patronage of the Adil Shahi dynasty (895-1097/1490-1686), many mathnawis were written during this period. In 1081/1670 by Tabrīzī, a love poem, written in imitation of Ibn Husain’s Persian epic of the same name, follows the model of Dāsāīn-i AmharHamza, and also borrows some topics from Firdawsi’s Shah-nāma (“The book of the East”). This poem, written in imitation of Ibn Husain’s Persian epic of the same name, follows the model of Dāsāīn-i AmharHamza, and also borrows some topics from Firdawsi’s Shah-nāma (“The book of the East”). This poem, written in imitation of Ibn Husain’s Persian epic of the same name, follows the model of Dāsāīn-i AmharHamza, and also borrows some topics from Firdawsi’s Shah-nāma (“The book of the East”). This poem, written in imitation of Ibn Husain’s Persian epic of the same name, follows the model of Dāsāīn-i AmharHamza, and also borrows some topics from Firdawsi’s Shah-nāma (“The book of the East”). This poem, written in imitation of Ibn Husain’s Persian epic of the same name, follows the model of Dāsāīn-i AmharHamza, and also borrows some topics from Firdawsi’s Shah-nāma (“The book of the East”). This poem, written in imitation of Ibn Husain’s Persian epic of the same name, follows the model of Dāsāīn-i AmharHamza, and also borrows some topics from Firdawsi’s Shah-nāma (“The book of the East”). This poem, written in imitation of Ibn Husain’s Persian epic of the same name, follows the model of Dāsāīn-i AmharHamza, and also borrows some topics from Firdawsi’s Shah-nāma (“The book of the East”). This poem, written in imitation of Ibn Husain’s Persian epic of the same name, follows the model of Dāsāīn-i AmharHamza, and also borrows some topics from Firdawsi’s Shah-nāma (“The book of the East”). This poem, written in imitation of Ibn Husain’s Persian epic of the same name, follows the model of Dāsāīn-i AmharHamza, and also borrows some topics from Firdawsi’s Shah-nāma (“The book of the East”). This poem, written in imitation of Ibn Husain’s Persian epic of the same name, follows the model of Dāsāīn-i AmharHamza, and also borrows some topics from Firdawsi’s Shah-nāma (“The book of the East”). This poem, written in imitation of Ibn Husain’s Persian epic of the same name, follows the model of Dāsāīn-i AmharHamza, and also borrows some topics from Firdawsi’s Shah-nāma (“The book of the East”).
critics. The mathnawi of Muhammad Mu'min Khan Ku'm (1215-67/1800-51), like those of Mir, provide a record of the poet's emotional involvements, whether real or imaginary, and have won recognition from literary authorities.

In the poetic creations of Nawab Mirza Shawk (1197-1288/1783-1871), whose real name was Tashad-dik Husayn, the Urdu romantic mathnawi with a personal motif reached its maturity. Shawk, who devoted his talents almost exclusively to the writing of mathnawi, is the author of three works in that genre, namely Farid-i 'ishk ("The Deception of Love"), Bahar-i 'ishk ("The Spring of Love") and Zaher-i 'ishk ("The Poison of Love").

Sharing honours with Mir Hasan's Sihr al-bayan ("The Magic of Eloquence"), which was finished in 1199/1784-5, and comprises approximately 2,500 couplets. It is a fairy tale of the conventional type containing a description of the rose-garden of Na'sin ("The Rose-garden of Na'sin") written in 1838 by Pandit Daya Shankar Na'sin (1811-43). This work has left a marked impact on contemporary and later poets, as seen from the mathnawi composed after its example. Its central plot revolves around the adventures of prince Tadj al-Muluk, whose search takes him into a fairyland where its terse description, its flights of fancy, and its choice of similes, words and idioms.

The modern Urdu mathnawi in its modern phase dates from the latter part of the 19th century, and its origin is linked with the campaign initiated at that time to achieve literary reforms. The reformers, dissatisfied with the glaza, advocated the adoption of the nash or "thematic poem" pattern after Western models. The mathnawi, with its tradition of continuous themes and a comparatively less inhibiting rhyme scheme, provided a ready-made form for the nash, and it came to be employed by the reformers as an effective literary instrument to popularise the new trends in Urdu poetry. The predominant theme of the modern Urdu mathnawi is social. As such, it differs from the earlier mathnawi which was identified with romantic subjects. In other respects also, it evokes differences from older models. Lengthy mathnawi like those composed in the past are now extremely rare, and the restriction imposed by custom on the type of metres to be employed by the mathnawi is no longer observed.

(Munirah Raḥmān)

MATHURA (earlier English spelling, now dis-continued, “Mutra”), an Indian city lying between Dīhī and Āgra, of considerable antiquity and of high reputation in India as a place of high religious sanctity for Hinduś and, formerly, for Dājīns and Bhuddhistś also; it was already a place of some renown when it became the eastern of the two Kūshāna capitals. It is, surprisingly, not mentioned in the Ḥadīth al-‘ālam, and only incidentally by al-Bīrūnī, although for Ptolemy it had been Mōdhura in his Geography. Its great reputation led to its being plundered by Mahmūd of Ghaznī in 408/1018 and by many later Muslim rulers, more in an excess of iconoclastic zeal than in a settlement of the district; notably by Sikandar Lōdī ca. 905/1500, who is reported to have destroyed many idols and to have prohibited head-shaving and ritual bathing. Some temples were allowed to be built in the tolerant reign of Akbar (the temple of Govind Deva at Bīndābād in the Mathurā district, built by Mān Singh [q. v.], even shows architectural borrowings from north Indian Muslim art); but Shāh-djāhān in 1646/1636-7 appointed a governor to “extirpate idolatry”, Arawgīzī some thirty years later destroyed its finest temple and built a mosque on top of it, and Ahmad Shāh Durrānī in 1703/1757 not only plundered the temples but butchered a large group of pilgrims. Otherwise, it saw little of Islam, the Mūwattīs, in whose territories it lay [see mīrū ṭa], not being renowned for their orthodoxy. A Dājīnī mosque, built in 1071/1660-1 (inscr. chronogram) by ‘Abd al-Nābī, a governor under Akbar, is an excellent building for its period, with fine inlay in encaustic tilework, four tall minārs, and two side pavilions with the curved-cotnic “Bengali” roof flanking the courtyard which stands 4 m. above road level; Arawgīzī’s own mosque is rather effete.

Bibliography: F. S. Growse, Mathura: a district memoir, Benares 1874 and many subsequent reprints, is highly praised but barely acknowledges the presence of Muslims. The mosque has not been adequately published. (R. F. Chisholm’s account of “Tiruomal Naik’s palace, Madura”, listed in Creswell, Bibliography, s.v. Mathura) is not at Mathura at all but at Madurā, the former capital of the Madura sultanate = Ma‘bar [q. v.].)

(John Burton-Pagge)

AL-MATLA (A.), the rising point of a celestial body, usually a star, on the local horizon. This concept was important in Islamic folk astronomy [see anxīl and manāzīl on some aspects of this tradition], as distinct from mathematical astronomy [see ‘ilm al-ḥay’a], because it was by the risings and settings of the sun and stars that the kibla [q.v.] or direction of Mecca was usually determined in popular practice. The terms used for the rising and setting points of the sun were usually maḥrūk and maḥrūk, maṭlā‘ being generally reserved for stars. The directions of sunrise at the equinoxes and solstices were usually associated with the corresponding zodiacal signs [see muntakār] or seasons, thus e.g. maḥrūk al-dājūn and maḥrūk al-dājūn both refer to winter sunrise, since the sun enters the sign of Capricorn at midnight.

In pre-Islamic Arabian folklore, the directions of the winds (see kibla) were defined in terms of astronomical risings and settings (see Fig. 1) and one such wind scheme is associated with the Ka‘ba itself (see Fig. 2). These wind schemes are recorded in later Arabic treatises on lexicography, folk astronomy, cosmography, as well as in encyclopaedias and various legal treatises on the kibla. The major axis of the rectangular base of the Ka‘ba points towards maṭlā‘ Suhayl, the rising point of Canopus, and the minor axis roughly towards maṭlā‘ al-ṣuyūţ, the rising point of the sun at midsummer. The later Islamic attempts to define the kibla for different localities in terms of astronomical risings and settings stem from the fact that these localities were associated with specific segments of the perimeter of the Ka‘ba, and the kiblas adopted were the same as the astronomical directions which one would be facing when standing directly in front of the appropriate part of the Ka‘ba (see Mārka iv).

The term maṭlā‘ was also used to denote the “time of rising” in the expression maṭlā‘ al-ṣā‘īr, daybreak or the beginning of morning twilight.

Bibliography: That given in the article KIBLA is to be supplemented with the information con-

Fig. 1. Four early Arabian wind schemes defined in terms of astronomical risings and settings and attributed to early Muslim authorities. I Khālid b. Sa‘fāwān. Limits of winds: 1-4 cardinal directions (defined in terms of the Pole Star and sunrise and sunset at the equinoxes); names of the winds: a sābā, b dānāṣ, c dābār, d ṭamāl. II ‘Alī b. Abī Ṭālib. Limits: 1, 2, 4 cardinal directions; names: as in I. III Ibn Dījandharī. Limits: 1 north, 2 summer sunrise, 3 winter sunrise, 4 south, 5 winter sunset, 6 summer sunset; names: a nakhbī, b sābā or khabīl, c ma‘tū, d qanīb, e dābār, f ṭamāl. IV Ibn al-‘Arafī. Limits: 1 setting (or rising?) of the Banāt Na‘ṣr, 2 rising of the Pleiades, 3 rising of Canopus, 4 setting of Vega; names: as in I.
Fig. 2. The most popular early Arabian wind scheme, in which the four winds strike the walls of the Ka'ba head-on. The rectangular base of the Ka'ba points in astronomically significant directions, and so the limits of the four winds are likewise astronomically defined. The rising of Canopus and the solstitial risings and settings of the sun were widely used for finding the kibla in popular practice, in order to ensure that one would be "facing" a particular wall of the Ka'ba, that is, standing in a direction "parallel" to the appropriate axis of the Ka'ba.


MATMĀTA, name of a large Berber people mentioned as early as the middle of the 3rd/9th century in the geographical work of Ibn Khurradadhbih as being among the thirty most important Berber tribes of this period. According to the majority of Berber genealogists cited by Ibn Khaldūn (including Sābīk al-Matmātī), the Matmāta, who were brothers of the Matghara, Sadina, Malzūza, Madyūna and Lamāya, belonged to the great Berber family of the Butr; they constituted, with the above-mentioned tribes, the family of Fājin, son of Izāzūt. However, some other genealogists mentioned by Ibn Khaldūn hold that the Matmāta belonged, along with the Barghāwāta and Azdāḏīja, to the Berber stock of Barānis (Brānes). There is also another genealogy of the Matmāta, according to which this tribe is regarded as belonging, along with the Barghāwāta and Azdāḏīja, to the great Berber family of the Zanāta, being descended from Djiūnā, ancestor of the Zanāta.

1. Tunisīa. It seems that the original homeland of the Matmāta, a people who were early converts to Islam and who adopted, around the middle of the 2nd/8th century the beliefs of the Ibāḍī sect, was the land situated in the south-east of Tunisia and more exactly to the west and south of the town of Gabēs, ancient Barghāna, Kābīs of the medieval Tāqānae, Kābīs of the mediaeval Arab geographers. They were called by this name by around 196/811, at the time when the Ibāḍī imām of Tāhār ʿAbd al-Wahhāb b. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Rustām sent, on the occasion of his siege of the town of Tripoli, the Ibāḍī general Kāfān b. Salma al-Zawāgī to Kābīs with orders to besiege it. We owe this information to the Ibāḍī historian Abu ʿl-ʿAbbās al-Šākmākī (928/1522), who used it in his work several much older sources. In speaking of Kāfān b. Salma (in another passage of al-Šākmākī's work this person is called Salma b. Kaṭa), who was appointed governor of Kābīs in this period by the imām ʿAbd al-Wahhāb, the Ibāḍī historian in question adds that under this governor's régime, the Berber tribes of the Matmāta, Zanzafa, Dammar, Zawāgīya and others were still living outside Gabēs. It seems that the Matmāta in this period were already occupying the mountainous country called Djabal Matmāta, situated about 30 or 40 km. south of Gabēs. This country was also at one time called Djabal Lawāta, owing to the Lawātī family which lived there with the Matmāta. The survivors of the Matmāta and Lawātī still live there today. Apart from this area, the Matmāta also inhabited, in times gone by, the town of al-Hāmma (ancient Aqāe Tactapitanē), situated 23 km. to the west of Gabēs. According to Ibn Khaldūn’s Histoire des Berbères, al-Hāmma was founded by the Matmāta. According to the Khād al-Iṣbāy of ca. 587/1191, al-Hāmma was a very ancient town inhabited by the Matmāta. The Tunisian scholar of the 7th/14th century al-Tīḏānī mentions, in his account of a journey from Tunis to Tripoli, this place by the name of Hāmmār Matmāta, although in the view of this scholar, the Matmāta may already have left, ceding the place to the Zanāta who were divided into three groups: the Banū Tūḏiān, Banū Wartāḏiūn and Awlād Yūsuf.

The later history of the Tunisian Matmāta (who, apparently having adopted in the 9th/10th century the beliefs of the Ibāḍī sub-sect of the Nukkāriyya [q. v.], as had their neighbours the Banū Dammar, established in the south of the area occupied by the Matmāta in the Djabal Dammar) is little known. It seems that the Matmāta living in the Djabal of this name recognised the authority of the last representative of the Almoravīd family of the Banū Ghāniyā, Yahīya, who, having his seat and base of operations in the Bilād al-Djārid, extended his power, around 1200 A.D., over the whole of Ifrikiya. In any case, the sayyid Abū Ibāš who pursued, in 603/1207, in his name of the brother the Almohad caliph al-Nāṣir, the Almoravid rebels in Ifrikiya, subdued the country situated behind Tripoli and chastised, according to Ibn Khāldūn, “the Banū Dammar, the Matmāta and the Naẓūsī,” the inhabitants at that time of the vast mountainous crescent which stretches from Gabēs to ancient Leptis Magna, on the edge of the plain of Dījīfā (Djeffāra). Under the domination of the Turks, the inhabitants of the Djabal Matmāta and the Djabal Dammar who, until this period, had remained practically independent and had not recognised the authority of the sovereigns of Ifrikiya, refused to pay taxes. The Turkish bey of Tunisia, Muḥammad Bey (1631-63 A.D.), had a fort built in the Matmāta Mts. in order to contain the rebels. We owe this information to the Tunisian historian Ibn Abī Dinār, who dealt with this event in al-Mu‘īns fi ʾibāb irīkiyya wa-
In the 18th and the first part of the 19th century, in the central Maghrib. One should mention here a clan of this tribe living to the west of Ouarsenis and Sersû and to the west of the town of Yalal (Hill of our maps) under the domination of the dynasty descended from Muhârîd b. al-Hasan, related to the Idrîsids of Morocco, who ruled in this period in Tlemcen and the district around it. This clan of the Matmâta had nothing in common with the Matmâta of Ouarsenis, who were Ibâdîs and who recognised the suzerainty of the Rustamîd imâms of Tâhârt. One of the clans of the Matmâta of Tlemcen was in control of the town of Ayzrâdji (?) situated near the western fringes of Tlemcen, probably in the area of the modern Algero-Moroccan frontier.

The history of the Matmâta of the Tâhârt district, after the fall of the Rustamîd imâmâte and the forced conversion of this clan to Shî'î beliefs at the beginning of the 4th/10th century, is little known to us. We know, however, that they took an active part in the war which broke out between the Zirî princes Hâmâd b. Bulûgûn (405-19/1015-28) and Bâdîs b. al-Manṣûr (396/406/996-1016), Ibn Khâldûn even mentions a famous amîr of the Matmâta of the Tâhârt district; he was called Zîrî and lived towards the end of the 4th/10th century and beginning of the 5th/11th; defeated by the Sanhâdja Zîrîds, he was forced to go to Spain.

The survivors of the powerful Matmâta clan of the Tâhârt district were still living in this area in the 19th century. They were living to the north of the plateau of Sersû, in Thaza (Tâza) and the surrounding district.

3. Morocco. Some advanced groups of the Matmâta pressed on, probably a little before the 4th/10th century, as far as Morocco. A group of this people settled in the territory of Nûkrû, in the eastern Rif, where they are mentioned by al-Bâkî in the 5th/11th century. Al-Yâkûbî (3rd/9th century) mentions also the clans of Matmâta settled in the town of Fûlûsûn (?) situated to the east of the town of Nûkrû. Another clan of the Matmâta lived on the upper course of Wâdî Moulouya, in an area called Matmâta Amâskûr, to the south of Fâs. It is mentioned by al-Bâkî and by Ibn Khâldûn. The latter author also speaks of a mountain called Matmâta situated between Fâs and Sefrou (Sufrây). One should add that there were also some Matmâta between Fâs and Tâza; furthermore, a place in this area still bears the name Matmâta.

Finally, there was also a group of Matmâta settled in the far west of Morocco, in the region called Tâmâsnâ, where there existed in the Middle Ages a kingdom founded by the anti-MuslimBerber tribe of Barghawâta. [9.5.2.2.3.6.7.9.76] The Matmâta of Tâmâsnâ formed part of the confederation of Barghawâta and professed the faith of this tribe. We know of it through the account of Zammûr, sent by the Barghawâta to the caliph of Cordova in 352/963, which is cited in the Kîtâb al-Ma'idîl uwa l-mamâlik of al-Bâkî. Zammûr gives in this account two lists of Berber tribes of Tâmâsnâ under the suzerainty of the Barghawâta empire, that is, those who profess the Barghawâti faith and the Muslims. The Matmâta of Tâmâsnâ are mentioned in the first of these lists. The history of this clan of the Matmâta is entirely unknown to us; however, we know, thanks to al-Idrîsî, that it still existed in the 5th/12th century.

4. Spain. There were also some Matmâta groups among the Berber tribes who went across to Spain at different periods. We know this from Ibn Khâldûn, who gives us some details in his Histoire des Berbères. We have already mentioned a famous Matmâta amîr of...
the central Maghrib called Ziri, who lived towards the end of the 4th/10th century and beginning of the 5th/11th century; this amīr was originally chief of the Matmātā of the Wānhār (Ghirānīs) plateau, as well as of Qaţādū, a mountain dominating the country around Tāḥart. Defeated by the Sanḥādja, he crossed into Spain, where he went to see the powerful Umayyad waẓir al-Maṃṣūr b. Abī 'Amīr [q.v.], who received him with alacrity and enrolled him among the Berber amīrs admitted to his service. It is very likely that Ziri was accompanied, on his journey to Spain, by members of his household and perhaps by several Matmāt warriors; he soon became one of the most distinguished officers in al-Maṃṣūr's Berber corps. After the latter's death in 392/1002, his sons al-Μuẓaffar (d. in 398/1008) and 'Abd al-Rahmān continued to treat Ziri with the same favour as their father. However, from the time of the revolt of the Umayyad Muhammad II b. Ḥiṣām b. 'Abd al-Dabāb, who had become caliph with the title of al-Mahdī. The end of Ziri is unknown to us. According to Ibn Khaḍūn, he stayed in the service of al-Mahdī until the great revolt of the Berbers in Spain. The year of his death is unknown.

AM, lord of 40/1036-48, or the Hammudid prince in the service of al-Mahdī until the great revolt of the Berbers in Spain, is Kahlan b. Abl Lawa, one of the most famous Berbers in Spain. The year of his death is unknown. According to Ibn Khaḍūn, he probably originally came from Wānšaṭarīg and Qaţādū and who crossed into Spain, is Khālīn b. Abī Lawā, one of the most famous Berber genealogists. He made his way to al-Nāṣir, first ruler of the Banū Hammūd dynasty (is this the Muhammad, lord of Al-Qādisiyyah who reigned in 428-430/1036-48, or the Hammūdī prince al-'Abī, lord of Malaga in 1001-21 and 1022-25?).

Finally, one should add that the greatest Berber genealogist, Sābkū b. Suleymān b. Ḥarāb b. Mūlāt Ibn Dunās, who is one of Ibn Khaḍūn's sources, belonged to the Matmāt tribe.


LA (s.v.), which specifies that it is the plural matmār which should be applied to underground silos where grain is stored. In fact, the singular currently denotes a silo, and the plural, a group of silos guarded by a tamāṭar and called mars in Morocco (ratba in Takrūna, where the guardian is known as ratāṭā; W. Marçaux, Glossaire de Takrūna, v, 2408-9, with discussion of the figurative expressions drawn from the root).

In the Maghrib, in addition to the communal granaries [see AGADIR], silos were the most usual method of storing cereals. The authorities sometimes dug out such silos, which reached vast sizes. Thus the 'Alawīd sultan Muhammad b. 'Abd Allāh [q.v.] caused to be built at Marrakesh, between 1173 and 1181/1760-8, two enormous silos on top of which was an inclined plane from which the grain, brought thither by beasts of burden, was despatched down chutes to the different parts of the subterranean storehouse, which was not visible from the outside (G. Höst, Nachrichten von Marokos und Fes, Copenhagen 1781, 75-7; cf. J. Delacrozières, Habs Zebbaa à Fès Djedjīd, in IV Congrès des Soc. savantes, ii, Algiers 1929; G. Deverdun, Marrakech, i, 495). In Algeria, as early as 1848, an officer had presented a project for setting up reserve silos (or "matmore") and this was actually done some years later (see Capasset, Mémoires sur le commerce du tabac, Paris 1908, Algiers 1913, 409-53).

The technique for the excavation of silos differs little from one region to another. In general, the opening is narrow in such a way that it may be hermetically sealed, and the cavity is enlarged lower down, although attaining no great depth. If the nature of the soil requires it, the interior walls are lined with the object of protecting the cereals stored from humidity. But the latter must also be shielded from some subtle dangers, so that ensilage, entry into a silo and the withdrawal of a quantity of grain, are surrounded by precautions of a magical nature which, as regards Berber Morocco, have been fully documented by E. Laoust, Mots et choses berbères, Paris 1920, 409-53.

The singular matmār (or matmār, from matmār, with the genitive also has the sense of "pit") is a toponym which may also be frequently encountered (see Le Strange, Lands, 138). It is in any case the name of a locality in 'Irāk close to Hilwān (see al-Maṣūdī, Marājī, § 359; Ibn Hawkal, 358, Fr. tr. Kramers-Wiet, 350; Ţāhī, ed. Ţāhī, 562), while Ḥāṣṭ Maṭmār, or simply Maṭmār, was the name for homes of cave-dwellers situated in the "Syrian March" (see A. A. Vasilev, Byzance et les Arabes, ii/1, Brussels 1968, 82; M. Canard, H'undanides, 730; cf. Ibn Hawkal, 200, Fr. tr. 194-5; al-Maṣūdī, Tanbihī, ed. Šāwei, 151, which seems to give to maṭmāra the sense of "village of cave-dwellers"); it should be noted that the (subterranean?) cells of monks are called maṭmāra by al-Dǎlībī, Hayawān, iv, 458-9.

Besides the chateau from the Spanish comedy (Matamores) whose (masculine) name in French is Matamore, the traveller Jean Moquet has noted in his Voyages en Afrique, etc., 1617, 166, a feminine matamore denoting a large and deep pit, and C. P. Richelet (Dictionnaire français, ed. of 1693) supplies the following definition of the same term: "It is a prison where tormenting the slaves. A flight of 20 or 30 steps leads down to it. Air and light are supplied only through a
small aperture. The slaves there are horribly over-
crowded ... A. Gallard, Histoire d'une ... on mathe-
matics was written in 923/1517 and dedicated to Sellm
I (918-26/1512-20). He had started by this time also
beneath fortresses or in the country, the only contact
with the world outside is through very narrow ven-
tilators” (see also R. Brunschvig, Hafside, i, 449-50
about a matmuna in Tripoli). Dozy’s account applies to
Muslim Spain, where matmuna has given rise to the
Spanish word mazmorra (see J. Corominas, Diccionario
critico etimologico de la lengua castellana, Berne 1954-7, iii,
306-9), which denotes, like the Portuguese mazmorra or
matamorra, a subterranean prison (on those which have
been discovered at Granada, see L. Torres Balbás,
Las mazmorras de la Alhambra, in al-And., ix/1 (1944),
198-210; see also R. Arié, L’Espagne musulmane au

Bibliography: Given in the article.

(C. H. Pellat)

MATN (A.), a term with various meanings, of
which that of text of a hadith [q.v.] is to be noted.
Matn already appears with the sense of “text” in
pre-Islamic poetry, and has been used thus in Arabic
literature up to the present day. It denotes especially
the text of a book as distinguished from its oral
explanation or its written or printed commentary.
In connection with traditions, matn denotes the content
or text itself, in distinction from the chain of
traditionists who have handed it down (ismā’ [q.v]).
The choice of this term to designate the body of a
hadith led Goldziher to put forward the view that the
traditions were put into writing at an early date, but
he recognised that he was unable to determine the first
occurrence of this. However, it should be remarked
that the matn has rarely been the subject of textual
criticism on the part of the fakāhā and, as G. H. A.
Juyboll observes (The authenticity of the tradition
literature, Leiden 1969, 139), if the criteria which
modern authors enumerate had been applied, there
would have been very little left of the “authentic” col-
lections.

Bibliography: Goldziher, Muhammedanische
Studien, ii, 56ff., Eng. tr. Muslim studies, ii, 20ff.
(A. J. Wensinck*)

MATRAH (lat. 23° 38 N., long. 58° 34 E.) the
largest city and major port of the Sultanate of
Oman. Matrah was only a small fishing village in
September 1507 when Afonso d’Albuquerque an-
chored his fleet there in preparation for the sacking of
Maskat [q.v.]. The Portuguese later fortified Matrah
with one fort on the waterfront and a second on a hill
at the southwest corner of the town. The Ya’āribī
imān Sulṭān b. Sayf expelled the Portuguese from
Matrah in 1651. During the Omani civil war of the
early 18th century, the city was occupied by Persian
troops, who were driven out by Ahmad b. Sa’id of
the Al Bā Sa’id [q.v.] in 1741. Since the establishment of
the Al Bā Sa’id dynasty, Matrah has been subjected
to attacks by opponents of the régime on several
occasions.

Matrah’s rise to commercial prominence began
during the period of Portuguese occupation. Maskat
was the entrepot for Portugal’s trade, but that city was
made inaccessible to the rest of Umān by the moun-
tains surrounding it. Matrah, with its excellent har-
bour and ease of access to both Maskat, only 4 km.
distant by water, and to the population centres of
interior Umān via Wādī Samā’il, came to dominate
the domestic trade. In addition, Matrah had impor-
tant weaving and ship-building industries. With Maskat’s decline as an entrepôt during the 19th cen-
tury, Matrah’s commercial importance increased,
and the construction of Miḥnā Khāsī in the early 1970s
has insured the city’s dominant position.
Because of its commercial activity, Matrah
historically has had a cosmopolitan population, with
Arabs, especially Banū Dījbīr and Banū Hasan
tribes, Balūcīs, Africans, Persians and Indians all
residing there. Among the Indians, the Liwātīyya
from Sind are distinctive. The Liwātīyya (sing. Lītī’),
who were originally Khāleda Ismā’īlīs but converted
their Ismā’īlī faith under Iğnā ‘Aḥṣaf Shī’ism in the 1860s, have been in
Matrah for more than 100 years. Although very active
in business, the Liwātīyya were, until recent times,
so socially isolated in a walled portion, probably the
original Portuguese fort, of Matrah known as Sūr
Liwātīyya, from which all outsiders were excluded.
During the 19th century, many Hindu Banyans
began leaving Maskat and settling in Matrah to take
advantage of Matrah’s international flavour.

Bibliography: The best description of Matrah
during the Portuguese period is Pedro Barreto de
Resendes, Livro do Estado da India Oriental, 1464,
mss. B. L., Sloane 197, Sch. no. 11690, fols. 124-7.
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b. Sa’id al-Azkwai, Kašf al-’ghumma, and a con-
tinuation of the 1780s by al-Ma’wālī, Kişās wa-
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History of the Imāms and Suyūṭīs of Umān ..., London
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MATRAKČI, NAṢŪḤ AL-SILĀḤĪ AL-MATRAKĪ, OR Nasīḥ b. Karagöz b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Būmawī (d. 1271/1754), outstanding knight, inventor of new forms of the game of matrak (a contest with a stick, cudgel or rapier for training and knight-
errantry), mathematician, historian, calli-
ographer and painter of the period of Suleyman the Magnificent (926-74/1520-66).
He was a student in the Palace School during the
reign of the Bayezid II (886-918/1481-1512). His first
book, Qomāl al-kutub wa-kamāl al-kusūf al-matmūt al-
mathematics was written in 923/1517 and dedicated to Selim I (918-26/1512-20). He had started by this time also
to distinguish himself as a knight. He began his career as an historian to translate al-Tabarî's famous history from Arabic into Turkish in 926/1520. The title of his translation was as an historian to translate al-Tabarî's famous history from Arabic into Turkish in 926/1520. The title of his translation as the fourth volume of his work, which includes the history of the Ottomans from the beginning to the year of 998/1581. We have manuscripts from this period dealing only with the time of Bayezid II, Selim I and Süleyman I, such as Ta'rikh-i Sultan Süleyman wa-Sultan Selim, the illuminated copy of Ta'rikh-i Sultan Selim, the illuminated copy of Ta'rikh-i Sultan Bayezid, the illuminated copy of Beşyân-i Menazzî-i Sefîr-i Ta'rikh (944/1537), Süleyman-name (926-44/1520-37), Feth-name-i Karabogaz (945/1538), the illuminated copy of Ta'rikh-i Feth-i Şahsî (950/1541), and the second part of the Süleyman-name (950-8/1541-53).

He was also the painter, with a group of other artists, of his illuminated historical works indicated above. He participated in different expeditions and sketched at least the outlines of his documentary paintings of towns and cities in their own localities. Meanwhile, a letter of 936/1529 of Sultan Süleyman praises him as the master knight of his time, incomparable in the whole Ottoman Empire. He completed his Tuhfat al-ghazâât on the art of using various weapons in 939/1532, and the second part of the Shiklos history, the Umdat al-hisâb (939-41/1532-5). Feth-name-i Karabogaz (944/1537), and the second part of the Ta'rikh-i Feth-i Suleyman-ndme (1543-51).

He was also the painter, with a group of other artists, of his illuminated historical works indicated above. He participated in different expeditions and sketched at least the outlines of his documentary paintings of towns and cities in their own localities. Meanwhile, a letter of 936/1529 of Sultan Süleyman praises him as the master knight of his time, incomparable in the whole Ottoman Empire. He completed his Tuhfat al-ghazâât on the art of using various weapons in 939/1532, and the second part of the Shiklos history, the Umdat al-hisâb (939-41/1532-5). Feth-name-i Karabogaz (944/1537), and the second part of the Ta'rikh-i Feth-i Suleyman-ndme (1543-51).

As a historian to translate al-Tabarî's famous history from Arabic into Turkish in 926/1520, the title of his translation was as the fourth volume of his work, which includes the history of the Ottomans from the beginning to the year of 998/1581. We have manuscripts from this period dealing only with the time of Bayezid II, Selim I and Süleyman I, such as Ta'rikh-i Sultan Süleyman wa-Sultan Selim, the illuminated copy of Ta'rikh-i Sultan Selim, the illuminated copy of Ta'rikh-i Sultan Bayezid, the illuminated copy of Beşyân-i Menazzî-i Sefîr-i Ta'rikh (944/1537), Süleyman-name (926-44/1520-37), Feth-name-i Karabogaz (945/1538), the illuminated copy of Ta'rikh-i Feth-i Şahsî (950/1541), and the second part of the Süleyman-name (950-8/1541-53).

He was also the painter, with a group of other artists, of his illuminated historical works indicated above. He participated in different expeditions and sketched at least the outlines of his documentary paintings of towns and cities in their own localities. Meanwhile, a letter of 936/1529 of Sultan Süleyman praises him as the master knight of his time, incomparable in the whole Ottoman Empire. He completed his Tuhfat al-ghazâât on the art of using various weapons in 939/1532, and the second part of the Shiklos history, the Umdat al-hisâb (939-41/1532-5). Feth-name-i Karabogaz (944/1537), and the second part of the Ta'rikh-i Feth-i Suleyman-ndme (1543-51).
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posteriora, including the commentary of Alexander and Themistius's paraphrase, the Sophistici eloqui (revision of an older version, cf. Badawi (ed.), *Manṭiq Āristi*, 75-234) contains the *Analytica* posteriora in Book 11 of *Organon* (cf., its paraphrase by Themistus, *De generatione et corruptione* with the commentaries of Alexander and Olympiodorus, the *Meteorologica* with Olympiodorus's commentary, and book Lambda of *The Metaphysica* with Alexander's commentary as well as Themistius's paraphrase. Only three of these have survived:


(c) Mattā's translation of the *Ars poetica* (edd. D.S. Margoliouth, London 1887; J. Tkatsch, Vienna 1928-32; cf. Badawī, Medīnat al-ulmūn, ed. A. Amlin and A. al-Zayn, ii, 153-4; G. Endress, *Ars poetica*, ii, 153-4; A. G. Brown, *Averroes and the Christian philosophers in Baghdad*, notably `Ibād b. Zur`a, al-Ḥasan b. Suwār, and the Muslim Abū Sulaymān al-Sijistani [q.v.]. On the other side, a vehement polemic, surging since the traditionalist reaction of the mid-9th century, was directed by the religious establishment of the *ṭalāf* al-ṣalāhyya against the claim of Greek logic and philosophy to universal truth, and more especially against the influence of logic apparent in the works of his contemporaries like Ibn al-Sarrād [q. v.] and his pupil al-Rummānī [q. v.] (cf. *Fihrist*, 62; Ibn al-Anbārī, *Nuzhah*, ed. Amer, 189). The attack led by Abū Sa`īd al-Sirāfī against Mattā in the *mašīf* of the vizier Abū `l-Fāth Ibn al-Furāt in 326/937-8, as reported by al-Rummānī to Abū Hāyān al-Tawhīdī (al-Imārī *wa l-mu'āna*, i, 107-28), is an impressive illustration. The leader of the logicians (depicted by al-Tawhīdī's infortunates as a covetous drunkard who sells his learning for profit) is shown, not without malicious tricks, to be unable to defend the philosophers' claim that logic is a tool necessary "to know truth from falsehood, veracity from lying, good from bad", and to dispute his opponent's argument that the only way to "logical speech" (*našī`u*) is through the grammar of a particular language. But if Mattā had no more to say to his unsympathetic audience than the report credits him with, his pupils al-Fārābī (cf. G. Endress, *The works of Y. b. `A*, 45f.), defending logic as universal grammar while assigning to grammar the rules peculiar to the utterances (*ta`āf*) of a particular language, made up for his silence.

and grammar, in JRASt (1905), 79-129; M. Meyer-
hof, Von Alexandrien nach Bagdad, Berlin 1930, 29; N. Resscher, The development of Arabic Logic, Pitts-
burgh 1964, 119-22; J. Tkatsch, Die arabische Übersetzung der Poetik des Aristoteles, Vienna and Leipzig 1928-32, i, 126-8; R. Walzer, Greek into Arabic, Oxford 1962, 66, 77f., 99f., 102; F. W. Zimmer-
mann, Al-Farabi's commentary and short treatise on Aristoteles De interpretatione, London 1918, pp. cii-
vi, cxvi-cxcix. (G. Endress)

MATTER [see hayûla].

ALMATURIDt, ABU MANSTtR MUHAMMAD B.
MUHAMMAD B. MAHMUD AL-SAMARAKANDI, Hanafi theologian, jurist, and Kûrû' commentator, founder of a doctrinal school which later came to be considered one of the two orthodox Sunni schools of kalâm (see MATURIDIVYA).

His nisba refers to Mâturid (or Maturit), a locality in Samarqand. On the basis of a misunderstood reference of al-Sâmânî (fol. 498b) to his son-in-law, some late sources consider him of distinguished Medinan descent and call him al-Anšâri. His main teacher, Abû Naṣr Ahmad b. al-`Abbâs al-`Iyâdî, was killed between 261/874 and 279/892, probably closer to the latter date. Al-Mâturidi thus must have been born before 260/873, especially since he is described as having been highly esteemed by his teacher, who would not engage in scholarly debate except in his presence. According to some late authors, al-Mâturidi also studied under another of his teacher's teachers Abû Sulaymân al-Djûşdîjânî, Naṣâyîr b. Yâhâyâ al-Bâhî (d. 268/881-
2) and Muhammad b. Mukâtîl al-Râzî (d. 226/841). The latter cannot have been his teacher, and the report is most likely unreliable also in respect of the other two. Not much else is known about his career. He is described as leading an ascetic life and as occasioning miracles (kamâlâ). The death date given by the later sources, 336/947 and 332/943. Al-Mâturidi's tomb in the cemetery of Djâkarîfizâ in Samarqand was still known in the 9th/15th century. Among his students were Abû Ahmad al-`Iyâdî, son of his teacher Abû Naṣr, Abû l-
Hasârî, and Abû al-Kârim b. Mûsâ al-Bâzdawî (al-Pâzdâwî), great-grandfather of Abu l-
Yûsîr al-Bâzdawî.

Of al-Mâturidi's works, the published text of the Kîsâb al-Taṣâlî (ed. F. Kholeif, Beirut 1970) is definitely authentic. The book, however, seems to have existed in different versions since some quotations from it in Abu l-Mû`în al-Hasaﬁ's Ta'bîrat al-
adillâ is missing in the edited text (see D. Gimaret, Histoires de l'Acte humain et théologie musulmane, Paris 1980, 175-8). Al-Mâturidi's extensive Kûrû' commentary K. Ta'wîlât al-Kûrân (vol. i, ed. Ibrahim `Awadâyân and the Sayyid `Awadâyân, Cairo 1391/1971) was, according to its commentator `Alâ' al-Dîn Abû Bakr Muhammad b. Ahmad al-
Samarkandî (d. ca. 540/1145), assembled by his pupils and therefore less obscure than his other works which were written by himself. Also attributed to al-
Mâturidî are three short published works, a Risâla fi l-
`Askâ`î'd, a K. al-Taṣâlîh (both ed. Y. Zûrûrîn, Islam akadîne dair eki metiner, Istanbul 1953), and a Sâghr on Abu Hâfîs al-Fîkh al-akbar. These works appear to have been composed by later representatives of the school on the basis of his doctrine. Abu l-Mû`în al-
Hasaﬁ does not list them among his works. He men-
tions, on the other hand, the following, apparently lost, books: K. al-Mâkûlât; K. Bayân wa`m al-Mu`tazîa; refutations of three books of the Mu`tazîa Abu l-
Kâsim al-Bâhî (al-Kâbî) (d. 319/932), his K. Awâdî al-adillâ, K. Ta'bîrat al-qâdsî, and his K. fi u'ddî al-
fu'a'd; a refutation of al-Uñîs al-kâshîma by the Mu`tazî Abu `AbdAllâh al-Bâhî (al-`A`zî); a refuta-
tion of a K. al-Inâma by an Ùmamî Shî'î author; two refutations of the Ùsmâ'îls (Karâmîa); and two books on legal methodology (Uñîs al-fîkî), K. Mu`âkîal al-sharî`î'î; and K. al-qâdsî.

In contrast to al-Ashârî, the founder of the other Sunni kalâm school, who espoused the doctrines of Hanbali traditionalism, al-Mâturidi adhered to the doctrines of Al-Farabî. His works were transmitted and elaborated by the Hanafi scholars of Bâlkh and Transoxania. He developed previous Eastern Hanafi teaching systematically in arguing against the positions of the Mu`tazîa, in particular, their chief representative in the east Abu l-Kâsim al-Bâhî; of the Karrâmiyya, Sunni traditionalists (Haqîwiyya); of the Ùmamî Shî'â; and of the Ùsmâ'îls, represented in Trans-
oxania by Muhammad b. Mu`zîad al-Hasaﬁ (d. 332/943). Of other religions, he refuted the views of Christians, Jews, Zoroastrians, Manichaeans, Bardesanes and Marcionites (see G. Vajda, Le témoignage d'al-Mâturîdî sur la doctrine des Manichéens, des Dayâsâtiyân et des Marcionites, in Arabica, xii [1966], 1-38, 113-28). His doctrine was in substance generally more rationalist and, with the exception of his Murji`î def-
inition of faith (imãda), closer to Mu`tazîzam than al-
Aší'ârî's. In his concepts and technical terminology he was, however, less influenced by the Mu`tazîa than al-Ashârî, who had been a trained Mu`tazî before his break with them.

In substantial agreement with the Mu`tazîzi posi-
tion, al-Mâturidi held that man is able and obliged to gain knowledge of God and his obligation to thank Him through reason independent of prophetic revela-
tion. In respect of the attributes of God, he, like the Mu`tazîa, allowed and practised metaphorical inter-
pretation of anthropomorphous expressions in the Kur`ân, though he rejected some specifically Mu`tazî interpretations. In other instances he relied on the traditionalist bîla kayf formulation, insisting on unquestioning acceptance of the revealed text. Against the Mu`tazîa, he considered divine attributes like knowledge and power as real and eternally subsis-
ting in his essence (kâmûna bî l-dhâtî). Although he accepted the conceptual distinction between attributes of essence and attributes of act, he main-
tained, against the Mu`tazîa and al-Ashârî, that the attributes of act are equally eternal and subsistent in the divine essence. Thus he insisted that the expres-
sions "God is eternally the Creator" and "God has been creating from eternity (lam yasal kalîmî)" are equally valid, even though the created world is tem-
poral. In particular, his doctrine that the takwil, bringing into existence, was eternal and distinct from the makawwam, the existing things, became a famous point of controversy with the Aší'ârîs. Al-Mâturidi affirmed the vision (ru`ûya) of God by the faithful in the hereafter, but consistently rejected the possibility of tâhîk, which he understood as grasping, of God by the eyes. He held speech (kalâm) to be an eternal attribute of God which could, however, not be heard. Like the Mu`tazîa, he thus affirmed, in respect to Kur`ân, IV, 165, wa-kallama lâhu Mûsâ takîmî, that God created a voice which He made Moses hear.

In regard to predestination and human free will, al-
Mâturidi's position was intermediate between the Mu`tazîa and al-Ashârî. He affirmed that the acts of man are created by God, subject to His will and decree. While they are thus acts of God in one respect
They are in another respect really, and not metaphorically, man's acts and his free choice (al-'ihtiyāt). Al-Māturīdī insisted that God will lead astray (adfalla) only those who, He knows, will choose the wrong way and will guide only those whom He knows will choose the straight path. The initial choice is man's, not God's as for al-Ashʿārī. Al-Māturīdī thus also rejected the predestinarian interpretation of the primordial covenant (miḥābāt), according to Kurān, VII, 137, according to which God separated the chosen from the condemned before creation and the latter confessed belief in His Lordship falsely under duress, though it might be said such incantation is valid for opposite acts. Capability (istiṭṭāʿa) is of two kinds, one preceding the act, the other simultaneous with it. The imposition by God of something beyond man's capacity (takfīl maʿā l-yūtak) is in principle inadmissible.

Faith (imān) was defined by al-Māturīdī essentially as taṣdiq bi l-kalb, inner assent, expressed by verbal confession (ṣīrār bi l-lisān). Works (asrāʿ) are not part of faith. Faith cannot decrease nor increase in substance, though it may be said to increase through renewal and repetition. Al-Māturīdī condemned istiṭṭāʿa, adding the formula “if God will” to the affirmation “I am a believer”. The faithful sinner may be punished by God but will eventually enter Paradise. The traditionalist tenet backed by al-Ashʿārī that faith is uncreated was rejected by al-Māturīdī.

Theological doctrine of the Hanafi scholars of Samarkand spread in the 4th/10th and 5th/11th centuries throughout Transoxania, eastern Khurāsān, Balkh and among the newly converted Turks in the Karakhanid territories of Central Asia. In the 4th/10th century there were some differences on a few theological questions with the Hanafi scholars of Bukhara, who were more strongly influenced by traditionalist, anti-rationalist tendencies. These were mostly harmonised by later Māturīdī scholars with compromise solutions. Māturīdī teaching remained virtually unknown west of Khurasan, where the traditionalist tenet backed by al-Ashʿārī was more readily recognised as the founder of a theological school na-

Most important in the dissemination of Māturīdī doctrine was the creed ('Aqā'id) of Naḍim al-Dīn Abū Ḥāfīz al-Nasafī (d. 537/1142) which closely followed the ideas of al-Muḥiṭīn's formulations in his Tashrīṭ al-adīlā. It achieved many commentaries and glosses for scholastic teaching and was repeatedly revised. Another popular Māturīdī creed in verses, known as al-Lāmiyya fi 'l-tawhīd or al-Lāmiyya fi 'l-tawhīd wa Badr al-ammīr, was composed by 'All b. Uṣūhī al-Abū (d. 569/1173) and was later explained in numerous commentaries, some in Persian and Turkish. Also in the 6th/12th century, there were Nūr al-Dīn al-Ṣābīnī al-Bukhārī (d. 580/1184), whose K. al-Bidāya min al-kifāya, extracted from his larger K. al-Kifāya fi 'l-khiṣaṣīya, has been published.

During the later Māturīdī authors, Abu 'l-Barakāt al-Nasafī (d. 710/1310) composed a popular brief treatise Umdat al-'aḥkām li-ahl al-ṣunnah with his own commentary entitled K. al-Imām fī 'l-ṣayla, both strongly influenced by Abu 'l-Muḥiṭīn al-Nasafī's Tashrīṭ al-adīlā. A theologian with a more personal pro-
c

thesis, he himself seems to have progressively moved towards Aḥṣā'arī positions. This is apparent in his later K. al-Makāṣīd and his own commentary on it, which were patterned after al-Iḍāqī's K. al-Mawdūf, and its commentary by the Ṣāfir al-Djurjānī. The Egyptian Hanafī theologian Kamāl al-Dīn Ibn al-Ḥumān (d. 580/1184), whose K. al-Biddya min al-kifāya, his acts, and the Murdžī definition of faith as assent of the equality of Ashārī and Māturīdī, and its commentary by al-Ṭabarī, i, 3026). One would assume the ṣimil or ẓāhīb al-ma'ṣūna of this period to have been a fiscal officer, especially as he was often appointed to the ḥārādī as well, or to the civil administration in general (al-Ṭabarī, i, 2486, 2524; ii, 755; Ibn Sa'd, v, 277); ma'ṣūna is even used as a global term for private income from public funds (al-Ṭabarī, i, 3026). One would assume the ẓāhīb as bringing accused persons to court, executing verdicts and collecting fines (Ḥilāl al-Ṣabīr, Rusūm ddr al-


MAURITANIA [see MūRĪTANIYĀ]. MAURITIUS, an island of the south-western Indian Ocean, one of the three Mascarene Islands (together with Réunion and Rodrigues), located some 2,300 miles (3,680 km) north-west of Cape Town, a similar distance south-east of Aden, and 2,000 miles (3,200 km) south-west of Colombo.

Although probably known to Arab navigators from as early as the 12th century A.D., none of the Mascarene Islands (or of the more northerly Seychelles) were ever colonised by Muslims—or any other—peoples before their discovery by Europeans in the early 16th century A.D.

During subsequent centuries, the Island of
Mauritius (named by the Dutch, after the Stadthouder Maurice of Nassau in 1598) passed successively under Dutch, French and British suzerainty, falling to the latter power during the Napoleonic Wars on 3 December 1810. While Europeans discovered Mauritius in the early 16th century made no attempt to settle or develop the Mascarenes, Dutch settlers began the colonisation of Mauritius in 1638 when numbers of European convicts, together with slaves from Indonesia and Madagascar, were landed on the island. It is probable that most of the Indonesians, and certainly some of the Madagascar slaves, were Muslims. By 1710, however, Dutch attempts at settling Mauritius ended in failure, and during the subsequent French administration of the island slave labour was imported almost exclusively from Madagascar and the Swahili Coast. Few of these enforced settlers are likely to have been of Muslim origin, however, for the African Muslims of the Swahili Coast tended to be the controllers, rather than the victims, of the Arabian Sea slave traffic.

Muslims, therefore, came to Mauritius in large numbers only after the British seizure of power in 1810 and, more particularly, after the abolition of slavery in 1835 and the introduction of large-scale indentured labour from the Indian subcontinent, for work in the sugar plantations, at about the same time. Indian migrants to Mauritius during the mid-19th century tended to be drawn mainly from the poor labouring classes of Bihar, the United Provinces (Uttar Pradesh), Orissa and Bengal (migrating via Bombay and Calcutta), or from similar social groups in Tamil Nadu and southern India (migrating via Madras). In this way, nearly 450,000 Indians entered Mauritius between about 1835 and 1807, with a few additional South Asians entering the colony in 1922-3. The indentured labourers who made up the great majority of Indian migrants were generally engaged on five-year contracts, but during the whole period of immigration only 160,000 were returned to India, the great majority remaining behind the end of their contracts to swell the population of Mauritius. In addition to these poorer, indentured classes, comparatively well-to-do Indians, particularly Muslim traders from Gujarat (erroneously known as "Arabs" in contemporary Mauritian circles) and Chettiar port. The mosque is the focal point of Mauritian Muslim society, around which are formed some of the larger mosques (constituted as a wakf) are also well represented (ca. 7%), whilst smaller identifiable groups include the Shi'a (0.8%), the Bohras (q.e.) (0.3%) and (counted as Muslims for census purposes) a flourishing Ahmadiyya [q.e.] community (ca. 9%). According to Benedict (1965), in general terms Muslims Mauritians are more highly organised on a religious basis than the Hindu Indo-Mauritians. This is related to their minority status, to the appearance early in Mauritian history of wealthy Muslims who supported their religion through waqf endowments, and "most of all to the nature of Islam itself, which lays down tenets for a religious community." In 1965, there were 65 mosques on the island, governing of each being in the hands of a mutawali or manager, usually elected by the congregation. All but one of these mosques have been constituted as a waqf endowment for purposes of support. The mosque is the focal point of the Mauritian Muslim society, around which are formed jamaat or religious associations. In 1952 the total Muslim population of Mauritius was listed as 77,014; by 1962 this had reportedly risen to 110,332.


MAWAKIB (a., sing. mawkiib), processions.

1. Under the 'ABBASIDS AND FATIMIDS

The basic meaning of procession (mounted or unmounted), cortege, is found in hadith (al-Bukhari, Bad' al-khalk, 6; Ibn Hanbal, iii, 213; al-Darimi, 2695). This is the precise sense given in the dictionaries, and that used by the Umayyads, 'Abbasids and Fatimids, often to describe the cortège of an amir, waizir, or other official (see, e.g., al-Tabari, ii, 1731; Hilal al-Sabi, Rusum dar al-khilafa, 9-10, 12, 14H).

By the 4th/10th century, it had acquired the broader meaning of audience as well as procession. Examples of the usage of mawkiib abound in the literature. In addition to the references for the 'Abbasids in Sourdrel, Vizirat, ii, 452, 653, 684, 685, see also Ta’jdir al-amum, 195 (yasaam mawkiib wa-daadaa gidida), and al-Sabi, Rusum, 71-2 (under rules for hajjaha), 78, 90; for the Fatimids, al-Kalkashandi, Subh, iii, 481, 494 (qatlas al-khalifah fi l-mawkiib). The phrase most often designating an audience is qawm al-mawkiib. In both 'Abbasid and Fatimid sources, this seems to refer specifically to the general audiences held on Mondays and Thursdays (Hilal al-Sabi, Historical remains ... ed. Amedroz, Leiden 1904, 242, 244 (Thursday); Ta’jdir, 195, refers to a Monday; al-Kalkashandi, Subh, iii, 494, 496, 518, 523). For details on audiences, see MARASIM.

There was a strict protocol to be observed when accompanying the ruler (al-mu'asir) in procession. The most important and off-repeated exhortation was to be vigilant in keeping to one’s assigned place (yalzam al-mawdi^ alladhi fihi rutbatuhu), reflecting the emphasis on tariqah, arrangement of the mawkiib according to rank. The rider must know the position of the caliph, without, however, turning too often to see him. He must maintain a silent and dignified bearing, speaking only in response to the caliph’s questions. He should not ride where the caliph will get wind of his horse or where dust will be kicked up into his face.
He should not enter the caliph's shadow; but he must ride on the sunny side of the mawkib to shade the caliph from the sun.

If a person was chosen to accompany the caliph, he was not permitted to consider this as a permanent position but rather as a privilege granted each time the caliph invited him. If the caliph decided to walk, all had to follow suit. If he were to dismount because of a call of nature, everyone had to dismount because they may not be mounted while he stands on the ground. If he diverts to prayer, they should pray with him. And if he drinks something, they should divert their glance (further elaboration in al-Sabi, Rusim, 86-9; al-Kadi al-Mun'man, Kitab al-Himma, 116-19; al-Dhaihizi, K. al-Tajd, 72, 77-83).

There are precious little data on the processions of the 'Abbasids, almost certainly a reflection of the static and non-processional character of 'Abbasid ceremonial. Neither of the two mawakib about which we have significant details (al-Sabi, Rusim, 9-10, the mawakib of Nizam; 12-14, Byzantine embassies) describes a caliphal procession.

The Fatimids had, perhaps, the most elaborate processions of any of their contemporaries. This has been attributed to the influence of Byzantium (see M. Canard, Le ceremoniel fatimide et le ceremonial byzantin: essai de comparaison, in Byzantion, xxix [1951], 408ff.). Where there is a dearth of information for the 'Abbasids, there is an abundance for the Fatimids. This is probably due largely to the fact that most of the sources for the Fatimids were transmitted by Mamluk authors, reflecting the Mamluk predilection for elaborate public processions.

The Fatimids staged grand processions on the New Year, the first of Ramadan, the last three Fridays of Ramadan, the Two Festivals and the inundation of the Kalâma. The most complete descriptions are those of Ibn al-Tuwair, the late Fatimid-early Ayyubid historian. Both Ibn Taghrirbirdi and al-Kalkashandi rely almost exclusively (albeit without attribution) on his undated descriptions. Only al-Makrizi, in the monumental Khitat and his history of the Fatimids, Itti'dz al-hunafat (published in 3 volumes, Cairo 1967-72), relies on the dated accounts of Ibn Zulal, al-Musabbihi and Ibn Ma'mun al-Butadhi, in addition to Ibn al-Tuwair. These dated accounts reveal considerable changes in processions over the course of time, although many general features remained constant.

Al-Kalkashandi enumerates the insignia of sovereignty (al-alat al-milaykaya) used in processions (Subh, iii, 468-71; cf. Ibn Khaldun, Maksudatlna, tr. Rosenthal, ii, 48-73, and Canard, Ceremonial fatimite, 388-93): crown (taj) — not a crown per se, but an elaborate turban worn in a particular fashion; sceptre (kadib al-mulk), held by the caliph during the procession; sword (al-sayf al-khass); inkstand (dawari); lance (rumb); shield (daraka); hafr, "horseshoe", a crescent-shaped red ruby affixed to a piece of silk and attached to the top of the taj; parasol (mizalla, carried over the head of the caliph); flags (a 'lam); fly-swatters (mighabba), arms (sabla); drums (wakibi); and tents (al-khyam wa 'tisadiat).

Not all of these insignia appeared in every procession. For example, on the processions for the 'id al-nahr and the anointment of the Nilometer during the time of Ibn Ma'mun, the caliph carried no kadib (al-Makrizi, Khitat, i, 436, 473). Ibn al-Tuwair notes that the caliph did not have a mizalla on the procession to the anointment (ibid., i, 476). The mizalla was not carried in the palace. When the caliph rode in a procession in which the mizalla was carried, it was customary for him to visit the tomb of his ancestors (al-turba al-mu'izziyya) upon his return to the palace (ibid., i, 407). The costumes of the caliph and his retinue, and of the wazir, produced in the dar al-kuswa (see subh, iv, 409-13) were different in each procession; the caliph sometimes changed costume for the return to the palace (ibid., i, 436, 471).

The rukib on the New Year (awwal al-fum) is considered as the prototype for Fatimid processions by Ibn al-Tuwair, a claim not made by other historians of the Fatimid period, and perhaps representing later practice (see al-Makrizi, Khitat, i, 445-50; Ibn Taghrirbirdi, Nus'am, iv, 758-59; al-Kalkashandi, Subh, iii, 499-505; and Canard's translation of al-Makrizi's text, La procession du nouvel an chez les Fatimides, in AIEO Alger, x [1952], 364-98, with copious annotation, based on Inostrantsev, La sortie solennelle des Califes Fatimides, St. Petersburg 1905 [in Russian]).

The preparations for the New Year procession began in the last ten days of Dhu 'l-Hijja, when the army, swords, saddles, shields, spears, flags, banners, mounts and costumes were brought out of their respective treasuries for inspection. On the 29th, the caliph sat in the ghabak (grilled loge) to review the horses and costumes chosen for the procession.

On Muharram, the caliph's mawakib was arranged in bayn al-kayrun, the parade ground between the two palaces. When the caliph appeared at the gate of the palace, wearing a mizalla with the yatta, girded with the maghribi sword and holding the sceptre, the drums were struck and trumpets sounded. The mizalla, which matched the costume of the caliph, was unfurled. The caliph's entourage mounted up, and the whole cortège began to move.

The prefect of Cairo (wali al-Khina) and the ifshafid rode up and down the length of the procession, keeping the route clear and maintaining order. The caliph was surrounded by his isbyan, who were followed by the wazir and his entourage. Then came the bearer of the lance, detachments of soldiers, standard bearers, and squadrons of the cavalry. The mounted soldiers numbered more than 3,000.

The mawakib departed from Bab al-Nasr and re-entered through Bab al-Futuq (sometimes vice-versa), when the caliph was ready to return to his house and his respective treasuries for inspection. On the 30th, the mosque was furnished and carpeted with precious rugs by the xibaba bayt al-mdl (wall al-Khidira) and the Kirkat al-Khidira. Under al-Hakim, the Rashida mosque was also the palace of al-Amir in 517/23 October 1123, a fact that the procession was modelled exactly on the rukib of the New Year (al-Makrizi, Khitat, i, 491; al-Kalkashandi, Subh, iii, 509). Only two accounts are imbedded in a historical narrative. Al-Musabbihi describes the procession of the caliph al-Zahir and his troops on 1 Ramadan 415/6 November 1024 with a mizalla and rumh (al-Makrizi, Itti'dz, ii, 158-9; al-Musabbihi, Akhbar Misr, ed. Ayman Fu'ad Sayyid and Thierry Bianquis, IPAQ, 1978, 61). Ibn al-Ma'mun provides a very brief account of the procession of al-Amir in 517/23 October 1123 (Itti'dz, ii, 102).

The caliph rode in procession to lead the prayer on three Fridays during Ramadan. The locations of the prayers varied somewhat. Ibn al-Tuwair reports Friday prayers at the Anwar, Azhar and 'Atik mosques. Under al-Hakim, the Rashida mosque was also the site of Friday prayer (see Subh, iii, 509-12; Ibn Taghrirbirdi, Nus'am, iv, 102-4; Khitat, ii, 280-2; Itti'dz, ii, 20, 58, 96-7, 104, 109, 118-19, 160).

The mosque was furnished and carpeted with tapestries and rugs by the sabib bayt al-mdl (director of the public treasury). On each side of the minbar, curtains embroidered in red silk, containing the baimala,
fāṭhah, and Sūra LXII on one and Sūra LXIII on the other, were hung. The caliph delivered the khutba under a perfumed kubbah, which was fastened to conceal him from view (mentioned as early as 388996 and 415/1024, al-Makrizi, Ittiṣāz, ii, 20, 161). Then the caliph descended to the mīṣrāb and led the prayer from inside the maṣṣūra [see MĀṢĪṬ].

On the ʿid al-fīr and ʿid al-aḍḥā (or al-nabī), the caliph rode in procession to the masjīd outside of Bāb al-Futūh. Muzzinans, sitting upon maṣṣūbās from Bāb al-ʿId to the masjīd, pronounced the takbūr continuously while the caliph was en route. The caliph wore his full costume with the mizālīa and the yāṭīma. Like prayer during Ramadān, the mīṣrāb was hung with two curtains, one on the right with the basmāla and Sūra LXXXVII, on the left with Sūra LXXXVIII (Ḳātāb, i, 451-7; Ittiṣāz, i, 137-8; ii, 5, 58, 79, 82, 87, 97, 109, 160-1; iii, 60, 83-168-9).

Upon returning from the masjīd, a banquet was held in the tawrīs (in some periods, in the bāṣMt al-dghab), when the silver māda called al-mudassaran was set up, covered with magnificent foods, including sugar castles made in the ḍdr al-fitr. There were two banquets on ʿid al-fīr, one before and one after prayer. People were encouraged to carry food away from the banquet and redistribute it (on banquets, see Ḳātāb, i, 387-8).

On the ʿid al-nabī, the caliph sacrificed animals either in the masjīd or the manbar, which were then distributed to notables of the state (see Ḳātāb, i, 436-8; Subh, iii, 523-4; Ṣudūr, i, 97-8). Ibn al-Maʾmūn describes in detail the inventory of sacrifices and distributions for the years 515 and 516 (Ḳātāb, i, 437, and Ittiṣāz, ii, 95-6). Ibn al-Ṭuwaryr reports three consecutive rūḵās on the first day to the masjīd; on the second and third to the manbar next to Bāb al-Rih (cf. Ibn al-Ṭuwaryr’s description of the way the caliph slaughtered, with the general rules as described in art. ʿaṣb). These rich details about the distribution of portions constitute important data for the as-yet unwritten social history of ritual (for individual years, see Ittiṣāz, i, 141-2; ii, 7, 37, 41, 59, 79, 83, 88, 91, 104, 110, 124).

Two processions took place at the time of the inundation of the Nile (wāṣir al-Nīl), one to announce the Nilometer (taḥkkīk al-mṣīṣā) and the other to cut the canal (ṣawb al-khālidīj, faḥ al-khālidīj). When the water reached sixteen cubits, the ḍayaṣ, Ibn Abi ʿl-Raddād (always called thus), sent a formal announcement to the caliph. The height of the rising water was measured every day, but a policy established under al-Muʿizz prohibited public announcement until it was only a few marks short of sixteen (Ḳātāb, i, 61; Ittiṣāz, i, 138-9).

The preparations for the announcement of the Nilometer began as soon as the caliph received word that the water was close to inundation. The kūrdū spent the night in the Nilometer, recting the Kurūn continuously. The next day, the caliph went in an ʿawṣir (Nile boat) to the Nilometer (without a mizalla, Ibn al-Ṭuwaryr, Ḑīb, i, 476, 1. 16). He entered along with the ʿawṣir and the muḥarrak waṣāṭa. The caliph and the ʿawṣir each prayed two rūḵās. Then the director of the public treasury brought out saffron and musk, which the caliph mixed in a vessel and then handed over to Ibn Abi ʿl-Raddād. The ḍayaṣ threw himself into the ḩaṣṣīya, took hold of the pillar with his feet and left hand, and anointed it with his right hand, while the kūrdū recited.

The next day, Ibn Abi ʿl-Raddād received a robe of honor (kubbah) [s. v.]; see an early reference in Ittiṣāz, ii, 150). On the third or fourth day following the anointment, the caliph went out in procession to the banks of the Nile, passing through Fustāt (decorated by its residents) and crossing to the west bank, where grand tents had been erected for the occasion. The magnificent ṭamārīs from Bāb al-Máṣīṭ (so-called because someone was invariably killed when it was set up) was put up (Ḳātāb, i, 471; Ḑīb, ii, 73-2). The canal was cut and the ʿaṣbārīs sailed in it. The caliphs used to take up residence in one of two pleasure-houses (manzaras) during the days of these festivities (for complete descriptions, see Ḳātāb, i, 470-9; Subh, iii, 518f.; Ṣudūr, i, 99-100; Schefer, Relation du voyage de Nasiri Khosrau en Syrie, en Palestine, en Egypte, en Arabie, Paris 1881, 136-7; particular years, in Ibn Muyassar, Ākhār Mīr, 44; Ḑīb, i, 319, ii, 59, 148-50, 50, 72-3, 81, 108, 129).

These major processions were announced to the provinces in letters from the dīwān al-insāṣ. A number of these literary specimens remain, most from the pen of the celebrated kāhīb Ibn al-Ṣayrafi ʿId al-fīr, Kūtāb, i, 456-7 (536/141-2); al-Sūdlījī al-muṣtanṣārīn, ed. ʿAbd al-Munṣīr Māḏjīd, Cairo 1954, no 1 (451/1059), no. 13 (445/1053); Subh, viii, 320-4. ʿId al-nabī: Ḑīb, i, 437-8; Subh, viii, 324-8; Sūdlījī, no. 64 (476/1083). New Year: Subh, viii, 314-15. Ramadān and Friday prayer: Subh, viii, 316-19. Nile: Ḑīb, i, 479; Subh, viii, 328-9. An unidentified procession is described in Raḥāl al-ʿĀʾmidī, ms. 4059 [Cat. 4365], fols. 24-5, in the Garrett Collection, Princeton University Library).

There were several minor processions, called abbreviated (al-mawdkīb al-mukhtāsara) between the New Year and Ramadān, but there are almost no details on them except that they took place on Tuesday and Saturday, four or five times. They were much less elaborate than the major processions (see Subh, iii, 521-2).

The only ʿShīʿi holiday marked by a procession was the ʿId al-gerdān on 13 Dhuʾl-Ḥiḥāḍ, commemorating the waṣṣiya to ʿAlī by the Prophet [see ʿAṢR]. In the early part of the Fatimid period, it was essentially a popular celebration of the ʿShīʿi population. During the time of Ibn al-Maʾmūn, it had become a court ceremony modelled on the rituals of ʿid al-nabī, with a procession to the manbar.

At the end of the Fatimid period, it had acquired a much different and complex character. Now an internal palace procession, attended only by professed Ismāʿīlis, it took place at the Shrine of Husayn and the ṣawr. The caliph delivered a kubbah, but rode without insignia or mizālīa. Upon returning to the ṣawr, the text of the nasīḥ of ʿAlī was read to the assembly. This late procession was, in fact, a ceremonial polemic against the Tawībis (on the history of the celebration, see al-Makrizī, Ḑīb, i, 273, 276, 280, 284, ii, 24, 67, 74, 91, 168, iii, 96; Ḑīb, i, 388-90, 436, 492-3; al-Musabbībi, Ākhār Mīr, 84-5; on the late Fatimids, see S. M. Stern, The succession to the Fatimid Imām al-Amīr, the claims of the later Fatimids to the Imamate, and the rise of Tawībi Ismaʿilism, in Oriens, iv [1951], 193-255).

Bibliography: In addition to the citations in the text, see the bibliography at the end of MARĀṢĪM. 1. (F. SANDERS)

2. IN MUSLIM SPAIN

The sovereign power of the amīrs and caliphs of al-Andalus showed itself in the etiquette [see MARĀṢĪM] of public audiences and during their official movements when, surrounded by their processional retinue (maṣākib), they went into or came out of their residence. This was generally at the departure for a military campaign, to review the troops or to travel from one residence to another.

According to Ibn Khadhūm’s Mukaddama, “the
insignia of sovereignty are the displaying of flags, the beating of drums and the sounding of trumpets, and horns, but as it happens, the historical sources for Muslim Spain have not preserved any traces of this use of wind instruments. Among the Caliphs of Cordova the prince Abd al-Malik was carried off by a gust of wind at the same time as the kādī's kubba (Ibn Hayyān, Muktabas, iii, 36, 40, 95, 120). These processions were held in the courts of Ibn 'Abd Rabbihi (Crónica anónima, 40).

The first riding forth of al-Nāṣir was in order to go hunting. In 322/934, it seems, at the time of his departure for the Osma campaign, 'dressed in a coat of mail, with his sword at his side, mounted on a chestnut-coloured charger and surrounded by his generals and his troops', this was the first time that 'the eagle standard was unfurled'. In 326/938, Muhammad b. Hāšām al-Tūqībī had the honour of accompanying him on horseback from the caliphal palace to the residence at al-Ramlā. For the attack on Osma and on Ega, the caliph had his maszalī raised. It would thus appear that we have here a tent or a fixed canopy and that the maszallī is synonymous with the kubba. But there was also a mobile 'parasol' or sunshade, for at the time of the attack on Galatayud, al-Nāṣir rode along until the evening in full exposure to the sun (ghayr muṣallāl).

The caliph used to travel along surrounded by guards, who on one occasion killed a madman who threw himself at his mount's head. The caliphal procession was regarded as something of a serious occasion, and imitating or parodying it was considered to be a 'crime' on the part of al-Nāṣir 'when he set aside a mount his female buffalo Rāsān, riggèd out in a kalansuwa and a sword' (Muktabas, v, 22-3, 34, 109, 124, 225, 269, 287). Kettledrums were known and must have formed an element of the procession since al-Nāṣir sent some of them to the rallied Maghribīs (ibid., 239, 290, 312).

In 361/972, the street of the Furr Burrièel proved too narrow for the procession of al-Hakam II; it was after one of these march-pasts that he ordered the burning of the Berber saddle of one of his ghulāms. Surrounded by his fātās, his approach was regulated by the ashāb al-madīna of Cordova and al-Zahrā, and the people kissed the ground and greeted and blessed the caliph before making known their petitions. The route was always 'lined with the troops'. To march past was a signal honour which was given to the emigrés Di̇afar and Yābāy b. ʿAli, who marched along preceded by the heads of the fallen Zirids and by flags and escorts by the troops, Abu l-ʿAyyāb, the fālā Fālik and Gahlīb, returned victorious from his campaigns in the Maghrib. The maszalī continued to be an attribute of the sovereign which he delegated for the expedition against the Magdiūs [q. v.] in 361/972 or else to the Dhu l-Sayfayn Gahlīb (Muktabas, vi, 45, 67, 79, 115, 152, 173, 190, 195-6, 212).

In 387/997, after having thwarted the plot of Subh, the caliph Highām II 'clothed in a kalansuwa wound round with a white turban, whose ends were flowing from his head, riding in his hand a handsome black kubba and bare head. The caliph rode forth with its standards unfurled and the kettledrums ready' (Dhikr, 170). It Ibn Ammar [q. v.] entered Silves at the head of 'a splendid procession, followed by black slaves and guard' (al-Muʿtamīd [q. v.] mocked in him enter Cordova 'in the most shameful manner, mounted on a mule, between two sacks of straw, bare-headed and loaded with fetters, and having ordered everybody, nobles and plebs, to come out and see the spectacle' (al-Marrākūshī, Muʿṣīdī, 80, 86). When the kādī Ibn Diḥḥāl [q. v.] of Valencia got rid of al-Kādir b. Dhi l-Nūn [q. v.] he behaved like a sovereign ruler, surrounded by royal pomp — he only mounted his horse when preceded by black soldiers and guards, escorted by troops, whilst his creatures decorated the streets, shouting out blessings and praises' (Ibn ʿIdhārī, Nuevo fragmentos, 69-70).

The processions of the Almohads or Muwahhidūn [q. v.] were rich and complex. The caliph rode forth surrounded by the great leaders of the Mahdi. The caliph was accompanied by his sons, standard-bearers and a hundred kettledrummers, and followed by the high dignitaries of state. The caliph would mount at the entrance of his tent or his residence, whilst the vizier walked at the side of his stirrup. The order of precedence was immutable and fixed by custom (ṣaʿa) (Ibn Sāḥīb al-Salāt, al-Mann bi l-imdāma; al-Marrākūshī, Muʿṣīdī; Ibn ʿIdhārī, Bayān, ed. Huici Miranda, Tetouan 1963). Certain items of clothing were special to the caliph. In 582/1186, during his campaign of Gafsa, 'al-Mansūr inspected the assemblage before his audience chamber ... he reminded them of the usages of royal power which they should respect and should refrain from imitating the royal privileges and using the royal colours'. In 568/1172, during the siege of Huete, Abū Yaʿṣūb was 'surrounded by his guard, accompanied by the sons of the ḍāma ʿa and by those of the Fifty, by the alḥ al-bayt and by the slaves; behind him came his brother, the Sayyid Abū Hafs and his other brothers, followed by standards and a hundred kettledrums playing' (Mann, 493). When in 578/1182 his remains were brought from Santamir to Seville, the great men of state, in order to conceal his death, 'began to walk, in accordance with the customary procedure, at the side of the animals bearing his litter, then they mounted their horses and the litter was covered with a green flag' (Muʿṣīdī, 192).

We do not possess any exact information about the processions of the Nasrids [q. v.]; one can only suppose that they were very simple, in view of the exiguousness of their territories. Ibn Khālidūn seems to confirm this, mentioning that 'the Banū l-'Abmar used only two musical instruments in their processions'.

Bibliography: Given in the article.

(P. Chalmeta)
3. IN IRAN

From ancient times, processions were connected with court ceremonial. Religious and triumphal processions are illustrated on ancient monuments. In Islamic times, the purpose of processions was mainly connected with court ceremonial. Religious and triumphal processions took place from time to time to the Friday mosque for the performance of the Friday prayers and also to the musalla, the place outside the town where prayers were held to celebrate the breaking of the fast at the end of Ramadan ('id al-fitr) and on the 'id-i turban ('id al-a'dha). On such occasions, he would be accompanied by a cortège formed by his officials, officers and followers, and standard-bearers would bear his standards before him (litav, 'alam [q.v.]; see also Spuler, Iran, 349). Sometimes a parasol (qat, see miqalla) would be held over his head.

Whereas the mule was customarily the mount of the common people and of some nobles, of the kings and the ruler, it was the mount of him who held temporal power. The point at which a visiting ruler or envoy dismounted was a frequent cause of contention and the privilege of remaining mounted when entering the presence of another ruler was eagerly contested (see further Spuler, Iran, 343). 'Abd al-Dawla, the Buyid, sent a message to the caliph al-Ta'if in 367/977-8 asking permission to enter the court (asb-i nawbati) of the caliph's palace (dir al-khutba) mounted (Fakhlí, Shdhinshah T-i 'Adud al-Dawla, Tehran, AHS 1347/1969, 59; Híilí al-Sábi, 80).

The custom of having a saddled horse (asb-i naubati, faras al-naub) at the palace gate on which the ruler could mount in an emergency or on other occasions apparently existed from the 2nd century A.H. The practice appears to have been started by Abú Muslim. According to Džzdzjí, a saddled horse was always kept ready for the ruler at the palace, which had been built for him in Marw-i Sháh-Djáhán until the Mongol invasion in 617/1220-1 (Tabákát-i Náširi, ed. 'Abd al-Hayy Habíbí, Kábul 1964, i, 107; see also Muhammad Táki Danishpážuh, Asb-i naubati bar dar-i káhí Abú Muslim, in Ráma'má-yi kitáb, xi [AHS 1340/1967-8], 225-8). The anonymous author of the Mughmal al-tawání states that the 'Abáááídcaliph al-Mánáár mounted the asb-i naubati during operations against the Ráwání (ed. Malik al-Shú'ará' Bahár, Tehran, AHS 1318/1939-40, 329). The Sámirid rulers Ahamam b. Ismá'il (295-301/907-14) and Nasr II (301-319/914-43) always had a saddled horse ready at the gate of the palace (Spuler, Iran, 352; see also Browne, LHP, i, 317). The Saddjús of Kirmán also appear to have kept a saddled horse ready. Afdal al-Din Kirmání relates an occasion when Muhammad b. Arslángah (537-541/1142-56) gave the asb-i naubati—an Arab horse with magribíi harness—to one of his intimates, Muhammad al-Dín 'Uthmán (Badýál) al-asmán wa wáq'átí 'Kirmán, reconstructed text by Míhlí Bayáni, Tehran AHS 1326/1947-8, 26; Muhammad b. Ibráhím, Tárikh-i Saljukshíyán-i Kirmání, ed. Th. Houtuma, Leiden 1886, 31).

Whether the asb-i naubati was used for processions or not, saddled horse, magnificently caparisoned, were an important part of royal pageantry. They were also often given by rulers, together with kálás [q.v.] to high officials, visiting envoys and others [see MARÁSÍM: 3]. The Gháznawíds kept many elephants, and Mas'úd probably more often rode an elephant than a horse. The most significant occasion for a special procession was that when Mas'úd went from Gházná to hold a masálím court, he was mounted on an elephant. It was an occasion of great pomp and splendour. Three hundred ghuláms, magnificently apparelled, and many elephants and led horses, including 30 caparisoned with jewel-encrusted harness and 50 with golden harness, were in his train. The ghuláms of the palace, equipped with bows and arrows and golden and silver staffs went on foot in front with armour-bearers from Marw and 3,000 footmen of various origins and other soldiers and the notables and the ‘pillars of the state’ (Abú 'l-Fadí Bayhákí, Tárikh-i Mas'údí, ed. 'Alí Akbar Fayyád, Maqálaí AHS 1350/1971, 373-2).

When the ruler rode out to a garden or to summer quarters, or made a progress through his domains, he would be accompanied by his retinue. Royal marriages and betrothals, the sending of the marriage portion of the bride (mahir, sádbák), and funerals were other occasions for processions. When the daughter of the Kará Kháánid Kádir Kháán Yúsuf of Turkistán, who had been betrothed to Mas'úd b. Mahmúd, was brought to Gházná in 425/1032-3 (Ta'rikh-i Samání, ed. Muhammad Houtsma of the afternoon prayer, the women of the great men at Mas'úd's court, accompanied by eunuchs, set out to greet the bride with a cortège ‘such as no one could remember’ (Bayhákí, 548-9).

Processions took place when envoys and others came to the ruler's court. When the caliph's envoy arrived at the court of Mas'úd b. Mahmúd in Baljí at the end of 422/1032 to announce the death of the caliph al-Kádir and the accession of al-Kátím, he was brought with great ceremony into the presence of Mas'úd on 1 Muharram 423/19 December 1031. Four thousand palace ghuláms, magnificently attired, were drawn up at the palace in several lines; half of them held silver maces and half were armed with swords and carried bows and three wooden arrows. Three hundred ghuláms of the royal bodyguard with golden maces stood near the throne. The great men of the court, provincial governors and chamberlains in their court dresses were also there. The marátaídarán stood outside the palace. There were also large numbers of elephants [see rit. 2. As beasts of war]; soldiers with their arms and standards were drawn up in two lines, between which the envoy was to pass. The rasáldar with led horses and a great crowd went to fetch him from his lodging, mounted him on one of these horses and, amid the sound of drums and trumpets, brought him to the palace where Mas'úd was awaiting him (ibíd., 382). On the following Fri., Mas'úd went to the Friday mosque for the pronouncement of the khutba in the name of the new caliph. The scene was again one of great splendour. The procession was led by 4,000 splendidly dressed foot ghuláms, followed by the Gháznawí general Beg Tághhlí and the royal ghuláms with the ruler’s banner, the mardíbar, and his chief, the chief chamberlain. Mas'úd, preceded by the chief chamberlain, set out along the road from the palace to the mosque, which
had been decorated on his orders by the notables of the city. Behind him came his chief minister, more chamberlains and the notables of the court. They were followed by the khaṭīb, Khaḍīja ʿAli Mikālī, with the caliph’s envoy on his right, the kādīs, ḵubakāhā and ʿulamāʾ and the headman (ażīm) of Bahlī. As the procession slowly approached the mosque, “no sound was heard except the sound of the whips and the shouts of the marṭabātārān to clear the way” (ibid., 384-5).

The following year when an envoy from al-Kāʿīn rejoined Rayy on his way to Masʿūd’s court, with a diploma from the caliph, Masʿūd ordered a reception (sīḥīh) to be prepared for him. An escort was sent with him from Rayy and when he reached Nishāpūr on 8 Rābiʿ I 424/11 February 1033, the ḵubakāhā, kādīs and notables of the city went out to meet him. On the following day, the marṭabātārān and rasīlārān also went to welcome him. The road from the Rayy gate to the Friday mosque was decorated, as also was the bazaar. Durāns and dinārs and valuable objects were scattered before him. A week later, after the envoy had rested from his journey, he was brought to Masʿūd’s presence with great ceremony. Crowds assembled along the road from the residence of the envoy to the gate of the garden in Shāḏayḵ, where Masʿūd was to receive him. The soldiers, notables and army leaders were mounted and held standards in their hands (ṣimbāl). The ṭarṣūdūr stood in front of the mounted soldiers. The marṭabātārān were drawn up in two rows. Army leaders (ṣālārān) and chamberlains were also present. A chamberlain, together with several attendants, led horses and a mule, was taken early in the morning by the rasīlār with twenty ḵīlās to the envoy’s residence to bring him to Masʿūd, who was to receive him sitting on his throne on a platform (ṣāḏ). The ṭarṣūdūr caused the envoy and the enuch (ḵhādīm), who accompanied him, to mount and had the ḵīlās which the caliph had sent with them put in boxes on mules. The cortège set out amid the sound of drums and trumpets preceded by treasury officials (ḵhūrdān-i khāzīnā) and eight horses with golden saddles and harness led by their bridles. Then came the envoy, preceded by the royal chamberlain and ṭarṣūdār. The rasīlār caused the envoy and behind him two horsemen, one carrying a standard and the other the diploma and letter of the caliph rolled up in black brocade (ibid., 471-2; see also MActsīm. 3).

A new feature of royal ceremonial was introduced by the Saljūqs, namely the ḡatājīya [q.v.]. This was a kind of saddle-cover, probably covered with precious stones, which was carried before the sultan in processions. This custom appears to have died out in Persia after the Saljuqs, but was found later in Egypt (see Ghasiȳa, and also Ibn Baṭṭūta, Travels, tr. H.A.R. Gibb, Cambridge 1956-71, iii, 664). When Togrul Beg brought the ʿAbbasid caliph al-Kāʿīn back to Baghdad after he had left the city on the attack of al-ʿAṣāṣārī in 450/1059, he dismounted at the gate of Baghdād but was told by the caliph to remount (Rwandi. Ṯabat al-rudūr, ed. Muhammad Ikhāl [see London 1921, 110, and see Spuler, op.cit., 343]. On entering Baghdād, it appears that Togrul Beg again dismounted and carried the ḡatājīya in front of the caliph until they came near to the caliph’s palace, when Togrul took the bridle of the caliph’s mule and walked beside him until they entered the Bāb al-Ḥujra (the Privy Chamber Gate) (Ṣadr al-Dīn al-Ḥusaynī, Alkhaṭīb al-maṣūm al-Saljuqīya, ed. Muḥammad Ikhāl, Lahor 1933, 21).

On an earlier occasion, when Togrul Beg was to have an audience with the caliph in 449/1057-8, the caliph’s boat was sent to bring him down the Tigris to the caliph’s palace. He was accompanied by his intimates (ḫuṣnān), some in boats and some mounted on elephants. Alighting from the boat, Togrul mounted one of the caliph’s horses which had been sent to meet him and entered the caliph’s palace, preceded by the sons of Abū Kālidjīr b. Būya and Kutlumūsh, army leaders and Daylamis and nearly 500 unarmored Turkish and Gīfānī ḡālāms. When he reached the gateway of the passage (dihādīz) leading to the audience hall, he was kept waiting for a long time on his horse until the gate was opened for him and then he entered on foot (Ṣub Ṣbn al-Dīwāzī, Mīrṭū al-amān, ed. Ali Sevim, Ḵanbara 1968, 25). On a subsequent occasion in Muḥarram 455/January 1063 when Togrul came to Baghdād, the caliph excused himself from going to meet him and sent instead his waṣīr Ibn Dāhir, who took with him two horses and other presents. On the following day, Togrul entered the Dār al-Mamlūk in a boat sent by the caliph (ibid., 97).

In 480/1087, when the caliph invited Malikshāh to the Dār al-Khīlāfā, he sent a boat for him. Disembarking at the Bāb al-Ḥurūbā, Malikshāh mounted a richly caparisoned horse sent for him by the caliph, which carried him to the gate of the caliph’s audience chamber (ibid., 244-5). In Muḥarram of that year, when Malikshāh saw the marriage portion (ḡahā) of his daughter to the caliph, to whom she had been betrothed, it was carried by 130 camels (a second instalment being apparently carried by 74 mules on the following day), preceded by 30 led horses, all splendidly caparisoned. The cortège was led by Saʿd al-Dawla Gūhar-ʿĀṭīn, the shīḥa of Baghdād, and the amīr Burṣūṣ. The city was decorated for the occasion and as the cortège went through the Nahr Muṣallā quarter the people cast dinārs and precious stuffs before it. The sultan had meanwhile left Baghdād on a hunting trip, and so the caliph sent his waṣīr Abū Ṣudūh b. Ṭerken Khāṭūn, Malikshāh’s chief wife and mother of the bride, with some 300 men bearing lanterns with a litter to bring the princess to the caliph’s palace. She set out by night riding in the litter, supported by the amīr. In the gate of the palace there were 34 mounted men and 560 Turkish slave girls on splendid mounts, preceded by the women of the amīrs and others, led by Niẓām al-Mulk, the muṣattāfī Abū Saʿd and the amīrs, all bearing lanterns (ibid., 245-6; Ṣbn al-Dīwāzī, sub anno 480; Ibn al-Dīwāzī, al-Muntazam, Ḵyderabad 1539/1940-1, ix, 36-7). Processions do not appear to have been a special feature of Ilkhānī or Timūrī rūmīrity. Women of the royal house took part from time to time in public ceremonies. Clavijo describes the cortège which accompanied Timur’s chief wife on the occasion of a public audience which he gave in the Great Pavilion in Samarkand. She was attended by some 300 women and eunuchs. “Over the head of the princess was borne a parasol, a man holding it, and the stick was a pole the size of a lance. This parasol was of white silk, dome-shaped and round like the top of a tent, with wooden ribs that kept the stuff extended; it was very carefully held over her head as she walked to keep the sun off her face. In front preceding her and the ladies of her suite marched many eunuchs ... Thus the procession advanced entering the Pavilion where Timur was already seated. The Great Khanum now took her place beside his Highness but slightly behind on a low dais” (Embassy to Tamerlane 1403-1406, tr. from the Spanish by G. Le Strange, London 1928, 259-60).
sions (ibid., 260-1). Clavijo also mentions the presence of elephants at Timur's court. They appear to have been used to entertain visitors (ibid., 257).

Clavijo states that when Shah 'Abbās returned to Kazwīn in 1007/1598 after crushing the Ozbegs in Khurasan, Sir Antony Sherley described the ceremony as known by the term ĵistikból. When Shah and his party, which included, among others, Abel Pinçon, had already been some three weeks in Kazwīn awaiting the return of the shah, the entourage of five miles of the city he encamped. He ordered Sherley and his party to come out two miles outside the gates of the city to meet him. Abel Pinçon describes the shah's triumphal entry in the following words: "When our company had approached to within five or six steps of the King, he pretended the whole time to look in another direction. After we had kissed his boot he spurred his horse sharply and guided a hussarily, dabble. Across the camp after the manner of the country … In his hand he carried a battle-axe, playing with it, carrying it now high, now low, and now and then placing it on his shoulder with rather strange movements.

In his triumphal entry he caused to be carried on the end of strong and heavy spears twenty thousand heads of Tartars whom he had defeated in Usbég, which appeared to me a hideous spectacle. After he who carried the heads came young men dressed like women richly decked, who danced in a manner and with movements which we had never seen elsewhere, throwing their arms about and extending them above their heads even more than they raised their legs from the ground, to the sound of ĵatâbles (sc. drums), flutes and certain instruments which are provided with strings, and to the sound of a song composed on the victory which they had gained, this being sung by four and certain instruments which are provided with strings, and to the sound of a song composed on the victory which they had gained, this being sung by four

Chardin, describing Shāh Sulaymān's coronation in Isfahān in 1077/1667, states that after the ceremony he sat until 10 o'clock in the Tālār-i Tawīla to receive the homage of the grandees of Isfahān who came to kiss the ground before him, and then "rising from his Seat took Horse; and that was the first time that ever he rode out of the Place where he was born [having been immersed in the haram]. And according to the Custom of the Persians, he made a Cavalcade round his Palace very leisurely, and with little attendance, riding in the middle of the distance of twenty Paces from them that marched before and, those that followed after, only twelve Footmen went on each side before and behind his Horse; and all this to the end he might be the better seen by the People" (The coronation of Solyman III. The present king of Persia, published with Tred's Travels of Sir John Chardin in the East Indies, London 1691, 56). Normally, however, when the shah rode abroad he was accompanied by a large retinue. Kaempfer describes the procedure under Shāh Saif (by which name Shāh Sulaymān was known after his second coronation). In the case of the shah's daily ride, when he came out of the haram and prepared to proceed along the Ėbār Bāgh, the master of the horse would lead out three horses, one of which the ruler would choose. Two groups of the bodyguard, on foot and armed, would set out in front, followed by the ûsâkkâtâ-bà bi on horseback and the kavâl-bâbi, and behind them some twenty mounted troops with their leader, all wearing red twelve-sided head-dresses, adorned in the case of some by a magnificent plumage of feathers. They rode without any discipline, but watched over the safety of the shah. The shah followed, surrounded by twelve qâlîrs (runners); behind him rode the grand wâzi' or some other high dignitary. The presence of the shah was indicated by his fâtir carried by a standard-bearer. Among the retinue, not in any special order, there would also be some twenty eunuchs, some white, some black, who carried the weapons, water-pipe and other paraphernalia of the shah. Then came those courtiers whom the shah had bidden to his table and the sons of the great men, for whom it was considered an honour to be allowed to accommodate the shah. When possible, there was also a physician and an astrologer present. Officials armed with axes would be sent in front of the procession to remove any obstacles in the way of the shah's progress (Am Hofe des persischen Grosskönigs 1684-1685, tr. W. Hinz, Tübingen-Basel 1977, 237-8. Cf. also Du Mans, Estat de la Perse en 1660, ed. Schefer, Paris 1890, repr. 1969, 33).

On certain special occasions, the shah also rode out. Kaempfer describes the celebration of the 1d-i kurdâ in 1660/1661 in the Hazâr Dīarbī district of Isfahān. A large and fine camel was prepared for the sacrifice. For ten days preceding the 1d on 10 Dhu 'l-Hijjâd, it was paraded through the different quarters of the town. On the day of the sacrifice it stood in the appointed place, with its feet tied, surrounded by thousands of people, waiting for the arrival of the
As soon as he arrived, he dismounted and was given a lance with which he struck the camel. After its head was cut off and its corpse divided into twelve parts, one for each quadrant of the city. The shah then remounted and rode back as he had come, while the people of the city assembled round their banners and accompanied their portion of the camel, which was laid on a horse and went before them to their several quarters to the sound of trumpets and drums (op. cit., 239-40; see also Du Mans, op. cit., 74-5; The Travels of Monsieur de Thoemöl into the Levant, London 1687, 107 (ibid., 108(bi))).

Exceptionally, the shah rode out himself to welcome distinguished guests. In the case of a guest of royal blood, he would go half-a-mile, having sent his representative with a company of kurcis one farsakh (or one hour's ride) in advance. The townspeople, in festal dress, would line the streets and spread precious stuffs in front of the horses of the royal guest. Such was the procedure when the Özbeg khan 'Abd al-Äzîz came back after performing the hajj in 1670 and when Akbar the son of Awrangzîb came to Persia in 1099/1688 (Kaempfer, op. cit., 242).

If the shah went hunting and took his women with him, he was accompanied by a large cavalcade, and when he moved to summer quarters in Mâzan-dârân an enormous train accompanied him. Men would be sent in front to choose a suitable place for the camp; when they came back with their report, if the shah approved, some 7,000 camels with tents, carpets and household equipment would be sent in advance. Some days later the kurûkîs would follow to clear all males from the neighbourhood of the road along which the royal cavalcade would travel. The shah's women, or those of them whom he decided to take with him, travelling in litters and accompanied by eunuchs, would follow. After them would come the shah with his retinue. In front would be the master of the horse with his subordinates and five or six led horses richly caparisoned, with sixty or so of the bodyguard, also mounted. Then would come the standard-bearers followed by the tshakâkasi-bâghi, the kurcî-bâghi, and the master of the hunt (mir-shikâr), accompanied by falcons with falcons on their wrists, and the chief kennelman with hunting-dogs led by attendants on foot. Then would come the shah with twelve personal attendants. Immediately behind the shah came the great men of the court, and finally numerous mounted slaves, among them the water-pipe carriers and those in charge of boxes of ice, sugar and other condiments carried on mules, and carpet-spreaders with carpets, mats and cushions for use on the way and light tents, and lastly water-bearers with water-pipes on camels or mules for the use of men and animals. Twelve dancing girls of great beauty, who were always present when the shah went on a journey, followed several hours behind (ibid., 242-5).

The Dastûr al-mulâtî mentions an official called the kurcî-yi rikâb, who was always in attendance on the shah. When the latter went riding, it was the duty of the kurcî-yi rikâb to hold the bridle of the horse which the shah was to mount with one hand and to help him mount with the other. In the royal assembly, the kurcî-yi rikâb sat below the muhtasib al-mamâlik (ed. Mahammad Taki Dânîshpûhî, in Rev. de la Faculte des lettres et des sciences humaines, Tehran, xxxi (1968), 318).

Hanway describes the procession of the Afghan Mahmîd on his entry to Isfâhan after Shâh Sultân Husâyin had resigned his throne to him on 29 Dhu 'l-Hijjâ 1134/11 October 1722): "The procession was opened by ten officers on horseback, and about two thousand cavalry, among whom were several lords of the PERSIAN court. Next came his master of the horse, at the head of fifteen led horses magnificently caparisoned: this officer was followed by some runners on foot, and then by a thousand common infantry. Immediately after came the grand master of the ceremonies, in the midst of three hundred negroes dressed in scarlet cloth: these negroes had been chosen from among the slaves of ISFAHAN to compose the conqueror's guard. Forty paces from thence was MAGHMUD, mounted on a horse, of which the VALî of ARABIA had made him a present, on the day of the abdication. The unfortunate HUS-SEIN rode on his left. The princes were followed by about three hundred pages on horseback" (The Revolution of Persia, London 1762, ii, 182). Mahmîd's chief officials followed, and behind them came the principal officials of the dethroned monarch. The procession was closed by a hundred camels carrying arquebuses, preceded by a great band of musicians and followed by nearly six thousand horse. Having crossed the Shirzâr bridge, Shâh Sultân Husâyin was sent to his place of confinement, and Mahmîd continued alone. Arriving at the gates of the town the inhabitants laid rich stuffs under his horse's feet and filled their air with perfumes. The guns on the camel's backs were often fired as they marched along; and in the intervals, the ten AFGHANS who walked at the head of the procession, without noise or sound imprecations against the followers of ALLAH" (ibid.).

The practice of kurûk, i.e. the prohibition of men and boys from any place where the king's wives were to pass, though probably not new, was rigorously enforced under the Safawîs and caused great inconvenience to the population. Olearius states that when the shah went hunting, taking his barâm with him, runners were sent in advance through the streets so that the population remained in their houses and the streets were empty (Vermehrte Neue Beschreibung der Muscatinschen und Persischen Resie, Schleswig, 1656, ed. Dieter Lohmeier, repr. Tubingen 1971, 529). Chardin claims that Shâh SâFi commanded no less than 62 kurûks as he went abroad with his wives visiting places around Isfâhan during the five months of his concomitant to the year 1078/1667 (Corona- tion, op. cit., 77. Cf. also Jean-Baptiste Tavernier, Voyages en Perse, Geneva 1970, 186-7, 188). The custom continued under later rulers. According to Hanway, the consequences to those who failed to get out of the way when notice of Nâdîr Shâh's approach was given were sometimes fatal (op. cit., 1, 169).

Under the Kâjârs, processions took place very much on the same sort of occasions as under earlier rulers. Special importance was attached to the ceremony of istikbâl. This was de rigueur when the shah or one of the princes visited some town or village or when he returned to his seat of government after absence on some expedition or other. On these occasions, civil and military officials and local notables would take part in the istikbâl, while wrestlers, jugglers, tumblers and other would display their skills; the slaughter of oxen, cows and sheep and the breaking of vessels containing sugar candy in the way of the prince was also customary. Morier states that when Fath 'Ali approached Tehran on his return after an expedition to Khurâsân in 1815, rows of well-dressed men were drawn up at some distance from the road and made low bows as he passed, while members of the religious classes were drawn up nearer the city. Ozen and sheep in great numbers were sacrificed as he passed and their heads thrown under his horse's feet. Glass vases, filled with sugar, were broken before him
and their contents strewed on his road. Dervishes
made loud exclamations for his prosperity, while
their rabsis, who raised on high a carved representation of wood or	tabernacle.... In all the bustle I perceived the King
continuously looking at the watch carried by Shatir
Bashi, anxious that he should enter the gates exactly	at a time prescribed by his astrologers" (A Second Journey through Persia, Armenia, and Asia Minor to Constantinople 1819-20, London 1818. 387-8).

Fraser, describing the return of Fath 'Ali to Tehran in April 1833 after a visit to Kumm, states that half the town went out to welcome him, while the other half lined the bazaars to make a show upon his entrance. "A confused assemblage of horsemen of all ranks and distinctions, from whom were continually issuing individual pairs to skirmish and show off, were followed by those of more respectability... who preceded a couple of hundred topechees, or artillerymen,
than a number of shatirs, or running footmen; and then after a long vacant space came the Envoy's horse, a ceremony never practiced in Persia to any but royal personages" (ibid., 84-5).

Displays of wrestlers, jugglers and tumblers, as in the case of receptions welcoming the shah, often formed part of the istikbal. Lady Sheil describes the welcome given to her husband in Tabriz on his way to Tehran as envoy to the court of Persia in 1849 in the following words: "There were princes and priests, and merchants, and mollahs, and mountebanks, and dervishes, and beggars; there were Koordish and Toork horsemen, ashraf, and shamans, and shamans, and shamans. The cavalcade began four miles from the town, and each step brought a fresh reinforcement to the procession" (Glimpses of Life and Manners in Persia, London 1856, 86). Writing of the procedure for her husband's return to Tehran, she states: "The village we were residing in was three miles distant from Tehran, and we were obliged to return a mile towards Tabreez, to receive the congratulations of the Shah's representatives" (ibid., 120-1).

The shah or one of the royal princes used to take part in the procession on the 'Id-i kurbdn. Fraser, describing the celebration in Tehran on 20 April 1833, states: 'It was customary for the king himself, or, in his default, for one of the elder princes, in a grand cortege of the rest, and their followers, to superintend the ceremony, which consists of a procession to a particular appointed place, where a camel is provided for the sacrifice. The king or elder prince, taking a knife, draws it across the animal's throat, which is then despatched and cut up on the spot .... On the present occasion not one of the princes attended, except Saheb-keran Meerza (aged about ten) .... nor was he accompanied by a single person of distinction.'

"The first part of the show which issued from the gate was a parcel of ragamuffin musicians with kettle-drums, and horrid screeching pipes, who preceded a number of mules and horses, strangely caparisoned and painted, having tawdry trappings on, and gold and silver tinsel, with ostrich feathers on their heads, and along with these came sundry flags of silk, red, green, and scarlet, and some striped like shawks; and the animals were mounted and ridden to and fro at speed by the fellows who brought them. These, as I understood, were intended to carry away pieces of the unhappy camel when he should be cut up; they were attended also by a number of dervishes, in their caps and patched robes. Next came six of the King's trumpeters, in their scarlet coats, with tippets and hoods; then came three or four led horses; then a couple of hundred topechees, or heavy loggers, in
two lines, forming a street, through which rushed thirty or forty furoshes with sticks, and gholaums with shields. After these came the little prince, gallantly dressed in a scarlet coat, well bedizened with embroidery of pearls and diamonds, his sword-belt full of match, and having handsome diamond ornaments on his cap and on his breast, and a pretty little sabre depending from his side. He was mounted on a fine horse. Behind the prince at due distance, came a rabble of horsemen, tofungkinies, etc. ... Before the gates of the Nigaristan ... the poor camel lay bound and ready." (A Winter's journey, ii, 73-5; see also Mu'ayyir al-Mamalik, op. cit., 95-5; and for a description of the procession in Isfahan, see Mirzá Husayn Khán b. Muhammad Ibráhim Khán Tahwilddá, *Djughrdfiyd-yi Isfahan*, ed. Mu'rifí Sotoodeh, Tehran (like that of the circumcision festival of Prince Curzon writes that formerly the Shah's court ceremonial was a blaze of splendour but that "he now affects a simplicity of costume in striking contrast to his predecessors. The bediamonded sword and the flashing airgette, which was so familiar on his first visit to England in 1873, had disappeared in 1889; and in Tehran I have seen him walking in the streets in a braid frock coat with prodigious skirts ... holding a walking stick in his hand. Upon other occasions he either appears on horseback, or, more commonly, is driven through the streets of the town in a sort of coach with glass panels drawn by six or eight white horses with henna-dyed tails. In front and behind ride a small detachment of the royal bodyguard or gholaums, whose full number stands at 2,000, or two corps of 1,000 apiece, who are recognizable by their gold-bridaed tunics and by the muskets, wrapped up in red cases, which they wear slung across their shoulders. A number of the liveried harlequins, or royal runners ... are also in attendance to clear a way, while the less ornamental ferashes, with their long switches, keep back the crowd." (Persia, London 1892, i, 396). The royal runners or *sháhir* (whose dress was a faithful representation of that worn by the *sháhir* of the Safawid kings) preceded the Shah whenever he went out riding or in his carriage (ibid., i, 332).

**Bibliography:** Given in the article.

(A. K. S. LAMBERT)

**4. IN THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE**

Ottoman processions (Tk. *aýd*), were frequently assembled on festal and solemn occasions. The Ottoman court celebrated the birth and circumcision of a prince, or the marriage of a princess, a victory of the army, a new campaign of a sultan, or his succession to the throne, the arrival of a royal guest, or an important foreign ambassador, with imperial festivities, which sometimes lasted 50 days and nights (like that of the circumcision festival of Prince Mehemmed, later Mehemmed III, in 990/1582) or more (the festival of 853/1449, under Murád II, to celebrate the wedding of his son, Prince Mehemmed—later Mehemmed II, the conqueror of Constantinople in 857/1453—and Sitti Khári, which continued for three months). Sometimes an occasion for a public rejoicing was created after an unsuccessful campaign or a defeat of the Ottoman army, with the intention of turning the attention of Sultan's subjects elsewhere and to falsify the result of a battle (the best examples of such festivities are in 862/1457, after Mehmed II was compelled to draw back from Baghádád; and in 937/1530, when Süleyman the Magnificent had to retreat from the siege of Vienna; and also in 990/1582, after the failure of Murád III in the war against the Persians). The wedding and circumcision ceremonies very often and deliberately coincided with *mubáhrá* and *mubárak*: the festivals and ceremonies of such festivities, which were organised merely to solemnise the pilgrimage of the Prophet (among others, a recent one was in 1866, under Sultan 'Abd al-'Azíz). All these festivities were enriched by spectacular and colourful processions, which consisted *inter alia*, of architectural displays, festival palms, sugar work in figures and of artificial flower gardens; these are considered below. One should note as a preliminary the following three definitions, before proceeding to examine the different types of processions: 1. *Aýd-i Hümáýun*, Imperial procession. A customary procession organised when the Sultan or the Grand-Vizier started for or returned from a campaign, on a route between the palace and the barracks at Dáwád Pagá (a district in Old Istanbul). 2. *Aýd Kánání, Code for processions*: the Ottoman code pertaining to the rules for the arrangement, order and the sumptuous of the viziers, scholars, high officials, staff and the military personnel, who were prescribed by the government to participate in the imperial processions. 3. *Aýd Köşık, Kiosk for spectacles*: a kiosk built especially for the Sultan and his harem, from where they watched the processions, celebrations and the festivities. This kiosk was generally used by the Sultans and the ladies of the court. The Sultan had a special room with attendants.

**Bibliography:** A detailed description of such processions is to be found in Djeláli-záde, (Muşáfá b. Djeláli), *Tabáká al-memalik ve derezat el-meslúlak*, ms. Nationalbibliothek, Vienna, H.O. 41; and in *Telgírfátízâde Mehemmed b. Ahmed's Defter-i teşkírlí*, ms. Nationalbibliothek, Handschriften-Sammlung, Mxt. 301; the processions in the festival of 1086/1675, in Edirne, under the reign of Mehemmed IV, are given by Hüseyin Hezár-fenn, *Telgíçí al-beyrân fit kawáini-i'Al-i Öflümân, ms. B.N., Fonds Turc, 40; 'Abdíf, *Sür-i pur sûrûr-i humáýun*, ms. Millet Kütüphanesi, Istanbul, Ali Emiri Kit. 343; John Covel, *Diary*, ms. B.L., Add. 22,912; vivid sketches of the processions in the 17th century may be seen in *Köprüli, Bizans müesselerinin Osmanlı müesselerine te'siri*, in *Türk hukuku tarihine dair tetkikler*, Istanbul 1931, 277, in which the author indicates that the Byzantine Greek word *alagion* is the source of the Ottoman word *aýd*.

The different types of procession.

1. BAYRAM ALAYI, "Holiday procession", traditionally organised to accompany the Sultan to the mosque and back to the palace, on the first days of two religious holidays, Kurban Bayrami (festival of sacrifices) and Seker Bayrami (the feast during the first three days after the Ramadan fast). The respective order of the participants in this procession was generally as follows:

- the Khidies of the imperial palace, on foot;
- the Chief White Eunuchs, on foot;
- the Director of the Registry of landed property, on horseback;
- the second and third Accountants, on horseback;
- the Finance Minister, on horseback;
- the Master of Orders, on horseback;
- the Steward to the Grand Vizier, on horseback;
- the Grand Vizier and the viziers, on horseback, on both sides the Janissaries, on foot;
- the Steward to the chief white eunuchs, carrying a silver sceptre in his right hand, and wearing a short fur-coat, a selimi turban, Tatar baggy trousers of violet velvet and a pair of Circassian shoes, on foot;
- the first and the second Masters of the horse, on foot;
- the Sultan, on horseback; on each side walked the bodyguards with their red and light brown conical hats and five-edged sceptres in their hands; lackeys and messengers; the clothing masters, wearing large wadded headgears with bejewelled crests;
- the Chief Lifeguard of the Janissaries and the Chief Clothing Master, both wearing bejewelled knitted caps with tassels, loose robes embroidered with gold threads, over it valuable robes of honour, girdles made of pearls and bejewelled daggers;
- the Head of the Black Eunuchs, wearing a selimi turban, an embroidered robe with a bejewelled girdle and a four-sleeved sable skin coat;
- the Masters of the Porte, with selimi turbans;
- the Chief Treasurer and the officials of the palace, wearing headgear, bejewelled daggers and knives and with bracelets of solid gold.

Bibliography: For designs and colours of the costumes, see Johannes Lewenklaus, Bilder türkischen Hofes in Wien, Berlin, Heidrun, Stuttgart, Vienna 1586; anon., Bilder aus dem türkischen Volksleben, Vienna 1856; anon., Türkische Trachten, Vienna (17th century); anon., Türkische Trachten, 3 volumes, Italy (18th century); the most reliable source for the Bayram procession is Teyyâr-zâde Ata, Enderûn-i telkhisî, i, Istanbul 1293; a short section in Paul Rycaut's The present state of the Ottoman Empire, London 1668, 1682; a description of such a procession may be seen in Hezâr-fenn, Telkhisî, fols. 32b-33a; a detailed description, with a personal view of an English lady, of Mahmûd II, may be found in Julie Pardee, The City of the Sultan, London 1837, ch. vi; for further information, see R. E. Koçu, Osmanlı sarayında Bayram tebrîkî ve Bayram Alayı, in TM, xii (Jan. 1972), 6-11; for an extensive article, see Das Fest der Kurban-Beiram in Konstantinopel, in Globus, xiii (1866), 148-52.

2. BEŞHİK ALAVI, 'Cradle procession', customarily organised to conduct the cradle of a new-born prince or a princess through the streets to the birth place of the baby. There were two specific processions for such an occasion: one was the procession disposed by the Sultan-Mother, and the other was arranged by the orders of the Grand-Vizier. The procession of the Sultan-Mother took place subsequent to the birth of the baby. The cradle, the bejewelled quilt and the valuable blanket were all taken from the old Saray and brought to the Topkapî Palace. This procession consisted respectively of the following participants:

- the guide, uniform;
- the officers of the Harem, two in a row;
- all the stewards of the lady who gave birth to the child, with their ceremonial girdles, equipments and headgears;
- numerous itinerant vendors, carrying trays of fruits, candies, flowers and cakes;
- the master vendors of sweetmeats, carrying the silver trays;
- numerous coaches with lattice-windows, and two eunuchs at the sides of each coach: in these coaches were the visiting ladies;
- the Messenger to the Chief of the Flag, and the Head of Musicians;
- the musicians.

The procession walked most of the way to the accompaniment of rhythmical beats of a kettle-drum. When the procession was over, various presents were given to the participants.

The procession disposed by the Grand Vizier was much more spectacular and crowded. It was a custom to put on this display six days after the birth of the child. The Grand Vizier, immediately after the imperial baby was born, ordered a cradle, a quilt and a blanket, embroidered with pearls, diamonds, emeralds and with other precious stones. The procession comprised the following participants in respective order:

- the guide, together with the attendants of the imperial house;
- the officers of the Grand Vizier's Harem;
- the Clerk of the Attendants and the Superintendent to the Attendants;
- the stewards to Sultanas;
- the Messenger to the Chief of the Flag, and the Superintendent to the Grand Vizier;
- the vendors, carrying trays of fruits and flowers;
- the tekkâşi (an official charged with making summaries and reports);
- the bodyguards;
- the Assistant of Ceremonies, and the Treasurer of Ceremonies;
- the Master of Ceremonies;
- the stewards to Sultanas;
- the Head of Musicians, carrying the blanket, and the footmen holding the blanket from its four corners;
- the Second Clothing Master, carrying the quilt;
- the First Clothing Master, carrying the cradle;
- the Steward to the Grand Vizier;
- the military band.

When the procession was completed, presents were given to all the participants, according to their ranks. The procession looked like a huge flower garden. The coloured turbans, caps and headgears, various fur-coats, yellow, red, green shoes, light boots, top-boots, etc., the artificial flower gardens, and hundreds of sugar boxes in different colours gave the atmosphere of a spectacular celebration.

Bibliography: The principal source is 'Akif Bey's Telkhisî-nâmî; the author was the master of ceremonies of the court during the reign of Mustafa III (second half of the 18th century), tr. Rado, 4-5; for the festivities of 1189/1775, to celebrate the birth of Khâdije Sultan, the daughter of Abd al-Hamîd I, on 20 Dju 'l-Ka'da 1189/14 February 1775, see Topkapî Archive E. no. 1562; for an illuminating example of a letter of congratulation,
see the letter of the Grand Vizier written for the birth of Khayriye Sultan, the daughter of Mahmud II, on 8 Shawwāl 1246/21 March 1830, Topkapı Archive, E. no. 5932, for the celebrations of the birth of Sultān Sulṭān, the daughter of Mahmud II, see Uzunçarşılı, op. cit., Çagatay Ulucay, Harem, ii, Ankara 1971, 78-9.

3. DJAÍZ ALAYI, "Procession of the trousseau" arranged to transport the trousseau of an imperial bride to the house of the bridgegroom. Before the procession started, the festal palms (nakhils) were brought to the palace very early in the morning, and were included in the procession as symbols of fecundity of the bride; for this reason, the festal palms prepared for a bride should be made of fruits, candies and flowers. The procession started after the prayer for the newly-wedded was completed. The respective order of the participants in this procession was generally as follows:

— the Commander-in-Chief of the Janissaries, with ceremonial dress;
— the Steward to the Commander-in-Chief, with crest;
— the chiefs of various Janissary corps, with crests;
— the Chief of Cavalry and the Chief Lifeguard of Janissaries, with their men;
— the Chief Reciter of the Kurān, accompanied by his assistants;
— the Chief of Police, accompanied by the policemen;
— the Police Superintendent, with his men;
— the court messengers;
— the court functionaries;
— the khudās and the scholars of the court;
— the Chief of the White Eunuchs;
— the Steward to the Sultan's Mother, and the Steward to the favourite wife of the Sultan;
— the Chief Architect, and the Steward of the Dockyards;
— two artificial sugar gardens with figures made of sugar, and numerous festal palms of gold and silver, adorned with fruits, candies and flowers;
— the vendors and attendants, carrying the boxes prepared for them as guests at the feast given by the Sultan. At both sides of the vendors and the attendants, walked the guards to watch over;
— the Chief of Messengers;
— the Minister of Foreign Affairs and the two Chief Military Judges;
— the viziers;
— the Grand Vizier and the Šaykh al-Islām;
— the Captain of the festal palms;
— artificial fruit gardens;
— the imperial military band;
— pure-bred rams guarded by the black eunuchs, one at each side;
— the concubines of the trousseau, and the Chief of Palace Guards, accompanied by his men. The furniture and the big pieces were carried by mules, adorned with precious clothes, such as brocade, satin and silk.

When the procession arrived at its destination, the participants were rewarded according to their ranks, with gold coins fur coats and silk robes.

Bibliography: For information on how the payments were realised for transporting a trousseau, see Topkapı Archive, E. no. 7004; for a detailed description of the procession of the diādēm in the festival of 1086/1675, Hezar-fenn, fols. 174b, 176a, 177b; Covel, Diary, fols. 200a, 217b; for such processions in the 18th century, Sur-nâme, ms. Nationalbibliothek, Vienna, cod. H.0.95; there were three different processions of the trousseau in the festivities of 1137/1724, during the reign of Ahmed III, for princesses Ümm Kūltūm, see 7a-10b, Khadijī, 19a-b, 20a-21b; see Topkapı Archive E. no. 7029 for the imperial mandate of ʿAbd al-Hamīd I, starting the obligatory causeway, whatever the economic situation of the bridgegroom was; for further information on the obligatory trousseau, Topkapı Archive E. nos. 361, 692, 962; for the gifts given by this same Sultan to the high officials of the state, during the wedding festivities of 1202/1787, Topkapı Archive E. no. 247; for a recent procession of the trousseau, see Von Moltke, Türkei's deri durum ve olaylar üzerine metinler, Trak. tr. Hayrullah Örs, Ankara 1960, 46-7; a detailed description of the same procession in 1252/1836, Julie Pardoe, op. cit., ch. xi; another example is the procession of Fātimā Sulṭān's trousseau, the daughter of ʿAbd al-Medjdī, in 1271/1854, see Topkapı Archive E. no. 8270; Č. Ulucay, Fatma ve Safiye Sultanlarımın düğünleri, in İstanbul Emtibāsı Me'marî, iv (Istanbul 1958); idem, II, 104; Nuktu, op. cit., 63-4.

4. EŞNAF ALAYI, "Procession of the guilds or corporations", held in the presence of the Sultan, where each guild displayed its own profession, as well as acted scenes mostly concerning the special field with which the guild was occupied. Some of the guilds, however, had clowns, rope dancers, illusionists, equilibrists, some others, mimics and actors; and the bigger corporations possessed all of these.

It was a custom in the imperial festivals that the procession of the guilds should take place always in the afternoons, and that they should appear in alphabetical order. Only four or five guilds were allowed each day to have a procession; for example, the processions of 181 guilds in the festival of 990/1582, which started on 11 June and ended on 6 July. Before the procession was over, each guild had to give to the Sultan its gifts, which were determined long before by the treasurer of the court. The representatives of the guilds, after presenting their gifts, would pray for the Sultan. After the ceremony, all members of these guilds would take their seats at dinner tables prepared for them as guests at the feast given by the Sultan.

All the guilds and the corporations had their own pennants; for example, the guild of lady's slipper-makers had a pennant with golden and silver threads and tassels, the cord-makers had a red and a white pennant, and the sword-makers had a red and green one. The weavers had two different pennants: one, red, and the other red, yellow and green. Sometimes these guilds included wild animals in the procession, just for the sake of attracting the interest of the spectators. Some guilds, which preserved the tradition of having warriors, namely swordsmen and archers, would include them into the procession as symbols of traditional combatants; these men walked with their traditional uniforms and demonstrated their skill when the time came.

The representative scenes of each guild, showing the profession, were exhibited on carts, pulled by horses or oxen. The bakers, for instance, while passing ceremonially, displayed their profession on two
successive carts: on the first, the millers ground wheat with an all-functioning miniature mill, while on the next the bakers baked bread in a burning furnace; and the priests in there presented to the Sultan and given to the spectators. The guild of tailors, in the festival of 990/1582, sewed an interesting and valuable dress, which could be worn on both sides; one side of this dress was red and yellow, the other white and blue.

Another kind of demonstration was either to show skills or to perform farces of mythological stories, in which the actors and clowns generally had stylised phallic gestures on their hands and wore costumes of cloth, paper and grass.

Most of the guilds presented gifts related to their profession: for example, the weavers presented the cloth they had been weaving during the procession. A few of the guilds presented things other than their profession: the haberdashers, for instance, presented to the Sultan, in the festival of 1086/1675, the following items: 2 silver decanters, 2 silver trays, 4 ornamented silver candlesticks, 8 silver candlesticks, 1 okka (öksye, equivalent to 1283 gr.) of rose-water, 2 plates with a tray full of musk-soap, 4 jars of sugar candy, 18 bottles of incense water, 60 bottles of flower-water, 3 trays full of dates, 6 plates full of sugar, 15 plates of candy, 4 plates full of sugar candy (of a different sort) and 7 kaşka glasses.

In every festival, the procession of the guilds were the centre of attraction, with presentations of products, displays of professional occupations, demonstrations of skills and performances of plays. Bibliography: For the display of professional occupations, see Georges Lebelski, La Description des yeux et magnifiques représentées à Constantinople…, 1584, 63-4; Nicholas von Haunolt, Particular Verzeichnuss mit das Ceremonien Gepraeng und Pracht das Fest der Beschneidung..., in Lewenkław, Neuehe Chronica Türkischer Nation..., Frankfurt am Main 1595, 481-509; Hezar-fenn, fol. 154a-172b; Covell, Diary, fol. 216a; for the costumes of the furriers, Pétis de la Croix, Mémoires, ii, Paris 1684, 119; Seyyid Huseyin Wehbi, Şir- nâme, ms. Nahlalbibliothek, Vienna, cod. 94, and BL no. Or. 7218: Mehmed Khażîn, Şir-nâme-i Khâzîn, ms. Beyazit Kit., Nurettin Pasha, 10267, fols. 73b-120a; for a detailed description of clowns, ‘Abdi, fols. 3a, 5b, 7b, 9a; Nabi, Waqâyî-i khânî-i Şehzadegân-i Hadîf-i Sultan Mehmed-ı Ghaţî-i Nabi Efendi, ed. A. S. Levend, Istanbul 1944, 48, 51; for the farces, see Mary Wortley Montagu, Letters of Milady Montagu, London 1764, 64; a summary description of the procession of guilds may be seen in Tietz, Ceremonien und Festlichkeiten bei der feierlichen Beschneidung eines türkischen Prinzen von Gebhul in Konstantinopel, in Ausland (22 May 1836), 572-84; G. F. Abbot, Under the Turk in Constantinople: a record of Sir John Finch’s embassy, 1674-1681, London 1920; for the rules of ceremony, Findiklı Mehmed Agha, Silahdar-teâbi, ii, Istanbul 1928, 645; further reference to the procession of the guilds is to be found in Nurtu, op. cit., 73-6; and in Metin And, Osmanlı şenliklerinde Türk sanatları, Ankara 1982, 227-48.

5. GELİN ALÂFY. “the Procession for the bride”, to chaperone the bride to the house of the bridegroom. Up till the 18th century it was deemed lucky to have the bridal procession on Thursdays. This solemnity surpassed the pomp of the procession organised for the transportation of the trousseau. Almost all the viziers, the scholars and the high officials of the state took their places in this ceremony. The respective order of the train was generally as follows:

- the Chief of Police;
- the Viziers of the palace;
- the holders of the fief;
- the Khâgân, the scholars of the court, and the Chief of Artillery, the Chief Armourer and the Steward to the Commander-in-Chief;
- the Master of Janissaries and a commanding officer of a division;
- the chiefs of various Janissary corps, cavalry and the Chief Lifeguard;
- the Chief White Eunuch;
- the Minister of Finance, Master of Orders and the Commander-in-Chief;
- the Chief of Messengers and the memoranda officials;
- the Şerîf of Mecca and the Küdî of Istanbul;
- the Chief Military Judges;
- the paşas, who act as intimates of the bridegroom;
- the Grand Vizier and the Șayîk al-Islâm;
- the Inspector and the Accountant of the Prophet’s Tomb at Medina;
- the Revenue-collectors and the Senior officials of Mecca and Medina;
- the Stewards to the Sultana-Mother and to the bridegroom;
- the Steward to the bride;
- two big festival palms carried by the dockyard stewards, the stewards walking at each side, and the white eunuchs in the middle;
- the Steward to the palace guards and the Secretary to the Chief Black Eunuch of the Sultan’s Harem;
- two smaller festal palms of silver carried by the dockyard stewards;
- the guards of the old serail;
- two other silver festal palms, followed by the secretary of the guards of the old serail, on horseback, holding a Kurân with a bejewelled cover and case;
- the Chief Saddler to the Chief Black Eunuch, leading thoroughbred horses, which were richly equipped;
- the Chief Black Eunuch; the guards of the old serail at each side, and in front of the Chief, the men carrying purses and throwing gold pieces to the spectators;
- the bride in a silver or a bejewelled coach;
- numerous carriages of accompaniment, with the ladies of the court;
- the military band;
- numerous coaches carrying the ladies of the Harem.

The horses of the coaches were generally covered with expensive cloths, such as brocade, silk and satin. All the coaches were surrounded by the black eunuchs on horseback. The stewards, who carried the silver palms were richly dressed. This procession was so long that it usually took one hour or more from the beginning to the end. Bibliography: A detailed description of the bridal procession of the eldest daughter of Murâd III may be seen in von Haunolt, Verzeichnuss des Hochzeitlichen Fest..., in op. cit., 532-5; the bridal procession in the festival of 1086/1675, ‘Abdi, fol. 17a; Hezar-fenn, fols. 177a-178b; Covell, Diary, fol. 216a; and also Thomas Coke, A True Narrative of the Great Solemnity of the circumcision of Mustapha, Prince of Turkey, eldest son of Sultan Mahomed present Emperor of the Turks, London 1676; Sür-i Hâmapaş, Nationalbibliothek, Vienna, cod. H.O. 88; Şir-nâme,
Nationalbibliothek, Vienna, cod. H.O. 95, fols. 10a-14b; a brief section on the wedding of Sâlihâ Sultan, the daughter of Ahmed III, may be seen in Topkapâi Archive, E. no. 277; Hâşim Âli, Veli Ahmed Efendi, Bab-ı Hayrân-i Hicribânî, ms. Süleymaniye Kit. 55, fols. 155a-b; a further discussion on the ceremony may be seen in the same author, Hâtib-i Hicribânî, ms. Süleymaniye Kit. 75, fols. 108b-109a, and in the same author, Hâtib-i Hicribânî, ms. Süleymaniye Kit. 75, fols. 108b-109a.

For a vivid description of the procession in 1832, see Ein Volksfest in Konstanzer Magazin fur Literatur des Auslands, Berlin 1833, 531; also Uluçây, Haremde mektuplar, Istanbul 1956; Ayse Osmanoglu, toplanti, 63, op.cit., 27, 88; Uluçây, Harem, 63, 87. Bibliography: This is only very limited for this period; see, however, Halit Ziya Uşaklıgil, Saray ve êsi, i, Istanbul 1941, 129-34; Leyla Saä, Saray ve harem hatürlarim, in Yeni Tarih Dergisi, Istanbul 1958, 539; Ayse Osmanoglu, Babam Abdüllahim, Istanbul 1960, 88; Safiye Unûvar, Saray hatürlarım, Istanbul 1964, 110; Uluçây, op.cit., i, 163.

The procession was generally composed of the following persons: the Grand Vizier, the Shâhîd-êl-İslâm, the Chief Military judges, the Sherif of Mecca, the Viziers, and certain number of high officials.

The ceremony was usually directed by the Shâhîd-êl-İslâm and sometimes by the Sherif of Mecca. After the ceremony, the Sultan visited the tombs of his ancestors, and returned to the palace in procession order.

The tradition was started by Selim I. It was a custom that every Sultan issued money, sacrificed sheep and distributed these to the poor. It was the task of the Steward to the Chief White Eunuch and the First Master of the Horse to take the petitions of the subjects while the procession was on its way to the palace.


7. KADİR ALÂVî, "Procession for the 'Night of Power'", In Volksfest in Konstanzer Magazin fur Literatur des Auslands, Berlin 1833, 531; also Uluçây, Haremde mektuplar, Istanbul 1956; Ayse Osmanoglu, toplanti, 63, op.cit., 27, 88; Uluçây, Harem, 63, 87. Bibliography: For a vivid description of the procession in 1832, see Ein Volksfest in Konstanzer Magazin fur Literatur des Auslands, Berlin 1833, 531; also Uluçây, Haremde mektuplar, Istanbul 1956; Ayse Osmanoglu, toplanti, 63, op.cit., 27, 88; Uluçây, Harem, 63, 87.

8. MEHWID ALÂVî, "The imperial procession organized to celebrate the birthday of the Prophet", op.cit., 63. Bibliography: This is only very limited for this period; see, however, Halit Ziya Uşaklıgil, Saray ve êsi, i, Istanbul 1941, 129-34; Leyla Saä, Saray ve harem hatürlarim, in Yeni Tarih Dergisi, Istanbul 1958, 539; Ayse Osmanoglu, Babam Abdüllahim, Istanbul 1960, 88; Safiye Unûvar, Saray hatürlarım, Istanbul 1964, 110; Uluçây, op.cit., i, 163.

7. KALÎÉ ALÂVî, "The Procession to gird on the sword". The Sultan, as Caliph of all Muslims, had to take the oath of allegiance when he succeeded to the throne. The procession would usually take place two weeks later. The place of this ceremony was the tomb of Abû Ayyûb al-Ansârî in Eyiîp (a district named after this tomb). The Sultan, with a long train of high officials and soldiers would go to Eyiîp either by boat or on horseback. If he went to Eyiîp via the sea, then he would return via the land, or vice-versa.

The procession was generally composed of the following persons: the Grand Vizier, the Shâhîd-êl-İslâm, the Chief Military judges, the Sherif of Mecca, the Viziers, and certain number of high officials.

The ceremony was usually directed by the Shâhîd-êl-İslâm and sometimes by the Sherif of Mecca. After the ceremony, the Sultan visited the tombs of his ancestors, and returned to the palace in procession order.

The tradition was started by Selim I. It was a custom that every Sultan issued money, sacrificed sheep and distributed these to the poor. It was the task of the Steward to the Chief White Eunuch and the First Master of the Horse to take the petitions of the subjects while the procession was on its way to the palace.


7. KALÎÉ ALÂVî, "The Procession to gird on the sword". The Sultan, as Caliph of all Muslims, had to take the oath of allegiance when he succeeded to the throne. The procession would usually take place two weeks later. The place of this ceremony was the tomb of Abû Ayyûb al-Ansârî in Eyiîp (a district named after this tomb). The Sultan, with a long train of high officials and soldiers would go to Eyiîp either by boat or on horseback. If he went to Eyiîp via the sea, then he would return via the land, or vice-versa.

The procession was generally composed of the following persons: the Grand Vizier, the Shâhîd-êl-İslâm, the Chief Military judges, the Sherif of Mecca, the Viziers, and certain number of high officials.

The ceremony was usually directed by the Shâhîd-êl-İslâm and sometimes by the Sherif of Mecca. After the ceremony, the Sultan visited the tombs of his ancestors, and returned to the palace in procession order.

The tradition was started by Selim I. It was a custom that every Sultan issued money, sacrificed sheep and distributed these to the poor. It was the task of the Steward to the Chief White Eunuch and the First Master of the Horse to take the petitions of the subjects while the procession was on its way to the palace.

as the others, but was nevertheless effective and colourful.

On entering the mosque, the Sultan was met by the Commander-in-Chief and the Trustee of the Pious Foundations. It was the duty of the Commander-in-Chief to take off the boots of the Sultan and offer him slippers. It was an honour given to him by the Sultan. If it was the first time that the Commander was doing this, he was rewarded with a dagger with diamonds on the handle. After this welcome, Sultan was escorted to his private pew by the Commander and the Chief Lifeguard. On leaving the mosque, the boots of the Sultan were put on again by the Commander.

In the procession back to the palace, the Commander walked in front of the Sultan’s horse and the Trustees, carrying censers at each side, until they were dismissed by the Sultan.

**Bibliography:** For such a procession, see Hezâr-fenn, fols. 170b-171b; Çeşmi-zade Muşafa Reşid, Çeşmi-zade tağlığı (1180-2/1766-8), ed. Bekir Kürkçoğlu, İstanbul 1959, 47; a vivid description may be seen in Ayse Osmanoğlu’s autobiography, 59-61; and in Safiye Ünivâr’s one, 103; also see, Midhat Sertoğlu, Osmanî impara-torlugu devrinde mevlid alayî, in TM, iv (April 1976), 45-9; also op.cit., ii, 160.

10. Nigâni âlavî. “Procession of engagement”, held on the engagement of a sultan or a princess. In this procession, the gifts of the bridegroom were taken to the bride’s house with an escort, which was generally composed of the following persons:

- the guide;
- the Chief Saddler of the palace;
- the Steward to the Chief White Eunuch;
- the Superintendent to the Grand Vizier;
- the Steward to the Grand Vizier;
- the Steward to the bride;
- the vendors and attendants carrying the gifts;
- twenty festal palms, each carried by two Janissaries;
- thirty large, ornamented trays full of confectionery;
- two artificial gardens made of sugar;
- one silver festal palm, at each side of which silver boxes of jewelry, carried by the attendants;
- bejewelled girdles, diamond rings, earrings with precious stones, bejewelled clogs, shoes, light boots, slippers, all carried by the white eunuchs and guarded by palace watchmen;
- the Stewards to the bridegroom;
- the pâhas, who act as intimates of the bridegroom;
- the Captain of the Sea, with his men;
- the Janissaries;
- the military band.

The gifts were delivered to the Chief Black Eunuch, who showed them to the Sultan, and upon the Sultan’s approval sent them to the Harem with the black eunuchs.

**Bibliography:** Sîr-nâmé, Nationalbibliothek, Vienna, cod. H.O. 95, fols. 2b-2a; N. M. Penzer, The Harem, London 1936; for the values of the gifts, Uluçay, op.cit., 100-1.

11. Sunnet âlavî. “Procession of circumcision”. This escorted the prince, who was going to be circumcised, from his residence to the field where the festivities took place. The respective order of the train was generally as follows:

- the Janissary corps;
- the adjutants, the messengers, and the white eunuchs of the court;
- forty small festal palms, twenty at each side, each carried by three Janissaries;
- the Chief Architect and the Steward to the Dockyards;
- two giant festal palms, “as high as pine trees”, each carried by 160 to 200 dockyard slaves, who according to the custom, were released for this occasion. These palms were balanced by the captains of the sea, holding ropes tied to the top of the palms; on each rope hung three different kinds of expensive cloth, each adequate in size for one dress;
- artificial gardens made of sugar: these gardens were full of trees, flowers, birds, domestic and wild animals; and in these gardens were jets of water running from the fountains, with nightingales singing;
- the viziers;
- the Grand Vizier and the Şayḫ-al-Islâm;
- the Master of the Horse, followed by thoroughbred horses, the harnesses of which were adorned with jewels;
- the Prince on horseback, with the private bodyguards on each side of him;
- the Chief Black Eunuch, followed by black eunuchs;
- the gentlemen-in-waiting, and the Chief White Eunuch;
- the Chief Usberis;
- the military band;
- the Chief Lifeguard, followed by the guards;
- the Chief of Cavalry, followed by the cavalry corps;
- the Chief of Artillery, with artillerymen;
- the Chief Armourer, with armourers.

When the procession was over, some of the festal palms would be set up in front of the imperial tent, and the others would be stuck up before the kiosk where the prince was going to be circumcised, as symbols of power and virility.

**Bibliography:** For the order of this procession, Georges Lebelski, A True Description of the Magnificent Tryumphes and Pastimes, represented at Constantinople, at the solemnizing of the Circumcision of the Soldan Maumet, the son of Amurath, the thyrd of that name, in the year of our Lorde God 1582, in the Monathes of Maie and June, in Francois de Billerberg, Most Rare and Strange Discourses of Amurathe, the Turkish Emperor that now is, London 1585 (no page number); Haanolt, Particulier Verzeichis…, in op.cit., 469-9, 472-3; Jean Palerne, Peregrinations du S. Jean Palerne, Foresien Palerne, op.cit., in 468-9, 472-3; Jean Petis de la Croix, Ensemble un Breu discours des Triomphes et Magnificences faizis a Constantinople en la solennite de la circoncision de Mahomet fils de Sultan Amurath III de ce nom Empereur des Turcs, Lyons 1606, 465-70; Sîr-nâmé-i Hâmûsûn, ms., Nationalbibliothek, Vienna, cod. H.O.70; Hezâr-fenn, fols. 166a-b; Covel, Diary, fol. 198a; and also Abdi, fols. 10a-b; for the day of circumcision, apart from the afore-mentioned sources, Thomas Coke, A True Narrative of the Great Solemnity of the circumcision of Mustapha, Prince of Turkie, eldest son of Sultan Mahomed present Emperor of the Turks. Together with an account of the Marriage of his Daughter to his favorite Mussaip at Adrianelope, London 1676; Pêtis de la Croix, Mémoires, ii, Paris 1684; Wehbi, Sîr-nâmé, British Museum, ms., cod.Or 7218 and Nationalbibliothek, Vienna, ms., cod. H.O. 94; Khashin, Sîr-nâmé, British Museum, ms., cod.Or 7218 and Nationalbibliothek, Vienna, ms., cod. H.O. 94; Nurettin Paşa, no. 10267; Leibib, Sîr-nâmé-yi Lebib, ms., Ist. Univ. Kit., no. 1972; Sîr-nâmé-yi Kâhir, Ist. Univ. Kit. T. ms., no. 6122; Nomel, L’Odysée d’un Amba-
The main gallery in Yuzulukaya (east of Ankara) show the Hittite phallicomorphic symbols. In the region of Afyon and Konya (central Anatolia), during the reign of the Phrygian kings, the symbols headed ritualistic processions, mostly in spring.

In the Ottoman palaces, these nakhils had an important place not only in the weddings, but also in the circumcisions ceremonies. For the weddings, they were prepared by the bride’s family, and in the circumcisions by the parents of the boy. In these ceremonies, the palms were carried in front of the procession, and if it was an imperial celebration, the Grand Vizier, the viziers and the high officials walked behind them. If the nakhils were in various sizes, the biggest would generally be carried first, and it would be followed by other smaller ones, together with gardens of sugar work, sweets in gold, silver and bronze trays, gold and silver decanters of şerbet (a sweet, cold drink, made of various fruit juices), bundles of the bride’s troussseau, coloured purses full of silver coins, and caskets full of precious stones. Of course, the arrangement of the nakhils differed according to the taste of the superintendents of the processions.

There were special craftsmen who constructed these festal palms. Ewlîyâ described them in his travel journal as esnaf-î nakhîldijîn-î sârî himayûn (”guild of nakhîls-makers for imperial festivities”). According to him, the guild had four workshops in Istanbul, with 55 skilled members in the 17th century. The founder of this guild was Meyser Ezerî. These craftsmen, Ewlîyâ writes, “constructed nakhîls” in wax as tall as the minaret of the Suleymaniye Mosque, with coloured ribbons, silver and golden threads, which could also be illuminated”. The iron-structured gigantic nakhîls “were carried by hundreds of galley-slaves supervised by guards, who gave with whistles such orders as: ‘pull it to the right, to the left,’ etc.” A similar scene is described in detail by an English priest, Dr. John Covel, who had the occasion to see the festivities of Sultan Mehmed IV, in the summer of 1086/1675 in Edirne. He witnessed these guards—generally dockyard stewards—with whistles, directing each group, carrying gigantic nakhîls, approximately 25 metres high. The lower end (approximately 4.50 to 5.50 metres in diameter) had eight or ten long parallel bars, and the slaves carried the nakhîls, holding these bars. There was someone who directed them: he commanded the slaves to rest or to carry on at the sound of the whistle.

The gigantic nakhîls were so big that in order to carry them through the narrow streets of old Istanbul, very often, the projecting parts of the houses, such as eaves and balconies, were pulled down and afterwards rebuilt. Although the rebuilding of the houses required a great deal of money, the value of the nakhîls were: almost twice the expenses thus incurred. The most important fertility symbols were each a work of art and very expensive. Some of them were entirely in silver and some were adorned with jewelry. At the wedding in 931/1524 of Khâdîjî Sultan, sister of Suleyman the Magnificent, one of the nakhîls consisted of 40,000 and another of 60,000 pieces of hand-made silver coins, and caskets full of precious stones. Of course, the arrangement of the nakhîls differed according to the taste of the superintendents of the procession.

Adjuncts of the processions included:

1. nakhîl, “Festal palm”. This phallicomorphic symbol sometimes took the form of a wreath or a fir branch, but generally it was made in the form of a cypress. In earlier periods it was in the shape of a date palm decorated with different kinds of ornaments, mouldings, fruits and emblems. We observe such emblems in Anatolia as far back as the Hittites and Phrygians (terracotta panels with reliefs decorated in coloured glaze from the Phrygian city of Pazarh, near Ankara, show such palms as fertility symbols). The excavations at Altinteppe, situated on the plain of Erzincan (eastern central Anatolia), have revealed panels decorated with palmettes belonging to the period of Urartu in Anatolia; also, the sculptures of...
Processions in India are of great popular appeal, from the panache of the simple wedding ceremonies to the most astonishing works in sugar were the ones in bigger sizes, such as models of a mosque, a castle, a town, a kiosk, a garden or a fountain with running water.

Apart from these models and the figures, there were also large circular trays or large boxes of confectionery, carried by two or three attendants and sometimes by three or four. In the festivities of 1086/1675, for instance, there were 200 coffers of confectionery, all distributed to the spectators.

**Bibliography:** An illuminating description of sugar figures may be seen in Gerlach’s Tagebueh., 97, 255; for the confectionery and the confectioner, Haunolt, Particular Verzeichnuss., 472, 476, 489-90; and idem, Verzeichnuss des Hochzeitlichen Fest...., 528, 534; Abdi, Sür-name, fol. 8b; Covel, Diary, fol. 215a; Hezar-fenn, fol. 168a, 174b; Sür-name of 1137/1724, ms., Nat. bibl. Vienna, H.O.95, fol. 3b, 7a; for Nointel’s letter to his friend Pompeonne, de Nointel, L’Odyssee d’un ambassadeur, 197; a later description of confectionery may be seen in Leblâ’s Sür-name, ms. Ist. Unîv. Kit. T. no. 6197, fol. 13b, 89a-90b; for the skill of confectioners, Beschreibung der Reisen, ii, 50; a detailed description may be found in Dursun Bey’s Ta’âlîh-i Ebu’l-Feth, Istanbul 1330/1911, 80; Nabi, Sür-name, 62; for recent information, Nutku, IV. Mehmet’in Edirne senilgi, Sur-ndme-i Humdyun, 72; and And, Osmanî s:niklendirinde Türk sanatlanlar, 209-24.

3. YAPMA BAĞÇE, “Artificial garden”. In the processions organised for weddings, and circumcision celebrations, the artificial gardens were one of the exhibits, which interested the spectators, together with the festal palms and the sugar figures. These models were approximately 2.70 m or 3.60 m in size, with fruit trees, flowers, kiosks and fountains. There were nightingales singing on the trees, and water running from the hill tops. If the model was going to be presented to the Sultan, it was decorated with precious stones, mostly turquoise and mother-of-pearls. These artificial gardens moved on four, six or sometimes eight wheels, and each garden was pulled by four or six dockyard slaves, who were later liberated by the Sultan. In some cases, there were also real musicians on these models, playing for the public.

In short, the artificial gardens were pieces of artistic composition.

**Bibliography:** For the miniatures showing the artificial gardens, Sür-name-i Hümayûn, Nat. bibl. Vienna, cod. H.O.70; and Wehbi, Sür-name, Nat. bibl. Vienna, H.O. 94; ‘Abdi, Sür-name, Millet Kit. no. 277, fol. 10a; Covel, Diary, fol. 15a, 215a, 217a; Hezar-fenn, fol. 165a, 166b, 177a; de Nointel, op. cit., 199; Huseyin Yurdudin, Matrakî Natsch, Ankara 1963, 12-5; and for the pictures of the models, see 86; Nutku, op. cit., 73; And, op. cit., 220. (O. NUTKU)

5. IN MUSLIM INDIA

Many of the terms used here have already been defined in the account of court ceremonial above, for which see MUKH. Proccesions in India are of great popular appeal, from the panache of the simple wedding ceremonies to

534; idem, Particular Verzeichnuss...., 469, 475; Melchior Besolt, Das Wolgeborenen Herrn Heinrichs Herrn von Lichtenstein von Nicolspurg u. Rom, Keys. Maist. Abgesandt Reys aff Constantinopol. 1584, in Lehnars Leben mit seinen dreiminiaturen nach der Reisebeschreibung aus Deutschland nach Constantinopel und Jerusalem, Nürnberg 1608; Stephan Gerlach (d. Aeltre), Tagebuch..., Frankfurt am Main 1674, 265; Hezar-fenn, op. cit., fol. 178a; ‘Abdi, fol. 8a-b; Nâ’îma writes that, in the festival of 1056/1646 to celebrate the wedding of Fatma Sultan, the daughter of Sultan Ibrahim, who was then four years of age, since the two minarets of the festival palms were too high and too wide to pass through the streets of Istanbul, terraces, balconies and the caves of various houses had to be pulled down, and the streets to be widened, see his Ta’âlîh-i Ebu’l-Feth, Istanbul 1280/1663; the case was the same in the festival of 1086/1675. Dr. Covel witnessed the demolishing process in Edirne: some of the houses were completely pulled down, and the streets of the festival palms and the sugar figures. These exhibits, which interested the spectators, together with the festal palms and the sugar figures. These models were approximately 2.70 m or 3.60 m in size, with fruit trees, flowers, kiosks and fountains. There were nightingales singing on the trees, and water running from the hill tops. If the model was going to be presented to the Sultan, it was decorated with precious stones, mostly turquoise and mother-of-pearls. These artificial gardens moved on four, six or sometimes eight wheels, and each garden was pulled by four or six dockyard slaves, who were later liberated by the Sultan. In some cases, there were also real musicians on these models, playing for the public.

In short, the artificial gardens were pieces of artistic composition.

**Bibliography:** For the miniatures showing the artificial gardens, Sür-name-i Hümayûn, Nat. bibl. Vienna, cod. H.O.70; and Wehbi, Sür-name, Nat. bibl. Vienna, H.O. 94; ‘Abdi, Sür-name, Millet Kit. no. 277, fol. 10a; Covel, Diary, fol. 15a, 215a, 217a; Hezar-fenn, fol. 165a, 166b, 177a; de Nointel, op. cit., 199; Huseyin Yurdudin, Matrakî Natsch, Ankara 1963, 12-5; and for the pictures of the models, see 86; Nutku, op. cit., 73; And, op. cit., 220. (O. NUTKU)

5. IN MUSLIM INDIA

Many of the terms used here have already been defined in the account of court ceremonial above, for which see MUKH. Proccesions in India are of great popular appeal, from the panache of the simple wedding ceremonies to
the pomp of royal ceremonial; and even these extremes have something in common.

The wedding (for full details see NIKAH) involves a preliminary exchange of presents (sādāk) between bride and groom, the bride's night procession (mehndī) to anoint the bridegroom with henna, and the bridegroom's procession in which he comes to carry away his bride; even in the simplest forms the bridegroom is mounted on a decorated horse, or the bride carried in a palanquin (pālīk) or on a litter (dīfī) [see MARI] accompanied by friends on foot and by a musical escort. The essentials of Muslim weddings in India (which incorporate many details derived from Hindu customs) are described, especially for the Deccan, in Dża'far Shāhīf, ch. viii; but the difference is only one of degree from such an elaborate wedding ceremony as that of the (Anglo-Muslim) granddaughter of Col. W. L. Gardeń at Kasganj in 1835 to a grandson of Shāh Alam II, sultan of Dihlī, described in Fanny Parks, Wonders of a Pilgrim in Search of the Picturesque, London 1850 (repr. Karachi 1975), i, 420-50, and similar in its lavish ostentation to the processions, for various purposes, of the royal court: the escort for the bride's dress in 'amāris on elephants and in covered bullock-carts (rathā) and palanquins with 100 trays of presents carried on men's heads; a similar procession to escort the bridegroom's dress; the sādāk procession, with fully caparisoned elephants and horses, nākīs, palanquins and rathās [see nārkī], 200 earthen pots, covered with leaf silver, containing sweetmeats and carried on bamboo screens and had triumphal arches at intervals, all lighted with thousands of small lamps, fireworks were let off all along the route, and the usual elephants, horses, nākīs, palanquins, rathās, and the portable stages, were lit up by men carrying 5,000 torches; and the bridegroom's procession to carry away his bride (described as an old Tartar, or Timūrid, custom; but Ibn Battūta does, however, write of a similar ceremony at the marriage of the sister of Muhammad b. Tughluk), similarly accompanied by many musical bands and innumerable flags, with the young prince at the head on a horse with an ornamental armour made of flowers, flanked by an alfādīr and followed by a gold-embroidered chan; besides the usual train of elephants and horses, etc., carrying the escort, and the portable stages, there were added a great number of led horses, and a small forest of artificial trees of wax and paper, decorated with gold and silver foil and mica. Not mentioned in the above account, but known from other sources, are the distribution of small copper coins from one of the elephants to the bystanders lining the route, and the liberation of caged birds at frequent intervals.

Descriptions of royal processions are less frequent than notices of other ceremonial observances. Ibn Baṭṭūta, however, describe, sketchily, certain processions in the time of Muhammad b. Tughluk: on his return to his palace from a journey, wooden pavilions were set up at intervals on the road from city gate to palace gate, several storeys high with well-dressed singers and dancing girls on each storey; the street walls were hung with silk cloths, and silk cloths carpeted the space between the pavilions for the sultan's horse to walk on. He was preceded by several thousand of his own slaves on foot, sixteen brocaded and jewelled elephants bearing sixteen parasols, and the ghādhīya, and followed by mounted troops; three or four small catapults set up on elephants might scatter silver coin among the populace (iii, 237-8, tr. Gibb, iii, 668; another ceremonial entry is described at iii, 395-6, tr. Gibb, iii, 744). At the reception of a person of rank (e.g. the amīr Ghiyāth al-Dīn Muḥammad, descendant of the 'Abbasīd caliph al-Muṣṭaṣir bi'llāh) the sultan sent envoys to a distance to meet him, and himself rode out ten miles to greet him personally, dismounting to pay homage and offer a āḥāna before the sultan himself, preceded by a kālan. Foreign dignitaries later in the procession were also mounted on elephants. Behind the sultan were his 'honours' [see MARATĪB] and all the members of his personal entourage, and then his half-brother, his father's adopted son, his nephew Firūz b. Rāqībat, the ważīr, and some half-dozen 'great amīrs who are never separated from his company', all mounted and followed by their marāṭīb and troops; other amīrs rode without 'honours'; those riding in the procession wore armour, both on themselves and on their horses. At the gate of the 'āshur, the procession halted and the judges, the principal amīrs and the "chiefs of the foreigners" (envoys from other courts?) entered before the sultan; after the prayers and the address by the swānī, the sultan protected his dress by a silk overall and himself stabbed the sacrificial camel in the throat with a spear before returning to his palace. Ibn Batṭūta also describes (iii, 109ff., tr. Gibb, iii, 600-2) a river-journey with the governor of Lāhārī in Sind: the governor rode in a central raised cabin in an ahāsara (possibly connected with the Hindī hātā, a cargo boat of some 35-55 tonnes; here evidently a state barge) rowed by 40 men; of the fifteen vessels which made up his baggage-train, four flanked the ahāsara, two carrying his marāṭīb and two carrying singers. Singers and the instruments of the marāṭīb performed alternately until the midday meal, when the ships closed up and gangways were set between them; at dusk the parties disembarked and set up camp on the river bank. When the procession moved to land, six horsemen rode ahead with drums and reed pipes, followed by the governor's hātīfīn, flanked by singers, and his personal troops, and the governor himself.

There is little difference on the composition of royal processions over the years, as far as can be determined from the limited evidence available; certain practices mentioned later, such as water-carriers walking ahead of the procession to lay the dust, may in fact not be innovations. When the Mughal ruler moved out of his palace, he was accompanied almost always by the bearer of the flywhisk, and invariably by the kār, as described above s.v. MARAŚĪM. 5; the ruler's person would be further guarded by mace-bearers (gurzīsārā), who obviously inherited the functions of the dārūsh or dārbār, as described by Amīr Khursāw and Barānī. Processions are the subject of frequent illustration in Mughal painting; the use of the ghādhīya seems by now to have been discontinued. There is evidence of some rulers taking part in processions on
foot on grounds of piety; Akbar so covered part of the journey to the shrine of Mucm al-Dln CishtT at sardca each camping site, and his own red and tent to be erected within it, carpets, cook-
Firuz-Shdhi, (white trimmed with blue) before any other and torch-bearers for night travel. The sultan selected everything, grass-cutters for fodder for the animals, (dola), swivelguns, each with two gunners and driver, then a body of artillery, two troops of armed cavalry, and a regiment of militia, all in new uniforms of different colours; the horses were caparisoned with embroidered horsecloths, silver ornaments and necklaces, with tails and manes dyed red with henna. These were followed by the mounted kettledrums, these with horse and rider ornamented with the royal fish emblem (representing the makh-marath; see under maratib. 5. Fanny Parks remarks, op. cit., i, 178, that the royal pleasure-boat on the river Gomai was "made in the shape of a fish, and the golden scales glittered in the sun"). The ruler followed in an open silver carriage drawn by four elephants with costly carries, and guarded by cavalry, and followed by the king's horses, led by grooms; other elephant-carrigages, with two elephants apiece, conveyed the British Resident, the waizir, and other favoured nobles. The golden naik followed, with a golden palanquin and a state carriage drawn by eight horses with a European coachman. Some fifty ridden elephants followed, with the Euro-
peans of the King's court and the umars and the great officers of state, and the regiments, both horse and foot, marching with their colours unfurled, and their bands "playing English pieces". After the sacrifice at the 'idgah, the procession returned to the royal palace in the same order, where the king held court firstly to receive nafris [g.v.], then to garland his favoured guests and to award distinctions and present basts; a feast followed, with animal fights, music and dancing, and fireworks. "This magnificent style of celebrating is perhaps unequalled by any other Native Court now existing in Hindoostan." The royal hunt—highly esteemed in India since it is best considered in three contexts.
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The other is that a slave-girl of the Barmakls, herself
disgraced masters, the contention being that since the
r.
Both accounts are suspect as they

khwani, demansted the surrender of his scarlet tents, reserving
in 1017/1608; in 1028/1619, however, he rode to the
tomb in full procession, as shown by a superb miniatures painting in the Chester Beatty collection.

1. In written sources.

Among the "seven arts" al-funun al-sab'a [see karn]—non-classical verse forms are always made to number seven, although the lists are not identical—the mawaliyya is given pride of place next to the mawaliyya and the zadjal, on the ground that its
r.

Two traditions place its beginnings in Iraq in early
\'Abb\'a\'sid times. One is that non-Arab (mawali) labourers in the orchards of Wasi\'i sang it, using the words ya mawaliyya ("O, my master!") as a refrain. The other is that a slave-girl of the Barmakis, herself called Mawaliyya, created the form to circumvent H\'ur\'un al-Rashid's ban on poetry praising her disgraced masters, the contention being that since the language was uninflected, the composition could not be said to be thar. Both accounts are suspect as they occur only in late sources and appear to have been fabricated to account for the otherwise unexplained appellation.

The form was, however, well-established by the
it is described as *abyad* ("white, blank"); if so ornamented, it is either *ahmar* ("red") or *akhdar* ("green"). The distinction most often made—"but not consistently applied—between these two being that the first deals with sad themes and the second with joyful ones.

The following illustrates the rhyme scheme,metrical variations, and the *zahr*, with the normal pronunciation of the punning rhymes added between square brackets:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3.</th>
<th>4.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ya dabulk il-karm(i)</td>
<td>khud bâlak min ill i fih</td>
<td>You who enter the vineyard, beware of what is in it;</td>
<td>wi giss(i) nabl il-†nab w ihram min illîthîh [†ilih]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feel the pulse of the grapes, be watchful of its fibres,</td>
<td>w ittabba* il-†aqîf law tifâb min illîffîh [†il-†a†f]</td>
<td>wi giss(i) nabl il-†nab w ihram min illîthîh [†ilih]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and trace back the root, though you weary of the winding trail.</td>
<td>il-hîw(i) fi† ish-†awasîw w il-wîhibîh âl-ârd</td>
<td>Feel the pulse of the grapes, be watchful of its fibres,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is good is high on the tresses; what is bad is on the ground.</td>
<td>*i̜lam bi †i{'n il-hawâ li l-bukm(i) †awâdî †awâdî</td>
<td>and trace back the root, though you weary of the winding trail.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Take note that passion is a threat to wisdom.</em></td>
<td><em>What is good is high on the tresses; what is bad is on the ground.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The form is a favourite in Arab lands, extending all the way from 'Irâk to North Africa. Variations are almost innumerable, and the observations that follow relate to prevalent practice in Egypt alone.

The terminology is often vague and inconsistent. The word *maωawyîyâ* itself is still used, especially in writing, but in common parlance the composition itself is always almost called a *maωawyîl*, and a master of the art is known as *rayyîr il-maωawyîl*.

The metre is seldom as regular as the pundits would have it, but if the composition can be scanned at all it is recognisably in the *basîl*, with two variations added to those allowed by the classical prosodists: the *fâli*un foot is often reduced to two long syllables even in the body of the line, and the *mustaufîlun* foot is occasionally changed to *mutafâli*un. It may therefore be scanned:

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\ddagger & - & \ddagger & -
\end{array}
\]

What in classical prosody is a hemistich is here clearly the basic metrical unit, for it is always rhymed, occurs more often in odd than in even numbers, and is never enjambed. In this entry, it will be referred to as a line.

The most marked development has been in rhyme schemes. The monorhyme quatrain (aaua), called *raβâ-i* or *mirâbâa*, is now comparatively rare. Variations appear to have been created mostly by insertions between the third line and the last. The first three lines are then called the *†ataba* ("doorstep")—although the term is also sometimes applied to each of the three lines—or the *farâh* ("spread, mat"), and the last line is then the *qâfâ* ("cover") or, in longer compositions, the *šâdîyya* ("skull-cap").

The simplest elaboration consists of the addition of a rhymed line in fourth place: aaua. This line is said to be *šârîj* ("lame"), and the *maωawîl* itself is *aωradj*.

Another augmented form has the rhyme scheme aaua zzz a. The composition is then called *sabînî* or *mišâbët* ("seventh"), *nuωmâni*, or *baghdâdî*.

Yet another elaboration is brought about by adding a number of lines, usually six, with alternating rhymes after the *fâli*un—*aωka ωkîh zzz a*—the last line also having an internal *z* rhyme. The setest of alternating rhymes is called *shâfâra* ("tree") or *ridâfa* ("alternate") or, else each of the two rhymes is called a *ridâf*, and they are distinguished from each other as *dakar* and *întâya* ("male" and "female"). The *maωawîl* is then said to be *mardîf* or *Šâdîdî* ("Upper Egyptian"). By multiplying the number of setests, or by using any variety of the *maωawîl* as a stanza, the composition can be extended indefinitely, particularly for narrative purposes.

A somewhat rare further refinement is the addition of internal rhymes to some of the lines; these are then called *mišâkka†* ("clapping or roofed").

Another feature strongly associated with the folk *maωawîl* but not exclusive to it is the expansion of the rhymes into all-palatal paronomasias, achieved by deliberate distortion of the normal pronunciation. The art is called *zahr* ("flower"). A *maωawîl* devoid of

(Ed.) AL-MÁWARDÍ, ABU 'L-HASAN 'ALI B. MUHAMMAD B. HÁBÍB, ǦÁWZÍL (LA F. 1058) was born in Basra in May 1058, aged 86 years. He became a teacher. The renown which he acquired, owing to the extent and the depth of his knowledge, drew to him the attention of the authorities; he was appointed kádi and fulfilled the responsibilities of this post in various towns, in particular at Ustuwa, near Nishapúr, before being entrusted with the role in Baghdád itself. In 429/1037-8, he was awarded the honorific surname (lakab) of ǧáddar or supreme kádi in spite of the opinions of eminent jurists, including al-Tabari, who denied the legality of this title. In addition, he was on four occasions chosen by the caliph al-Kaárím (422-67/1031-74) to perform diplomatic missions in 422/1031, 428/1042-3, 434/1047-8 and 433/1043-4. Anecdotes confirm that his rank and his vast learning did not in any way detract from his modesty and that he was an enthusiastic and eloquent speaker. He was furthermore highly regarded by the preceding caliph al-Ḫájír, who was then the ruler of Iraq (al-Mawardí was only in the conduct of his negotiations with the Buyids who were then the rulers of Iran) (1968), 11-92. See also MAZALIM.

(Selection from works of Al-Mawardí chosen by Brockelmann, C. 1968)

The most striking example is that of the ǧáddar declared in 429/1037-8 against the Buyids, al-Dhahabí, who was demanding from al-Kaárím the right to bear the title of ǧáddar. However, al-Mawardí did not escape the suspicions of the orthodox, and the great ǧáddar al-Šaafií jurist al-Šubkí (d. 756/1355) speaks of Muţázírí views for which he was criticised (Tabkáští al-šáfi'íyya, iii, 303, v, 12).

As regards the works of Al-Mawardí, the classification followed is that of Muşáfá al-Šaâkí, in the introduction to the Addá al-dánuy wa l-ǧi'din (ed. in the margins of the Kaškálí of Al-Šámi, Cairo 1316/1898-9; ed. M. al-Sakka, Cairo 1955).

2. Works of a political and social nature: Kitáb al-akhirání al-sulájiyya, translated notably by Fagnan (Algiers 1915; new edition, Paris 1982) under the title of Traité des statuts gouvernementaux ou Constitutions politiques; this is the work which made Al-Mawardí known in the West, and it is considered a classic work of public law; Kitáb Šawáni al-ţáriqa wa-ṣ-siyyát al-muání, on the adab of the viziers (ms. in Vienna). Kitáb Táshkíl al-maşrúr wa-ta'lí'íl al-saţar, on politics and different forms of government (ms. in Gotha); Kitáb Násíf al-malúk (ms. in Paris).

3. Studies of language and of adáb: Kitáb l-ţanáh, on grammar (lost); Kitáb al-ţáshkíl wa l-ţikam, collection of 300 traditions, 300 proverbs and 300 verses (ms. of Un. of Leiden); Kitáb Addá al-takallum (selection from works of Al-Mawardí chosen by Muhammad b. Ǧáli Al-Zahra; ms. of Un. of Leiden, Or. 989-9), Kitáb Addá al-ţáddi, which in fact represents two of the thirty sections of the Ǧádi (ed. Baghdád 1971); Kitáb Muṣțuíʕ al-fadá, Tractatus paroemeticus de virtutibus moribus, attributed to Al-Mawardí (ms. Escurrail).


(C. Brockelmann)

MAWÁLÍYÁ — MAWÁT (A.), juridical term designating dead lands.

Fiqh makes the practical distinction between dead land (ard maouâl) and living land. According to Abú Ǧáfír, dead land is that which is not well cultivated and is without water; for al-Shaâkí, it is all that is neither cultivated nor dependent on a cultivated place. Dead land is of two kinds: that which, from time immemorial, has always been in this state, of a kind that bears no mark of cultivation and concerning which no property right has been established; whereas dead land of the second category is that which, once cultivated, has then been neglected, become dead and allowed to lie fallow.

But dead land can be brought to life. Revivification (išká) is a task performed on the land and intended to make it usable. Both near neighbours and those at a greater distance have the right of revivification. For Malik, however, the nearest neighbours are the most qualified to undertake the work of revivification. Giving value to the land allows the one who has carried out the task of revivification to become a man of property. A piece of dead land that has been revivified becomes the property (milk) of the revivifier. According to the Hanáfí, revivification of the land is only allowed with the caliph's authorisation, but, according to al-Shaâkí, the one who revivifies dead pieces of land becomes the owner with or without the caliph's permission.

On the nature of what constitutes giving value to land so as to create a property right, the different juridical schools are not in agreement: according to the Malikís, it is not enough to enclose the land, to sink a well in it or to pasture a flock on it. One must,....
for example, find a spring and then exploit the spring by means of water channels, or else clear the land in such a way as to make it usable, or even build; in short, giving value to it must consist of useful and productive work. The Mālikis, however, appear less demanding than the other juridical schools on the subject of the conditions required to acquire the soil by reactivation.

The land surrounding the reactivated land (harirri) also becomes reactivated land, but on this the four juridical schools are not in agreement on the extent of the conditions required to acquire the soil by reactivation.

The portion of the treasure also received al-Rahba and al-Rakka on the Euphrates as well as Edessa or al-Ruha. The portion of the treasure that has been reserved can lose its character as a reserve, under certain conditions, if someone comes to reivate it. In the same way, if dead land granted as a concession is reivated by an individual who has not been granted the concession, the right of the reiviver does not prevail over that of the concessionary; in any case, where dead lands are granted as concessions, the beneficiaries of the concessions do not really become the owners before having reivated them. According to the Prophet’s saying “To the one who quickens a dead piece of land, that land belongs.” In practice, one can understand all the importance that could be attached to making an ownerless and abandoned land usable and productive, a fiscal importance especially, since quickening involved the payment to the public treasury of the tax for the land, tithe or kharaj, in accordance with regional conditions.
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MAWĀZIN [see MAKĀVĪN]

MAWŪDĪ s. ʿIMĀD AL-DĪN ZANKĪ, KUṬB AL-DĪN, AL-TĀHĪB [see ATABAK] of AL-MAWSĪL.

ʿImād-al-Dīn Zankī, on his death on 6 Rābi`a II 541/15 September 1146, left four heirs: of these Mawūdī b. ʿImād-al-Dīn Zankī, Kuṭb al-Dīn al-Ar`ādji, the youngest of his sons, was only sixteen years old. The eldest, Sayf al-Dīn Ghāzī, represented his father at al-Mawsīl of which Zankī [q.v.] held only the usufruct; the second son, Nūr al-Dīn Mahmūd [q.v.], twenty-nine years old, accompanied his father in his campaigns; the third, Nūrāt al-Dīn Amir-Āmīrān was named as heir presumptive when the former was ill, in Ramadan 552/October 1157, and later sent to Harrān as governor. Mawūdī also had a sister who married the amīr Nāṣir al-Dīn al-Sūrī. The task of appointing Zankī’s successor was in the hands of two trusted counsellors: the vizier Djalāl al-Dīn Muhammad b. ʿAlī al-Djīwād al-Iṣfahānī, and the chamberlain (ḥāfīz) Salah al-Dīn Muḥammad al-Yāḥṣīyānī, titular amīr of Ḥamāt.

At the time of his illness, Sayf al-Dīn Ghāzī I transferred power to his youngest brother Kuṭb al-Dīn Mawūdī at the request of his loyal counsellors Djalāl al-Dīn and Zayn al-Dīn Kūčī, who had previously served him. The young prince associated with this trust was another loyal supporter of Zankī, a jurist, the kādī Kamāl al-Dīn Abū l-Fadl Muhammad al-Ṣḥahrāzūrī. On his assumption of power, Kuṭb al-Dīn Mawūdī, succeeding to the eldest of the family, took up residence in the governor’s palace and ordered the imprisonment of his elder brother Nūr al-Dīn Amīr-Amīrān who had sought to establish a faction of amīrs. Nūr al-Dīn, for his part, had favoured the installation of Mawūdī at al-Mawsīl. Recognized by the army and the population as sovereign of the entire Djiyarī, his position was confirmed by the investiture of the Saldijjāk sultan Maṣūdī b. Muḥammad [q.v.] and that of the caliph al-Muṣṭaفا [q.v.]. Shortly after his accession to power, Kuṭb al-Dīn Mawūdī married the princess Zumurrūd Khatūn, daughter of Timūrṭāsh, the Artūkid prince of Mardin [q.v.] who had previously offered her to Sayf al-Dīn as a means of sealing an alliance with the Zankids.

A crisis soon erupted in 544/1149 between Kuṭb al-Dīn and his elder brother Nūr al-Dīn regarding the town of Sindjār [q.v.], where a third of the treasure of Zankī was stored in the citadel. The amīr ʿAbd al-Malik, governor of Sindjār, receiving no reply from Aleppo to the overtures that he had made to Nūr al-Dīn, made his way to al-Mawsīl to pledge allegiance to Mawūdī. Meanwhile, his son Shams al-Dīn had offered Sindjār to Nūr al-Dīn on condition that he himself should retain the treasure. On Monday 10 Rajdāb 544/13 November 1149, Nūr al-Dīn occupied Sindjār and succeeded in winning over to his side the amīr Fakhr al-Dīn Kara Arslān b. Dāuíd of Ḫusn Kaylā, a rival of Timūrṭāsh of Mardin, the father-in-law of Sayf al-Dīn. Learning of the forthcoming alliance of the Aleppo and the Artūkid troops, Mawūdī returned to Sindjār. Accused of improperly appropriating the treasure, Nūr al-Dīn was able to argue his right of superior age in his defence; he expressed his wish to discuss with Mawūdī the problems raised by the succession to Sayf al-Dīn, and drew his attention to the considerable number of amīrs who had rallied to his cause. Mawūdī’s counsellors feared desertions to the side of Nūr al-Dīn and considered that if the ruler of Aleppo were to emerge the victor in the confrontation, the sultan would come to attack al-Mawsīl which, enfeebled, would be incapable of resisting him. On the other hand, if Nūr al-Dīn were to be defeated, the most reliable bastion against the Crusaders would collapse and the Franks would then be able to expand still further. With the threat from common adversaries, the Saljuk sultan to the East and the Crusaders to the West, the only solution was to make peace between the members of the Zankid family. The negotiations, skillfully conducted by Djalāl al-Dīn al-Djīwād, led to an agreement between the two brothers. Nūr al-Dīn returned Sindjār in exchange for Ḫims which had been given to his brother Sayf al-Dīn to reward him for his support against the second Crusade. Nūr al-Dīn also received al-Raḥba and al-Raḥkā on the Euphrates as well as Edessa or al-Ruḥā [q.v.]. The portion of the treasure...
of Zanki stored at Singar was to be used to finance the 
guhd of Nür al-Din.
In 553/1158, when ill, Nür al-Din named his brother Kūt愍 al-Din Mawdūd as eventual successor and 
made him his own promise to obey him. Mawdūd, crossing the Euphrates between Siffin [q.v.] 
and al-Rakkā, made his way towards Damascus to 
visit his brother. Meanwhile, having recovered, Nür 
al-Din had returned to northern Syria; the two Zankid 
princes set out to take Harrān, which they entrusted 
to the isfahālār Zayn al-Din ‘Ali Kūčīk.
In the following year, Mawdūd arrived with powerful 
reinforcements to assist Nür al-Din, who was 
threatened at Aleppo by the advance of a Frankish-
Byzantine coalition. In Dhū ‘l-Hijjah 554/December 
1159-January 1160, news came of the death of the 
Sulghūk sultan Muḥammad b. Muḥammad [q.v.] at 
Hamadān. This was an event of importance to 
Mawdūd, who was holding prisoner at al-Mawsil 
Sulaymān Shāh, one of the candidates for the succe-
ssion. After long negotiations, Mawdūd agreed to 
release his prisoner on condition that he be appointed 
Atabeg of the new sultan and that the latter take 
Djamāl al-Dīn al-Djāwād as vizier and ‘Ali Kūčīk as 
commander of the sultan’s armies. Escorted by troops 
from al-Mawsīl, Sulaymān Shāh set out for Hama-
dān, but, the victim of a conspiracy, he was poisoned 
and died on the way. Mawdūd’s troops turned back, 
and there were no further links between al-Mawsīl 
and Kūt愍. In Ramadan 555/August 1164, Mawdūd 
received an appeal yet again from Nür al-
Dīn, who wanted the assistance of his allies in causing 
a diversion in northern Syria with the aim of averting 
an invasion of Egypt by the Franks. Mawdūd 
responded by sending considerable contingents which 
laied siege to Harrān, which the Barsanid prince took to 
Harim. During the second campaign of the amīr Shirkūh in 
Egypt, Mawdūd sent, at the request of Nür al-Dīn, 
reinforcements to take part in operations against the 
Count of Tripoli.
At the end of summer 562/1167 he returned to al-
Mawsīl with troops exhausted by the campaign and 
by the fast of Ramadan. In token of gratitude to his 
brother, Nür al-Dīn ceded al-Rakka to him. Having 
learned that after the death on 27 Ramadān/17 July 
of Kara Arslān, the prince of Hisn Kayfa and of Diyar 
Bakr, his succession reverted to his son and 
designated heir, Nür al-Dīn Muḥammad (562-
81/1167-85), Mawdūd wanted to attack the territories 
Designated heir, Nur al-Dīn Muhammad (562-
81/1167-85), Mawdūd wanted to attack the territories 

ceded to the young Artuku d prince; but Nur al-
Dīn, who wanted the assistance of his allies in causing 
a diversion in northern Syria with the aim of averting 
an invasion of Egypt by the Franks. Mawdūd 
responded by sending considerable contingents which 
laied siege to Harrān, which the Barsanid prince took to 
Harim. During the second campaign of the amīr Shirkūh in 
Egypt, Mawdūd sent, at the request of Nür al-Dīn, 
reinforcements to take part in operations against the 
Count of Tripoli.
At the end of summer 562/1167 he returned to al-
Mawsīl with troops exhausted by the campaign and 
by the fast of Ramadan. In token of gratitude to his 
brother, Nür al-Dīn ceded al-Rakka to him. Having 
learned that after the death on 27 Ramadān/17 July 
of Kara Arslān, the prince of Hisn Kayfa and of Diyar 
Bakr, his succession reverted to his son and 
designated heir, Nür al-Dīn Muḥammad (562-
81/1167-85), Mawdūd wanted to attack the territories 
Designated heir, Nur al-Dīn Muhammad (562-
81/1167-85), Mawdūd wanted to attack the territories 

married one of his cousins, the daughter of Nūr al-
Dīn Muḥammad. Fakhr al-Dīn, who conducted affairs of 
state at al-Mawsīl, did not approve of this decision, 
since he wanted to withdraw from the tutelage of the 
ruled of Aleppo, who did not like him. He decided to 
engineer the downfall of Imand al-Dīn, and allied 
himself with one of the wives of Mawdūd, the 
daughter of the Artukīd Huṣām al-Dīn Timrūğ b. 
Iḥṣāzī and mother of Sayyid al-Dīn Ghāzī. The vizier 
succeeded in making his master revoke his decision. 
Mawdūd, being close to death, summoned his amirs 
together and made them pledge allegiance to his 
younger brother. It was thus that the young Sayyid al-
Dīn Ghāzī acceded to the throne as legitimate heir when 
his father died following his illness on 22 Dhū 
‘l-Hijjah 565/6 September 1170. Fakhr al-Dīn ‘Abd 
al-Masīḥ continued to administer all the business of 
al-Mawsīl, while Nūr al-Dīn lost the control which he 
had exercised over the city during the lifetime of his 
younger brother.
One of the daughters of Mawdūd, ‘Aẓīzat al-Dīn 
Aḥkāmshār Khāṭūn, wife of al-Malik al-Mu‘azzam, 
constructed in 610/1213, on the banks of the river 
Tārāw, at Sābiliyya, the Hanafi funerary madrasa of 
al-Māridānīyya. One of his grand-daughters, Tarkan 
Khāṭūn, daughter of ‘Izz al-Dīn Masūd b. Kūt愍 
al-Dīn Mawdūd, wife of al-Malik al-Aḥraff Mūsā, who 
died in 640/1242, constructed at Kāsīyān [q.v.] in 
the same suburb of Damascus the Shāfī‘ī funerary madrasa of al-Āthābīyya.
In the writings of western chroniclers of the 
Crusades the name of Mawdūd is transcribed in such 
renderings as Malducus, Maldutus or Manduit.
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(NE. ELISSEEFF)
He was probably born in 401/1010-11 or 402/1011-12 as the eldest son of Mas'ud b. Mahmūd [q.v.], and during his father's reign was closely associated with the sultan on various military expeditions. When Mas'ud was deposed and then killed in Džumādī I 432/January 1041, Mawdūd made himself the avenger and protector of his son. When his grandfather, his uncle Muhammad b. Mahmūd. He marched from Balkh, secured the capital Ghazna, and met Mahmūd’s army coming from India near Djalalābād, at a place subsequently named Fathabad, for Mawdūd completely defeated the rebels in Radjāb 432/March 1041. Mahmūd and all but one of his sons were executed, and a threat from Mawdūd’s younger brother Madjdud, governor of Multan, scotched by the latter’s mysterious death, so that Mawdūd became uncalled ruler now in Ghazna.

He faced formidable problems in combatting the Saldjuks in eastern Khurāsān and Sistān. He attempted an alliance with the Saldjūk’s Karakhānīd enemies in Transoxania [see ILEK-KHANS], and in 435/1043-4 invaded Turkānīstan, but was repulsed by Chāghri Beg’s forces. Another Saldjūk, his younger brother Madjdud, governor of Multan, passed definitively to the Saldjūks, and a further endeavour by Mawdūd to organise a grand coalition of anti-Saldjūk princes in Transoxania and Persia was cut short by his own death. Early in his reign, Mawdūd sent forces into Sistān in order to retain Ghaznawī overlordship over the Saffarids there and to exclude Saldjūk influence, but the local āmir Abu ‘l-Fadl Naṣr b. Ahmad had to pursue a policy of balance between his two powerful neighbours. The concerns of India latterly much occupied Mas'ud, but his violent end provided an opportunity for the reassertion of independence by various Indian tribal rulers. A coalition of rājdūs recaptured Hansī, Thānesar, etc., but was however driven back from Lahore in 435/1043-4.

Mawdūd died of an internal complaint just at the beginning of his new attempt at a revanche against the Saldjūks, probably in Džumādī II 440/December 1048, although the sources diverge on this. He was clearly a skilful commander and able ruler who managed to pull the empire together after the cataclysms which had come upon it and who withstood the eastwards pressure of the Saldjūks; but even had he been granted a long reign, it is doubtful whether he would have been able to recover the lost western provinces.

Bibliography: The main primary sources are Gardīzī, Džūdžānī, Ibn al-Āṣīrī, Ibn Bābār and Fakhrī Murdabīr; these are used in C. E. Bosworth, The later Ghaznavids, splendour and decay. The dynasty in Afghanistan and Northern India 1040-1186, Edinburgh 1977, 20-37. (C. E. Bosworth)
MAWDUDI, SAYYID ABU 'L-'ALĀ (commonly anglicised to Mawdūdī, intellectual, major influence in the politics of Pakistan and one of the leading interpreters of Islam in the twentieth century. He was born on 3 Radjāb 1321/25 September 1903 at Aurangabad in India’s Hyderabad State. His family claimed direct descent from Khānāda Ǧūd b-Din Mawdūdī Ǧūstī (d. 577/1181-2); his ancestors migrated to the subcontinent in the later 9th/15th century and produced many spiritual leaders. His father, a lawyer, came from Dīlīh and was associated with Sayyid Ahmad Khān [q.v.], but preferred to live in Hyderabad, which was the last significant centre of the Mughal tradition. When young, Mawdūdī was carefully insulated from western culture and the English language; educated at home, and briefly in

one of Hyderabad’s madrasas, he experienced neither the typical schooling of the Shālm nor that of the British Indian government. After Mawdūdī’s father died when he was sixteen, he supported himself for a decade as a journalist, most notably as editor of al-Djam‘īyyāt from 1924 to 1927, the organ of the Djam‘at-i Hind. Supported by the Jamaat-e-Islami, he embarked on an exhaustive study of the doctrine of djihād [q.v.]. This work, which was first serialised in al-Djam‘īyyāt and then published under the title al-Djihād fi ‘l-Islām, heralded most elements of his later thought. The effort of composition greatly intensified his understanding of his faith, and in 1928 he retired to Hyderabad to do further research and writing. In 1932 he undertook the editorship of the monthly journal Tardjumān al-Kurān, which was to be the main vehicle of his ideas for the rest of his life. He knew now what he had to do: “The plan of action I had in mind was that I should first break the hold which Western culture and ideas had come to acquire over the Muslim intelligentsia, and to instil in them the fact that Islam has a code of life of its own, its own culture, its own political and economic systems and a philosophy and an educational system which are all superior to anything that Western civilisation could offer. I wanted to rid them of the wrong notion that they needed to borrow from others in the matter of culture and civilisation.” (Sayyid Abul Ala Mawdoodi, Twenty-nine years of the Jamaat-e-Islami, in The Criterion, v6, 43). The intensity of this feeling runs through the pages of his Risāla-yi Dinṣūyā of 1932; the fear of the corrupting influence of western civilisation is manifest in his articles on pardah first published in 1935.

The last decade of British rule brought new fears: that independence would bring the absorption of the Muslim identity into a secular Hindu-dominated nation-state, and that the Muslim response of aiming to found a separate Muslim nation-state of Pakistan was not the right one. Mawdūdī then intervened in politics. In a series of articles, later published under the title Musalmaṇ awr mauwūda sīyāsī kashmakash, he reminded Muslims that they were a separate nation in the Indian environment, while at the same time emphasising that they were not one in any European sense, as the All-India Muslim League was suggesting. Muslims were in danger of forgetting that they had a message for all humanity. The way to carry this message forward was to establish not a nation state of Muslims but an Islamic state in which every constituent part would reveal Islam in ideal and practice. In August 1941 Mawdūdī founded the Djam‘at-i Islāmī, a carefully-selected righteous elite of which he was the leader, to put these ideas into effect.

The emergence of Pakistan in 1947 gave Mawdūdī a forum in which he could act. From 1948 to 1956 his writing intensified. In 1952, supported by the Djam‘at-i Islāmī, played the key role in directing Pakistan away from developing the form of the secular state which its founders had in mind towards the goal of an Islamic state. His pressure was primarily responsible for the Islamic content of the “Objectives Resolution” of the Constituent Assembly (March 1949) which laid down the main principles on which Pakistan’s constitution
was to be based. His leadership brought the representatives of all groups of Ulama to agree in ... of resurgent Islam, New York 1983, 99-133; Aziz Ahmad, Islamic modernism in India and Pakistan, 1857-1964, London.

It was in large part his achievement that the constitution-making the benchmark of the "conservative" process. It was in large part his achievement that the first constitution, which was promulgated in 1956, looked towards reconstructing "Muslim society on a truly Islamic basis and revising all existing laws in the light of the Qur'an and Sunnah". In 1953 Mawdudi was for a period condemned to death; he was imprisoned during the years 1948-50 and 1953-5.

From 1956 the discussion of the role of Islam in the constitution died down and Mawdudi, until restricted by ill-health in 1969, travelled widely outside Pakistan. He was a particularly frequent visitor to Saudi Arabia, where he took part in both the establishment and the running of Murtaza's Islamic university and the World Muslim League. Whenever an Islamic issue arose in Pakistan, like the Muslim Family Laws Ordinance of 1961 or the Ahmadiyya question in 1974, he was prominent. Throughout he opposed the regimes governing Pakistan and, although he resigned from the headship of the Jama'at-i Islami in 1972, he was behind its involvement in the movement to overthrow Z. A. Bhutto in 1977. General Danyal (Ziya) al-Haqq's regime, with its promise of Islamisation, was the first that he felt able to support. When Mawdudi died on 22 September 1979, he did so knowing that Pakistan was at last ruled by a government that was trying to realise a version of his Islamic order.

Mawdudi's academic output was voluminous: tradition, law, philosophy, history, politics, economics, sociology and theology being amongst the subjects covered. Many of his works have been translated, some into over a dozen languages. His masterwork is his Kur'an commentary, Tafhim al-Kur'an, which took him thirty years to finish. His Islamic vision, nevertheless, is scattered through many different publications, many of which were written to meet problems of the moment. Good points of access are a series of radio talks he gave in 1948, Islam kā naẓīm-i hayāt, and the collection of his writings on the Islamic state The Islamic law and constitution.

Central to Mawdudi's vision is the belief that God alone is sovereign; man has gone astray because he has accepted sovereigns other than God, for instance, kings, nation states or custom. All the guidance which man needs can be found in the Shari'a, which offers a complete scheme of life where nothing is superfluous and nothing lacking. Political power is essential to put this divinely-ordained pattern into effect; the Islamic state has a missionary purpose. Moreover, because God's guidance extends to all human activity, this divinely-ordained pattern into effect; the Islamic state has a missionary purpose. Moreover, because God's guidance extends to all human activity, this state must be universal and all-embracing, and the state must be universal and all-embracing, and the state has a missionary purpose. Moreover, because God's guidance extends to all human activity, this state must be universal and all-embracing, and because the state's purpose is to establish Islamic ideology it must be run by those who believe in it and comprehend its spirit—those who do not may just live with the confines of the state as non-Muslim citizens of the state, with whom, in consequence, the ruler must consult in the process of government. So Mawdudi describes his policy as a "theo-democracy" in which the whole community of Muslims interpret the law of God within the framework supplied by the Shari'a. The ruler (amir) is to be elected by whatever means are appropriate, providing that they ensure that the man who enjoys the greatest measure of national confidence is chosen. His legislature (maqdis-i dini) is also to be elected by whatever means are appropriate, providing that they ensure the choice of men with the confidence of the people. Legislation itself takes place in four ways: by interpretation, by analogy, by inference, and, in that area of human affairs about which the Shari'a is silent, by independent judgement.

The major feature of Mawdudi's thought is to have transformed Islam into an ideology, an integrated and all-embracing system. He aimed to set out the ideal order of the time of the Rightly-Guided Caliphs. The outcome is the most comprehensive statement of the nature of the Islamic state in modern times, and one which, while conjuring an ideal from the past, has been shaped by contemporary concerns and modes of thought. His exposition, as might be expected from a man who was primarily a theologian, is strong on general principles but weak on detail.

Mawdudi is amongst the most influential of those Muslims who have felt, as the 20th century has progressed, that the answer to western domination need not be formulated in terms of nationalism and secularism but in terms of Islam. Himself inspired by Ibn Khaldūn, Shāh Wali' Allāh, Muhammad Iqbal and Hasan al-Banna (q. e.), he has influenced in his turn men ranging from the leaders of Islamic movements in Egypt, Syria and Iran to many ordinary Muslims throughout the Islamic world.


(F. C. R. Robinson)
foreign merchants and colonists under imperial pro-
tection, the non-Arab population of pre-Islamic
Arabia consisted of Jews, slaves and freedmen of
African and Middle Eastern extraction, half-bred
descendants of caravans, and presumably also ethnic
and occupational parish groups of the type attested in
modern times (Kawâwîla, Bayâ-dir, Sulûbis, etc.).
There is no reason to doubt that all were known as
maudlí in the sense of "kinsmen", in so far as they
were free and came under Arab protection (cf. the
modern use of the word âdh "brother"), but the ques-
tion is, what this implied. Are we to take it that all
non-Arabs were individually assigned to Arab tribes
and acquired partial membership of Arab tribes
through them, having no social organisation of their
own? Or did they form social groups of their own, so
that they were collectively placed under the protection
of Arab tribes in which they acquired no membership
at all, merely becoming their satellites? The first solu-
tion is that enshrined in Islamic wâlî; but it is the
second which is attested for Arabia.
Thus it is well known that the Jews of Arabia
formed tribal groups of their own. In fact, Jewish
tribes were sometimes strong enough to escape Arab
protection altogether (and thus also the status of
maudlí). But this was hardly the common pattern. The
Jews of Fadak, for example, paid protection money to
Kalb (M. J. Kister, On the wife of the goldsmith from
Fadak and her progeny, in: J. Juda, ed., The Jewish
people in the Arabian peninsula iv, Berlin 1889,
Wellhausen, München 1911, 290); Kalb of the Jews of
Wâdir a-Kura similarly paid what was to be known as
khuwwa to Arab overlords (al-Bakri, Mu§qam mî ista^djam, ed. F. Wüstenfeld, Göt-
tingen 1876-7, i, 30); and those of Yathrib were
reduced to client status by the Aws and Khazraj (q.v.)
some time before the rise of Islam (J. Wellhausen, Slüzen and Vorbeien, iv, Berlin 1899,
79f.). Naturally, client status weakened the tribal
organisation of the Jews; the same is true of modern parish groups. But the Jewish tribes were
dissolved, nor were the Jews assigned to individual
patrons; clientage was a relationship between groups.
Similarly, the Arabised descendants of the Persian
workmen and prostitutes of Hadjar clearly formed a
quasi-tribal group of their own under 'AbdI, but they adopted the rules of their protector
(al-Tabâri, i, 986).
The question is thus, whether freedmen were
treated differently? On this point, the evidence is less
conclusive. Continuing relations between manumitter
and freedman were clearly common, and there is
evidence that the pre-Islamic Arabs practised
manumission with what the Greeks called paramanê, a
classic function of the freedman to stay with the
manumitter for a specified number of years or until
the latter died (P. Crone, Roman, provincial and Islamic
law, Princeton 1987). But continuing
relations between manumitter and freedman in no way imply that the latter was incorporated in the manumitter’s
kin; the paramon or freedmen only became a member of
his household, and then only for a specified time;
and one would in general have thought the pre-
Islamic Arabs as reluctant to contaminate their
agnatic kin with non-Arab freedmen as were their
descendants in more recent times. The freedmen (and
indeed slaves) of modern Arabia formed lineages of
their own, and it was through them, not through their
manumitters, that they acquired their rights and
privileges in respect of marriage, successorship and
inheritance; and it was to the manumitters’ tribe as a
political entity that they stood in a relationship of
dependence, paying the latter military assistance and/or
khwās (J. L. Burchhardt, Notes on the Beduins and the
Wahābîs, London 1830, i, 181f.; A. Jaussen, Coutumes
des Arabes au pays de Moab, Paris 1948, 125f.; cf. A.
Musil, The manners and customs of the Rawaâ Beduins,
New York 1912, 176f.); and, as we shall see,
it should be noted that non-Arabs were not
generally affiliated as confederates. Hîf (q.v.) was a
mechanism for the partial or total incorporation of
foreigners, individually or as groups, and it is fre-
quently regarded as ancestral to Islamic wâlî. But hîf
was used only for Arab foreigners, or more precisely
for foreigners with full tribal status. The Jews thus
qualified on occasion, as did others such as the Abnas
(q.v.) but only to the extent that they escaped client
status (though there are admittedly ambivalent causes);
non-Arab freedmen never qualified (cf. Goldziher,
Muh. Stud., i, 106). The hîf is thus irrelevant to the
question. By the same token, so is most of pre-Islamic
poetry. The vast majority of maudlí mentioned in this
poetry (where the word is exceedingly common) are
Arabs from whom help of one sort or another could be expected: real, fictitious or metaphorical kinsmen (cf.
ibid., 105 n.; many more examples are given in
Crone, Roman, provincial and Islamic law). Con-
 federates are occasionally singled out as maudlí l’-
 ymin, “kinsmen by oath”, as opposed to maudlí l-awlîlah or karâba, “kinsmen by birth/kinship” (G. W. Freytag, Hamasa carminia, Bonn 1828, 187; C.
Lyall, ed. and tr., The Majallâfîyû, Oxford 1918-21,
no. 12:3; Ibn Hîdîâm, 467; Nûbûga al-Djâdâlî,
Dîwân, ed. and tr. M. Nallino, Rome 1953, no.
12:41). But the distinction is usually quite neutral,
and though confederates could obviously find them-
selves in a subservient position so that the dividing
line between them and client groups was blurred (as
it is in Nâbîgha; cf. Juda, Apêkte, 14-15) they were
followers of a type quite different from that of non-
Arab clients. It is only when the poets distinguish
between samîm (or sarîb) and maudlí that the latter
would seem regularly to encompass servile and non-
Arab elements, and the same is perhaps true when
they speak of “tails” and “fins” of tribes (cf.
Goldziher, Muh. Stud., i, 105-6); but these passages
are perfectly compatible with the proposition that
freedmen and other non-Arabs should be seen as
members of satellite groups rather than as persons
“assimilated to the tribe by affiliation” (Goldziher).
2. The Râghîdîn calîphs and the Umay-
yads.
With the conquests, the Arabs found themselves in
charge of a huge non-Arab population. Given that
it was non-Muslim, this population could be awarded
a status similar to that of clients in Arabia, retaining
its own organisation under Arab control in return for
the payment of taxes [see DHIMMA]. But converts posed a
novel problem in that, on the one hand they had to be
incorporated, not merely accommodated, within Arab
society; and on the other hand, they had “forgotten
their genealogies”, suffered defeat and frequently also
enslavement, so that they did not make acceptable
hîf; the only non-Arabs to be affiliated as such were
the Hamrâ’ and Aswâra, Persian soldiers who
deserted to the Arabs during the wars of conquest in
return for privileged status (al-Balâdhûrî, Futûh, 280,
373). It was in response to this novel problem that
Islamic wâlî? was evolved, presumably by the authorities and at an early stage, though nothing can
be said with certainty about its emergence.
(a) Early Islamic cafrâ’? What follows is based on
a collation of information in classical legal (below,
section 5), hîf and historical sources. All non-Arabs
who aspired to membership of Arab society had to

procure a patron (an "upper" mawla in the terminology of the lawyers). Freedmen automatically acquired a patron (an "upper" mawla in the terminology of the lawyers). Freedmen automatically acquired a patron in their manumitter, unless the latter denounced the tie. Free persons and those freed without wāld had to acquire one by agreement. Contractual clientage was known as wāld of mawldūt ("inclination", "attachment"); the term generally used in Hanafi literature, tīša ("following"); al-Tabari, ii, 1853), tīšma ("service"); Aghāni, xii, 48) or islām; conversion: whoever converted "at the hands of" another became a client of the other according to a familiar hadith (man aslama 'al-yad ghāshīh fa-ba'da mašūghīh wāldūhū). Wāld was a solution to the problem of affiliating non-tribesmen to a tribal society, and though most such non-tribesmen were clearly converted, conversion was not necessary for the legal validity of the tie. A fair number of non-Muslim clients, both freeborn and freed, are attested (Crone, Slaves, n. 358; al-Tabari, i, 3185).

From the point of view of the authorities, the main role of the patron was to provide the client with an 'ākla (q.v.). The patron and his agnates were required to pay compensation ('ādīyya (q.v.) for bodily harm inflicted by the client, to the extent that the latter had no agnates of his own. Refusal to pay seems to have been a common problem (al-Kindi, The governors and judges of Egypt, ed. R. Guest, Leiden and London 1912; 335f., 335f.). Conversely, if the client was killed they were entitled to blood-money in compensation for him (cf. al-Kindi, op. cit., 333f.). In return for his obligations, the patron acquired a title to the client's estate, though not an indefeasible one. The classical rules of exclusion are not, on the whole, favourable to the patron, but it is not known whether they applied in pre-classical law. The role of the client, on the other hand, was purely passive. He did not contribute to blood-money, payable for damage inflicted by the patron, nor did he share in the receipt of blood-money if the patron was killed or acquire a title to his estate. He was not formally obliged to render obsequium. The patron by manumission could make over the patronate to a third party by sale, gift or bequest, and the parties to the contractual relationship could terminate theirs (in which case the client would need a new patron). If not, it would pass to the descendants of the patron or to his heirs (practices of the classical period, though it would lose legal (but not necessarily social) importance as the client acquired agnates in Islam). Muslim clients could and frequently did have clients of their own.

From the point of view of the client, the main role of the patron was to provide him with access to a privileged society, and in practice the patron's rewards were far greater than those provided by the authorities. For one thing, the patron might qualify his grant of freedom with stipulations requiring the freedmen to pay regular sums, gifts or labour services to himself or a third party for a specified period, or reserving part or all of the freedman's estate for himself regardless of the presence of heirs (practices condemned in early hadith; cf. Crone, Roman, provincial and Islamic law). For another thing, freedmen were notoriously loyal. They would stay by their manumitters in danger (al-Tabari, iii, 300ff., ii, 1959; cf. Ch. Pellat (tr.), The life and works of Fāṭima, London 1969, 215, 260), share their sorrows (cf. al-Tabari, ii, 384), assist them in need (though for one who refused, see Aghāni, xvi, 107), attend to them in death (al-Tabari, i, 3046, ii, 1751) and seek to avenge them (ibid., ii, 1049; al-Baladhuri, Anṣāb, v, 338). Concerning the services provided by contractual clients, we are less well informed. Like freedmen, they clearly went to swell their patrons' retinues, both military and civilian (M. J. Kister, The Battle of the Harra, in Studies in memory of Gaston Wiet, Jerusalem 1977, 44; Crone, Slaves, 53f.), and they must have performed other types of khidma too. But patrons preferred freedmen to mawilī in Umayyad society. No formal disabilities seem to have attached to the status of client in public law. In principle, clients were in a dependent position only vis-à-vis their patrons, enjoying the same rights and duties as other Muslims in society at large (lahsun mā lanā wa-'alayhim mā 'alaynā). In practice, no less often, there was massive prejudice against them. The Arabs generally equated them with slaves, partly because they were unwantable agriculturalists (Hassān b. Thābit, Dīwān, ed. and tr. H. Hirschfeld, Leiden and London 1910, no. 189: cf. Dhu 'l-Rummā, Dīwān, ed. C. H. H. Macartney, Cambridge 1919, no. 29:48), partly because they had suffered spectacular military defeat ("O men, do you not see how Persia has been ruined and its inhabitants humiliated? They have become slaves who pasture your sheep, as if their kingdom was a dream"). Nābiqā al-Dhāqādī, no. 8:12f.), and, finally, because the majority of clients were freedmen. Christian and Muslim sources are agreed that the Arabs took enormous numbers of prisoners-of-war during the wars of conquest. "He killed and took prisoners" is the standard expression for the activities of a conqueror in the Muslim ones (Khalīfa b. Khayyāt, Ta'ārah, ed. S. Zakkar, Damascus 1967-8, i, 127, 163, 168, 171, 178, 237, 242; Sebeos, Histoire d'Héraclius, tr. F. Macler, Paris 1904, 100f., 110, 146; Bar Penkaye in A. Mingana, ed. and tr., Sources syriques, Leipzig [1907], "i47 = 175; Michael the Syrian, Chronique, ed. and tr. J.-B. Chatot, Paris 1899-1910, iv, 417 = ii, 422); and the usual late of prisoners-of-war was enslavement. Moreover, many localities were required by treaty to supply a specified number of slaves to the Arabs, such as 30,000 or 100,000 once and for all and for a smaller number annually (al-Tabari, ii, 1238, 1245, 1246, 1321, 1299, 1667; al-Baladhuri, Fatḥāb, 208; C. E. Bosworth, Sīṭān under the Arabs, Rome 1968, 17; M. Hinds and H. Sakkout, A letter from the governor of Egypt to the King of Nubia and M ISAFA concerning Egyptian captives brought to him by the Avars and Cossacks, in Islamica 1, 427, 1912; Judah, Aspekte, 64-5). Victims of war and their descendants thus outnumbered freeborn clients, and "slaves" was the standard term of abuse for a client of any kind (al-Tabari, ii, 1120, 1431; al-Baladhuri, Anṣāb, i, 247, v, 356; Aghāni, xvi, 107). Naturally, such men were subject to numerous disabilities in the society of their conquerors. Slaves and clients were "wile" (TA, s.v. h-u-y), and clients of clients were "the most miserable persons to walk on earth" (al-Baladhuri, Anṣāb, ibv, 10; cf. al-Farazdak in Lāh and TA, s.v. u-l-y). Thus a mawālī who married an Arab woman risked both penalties and the dissolution of his marriage (Aghāni, xvi, 106f.; cf. also Goldziher, Muh. Stud., i, 128ff.), though such marriages are unlikely to have been officially prohibited (below, (d)). A mawālī's life was felt to be worth less than that of an Arab, so that an Arab should not be killed in retaliation for a client (al-Baladhuri, Anṣāb, i, 220), while conversely, retaliation inflicted upon a client failed to compensate for harm suffered by an Arab (al-Tabari, ii, 1849). A mawālī was not worth avenging (though Kutayba b. Muslim [q.v.] invoked a moral obligation to do so in an unusual situation where the client was a Transoxiana nobleman, al-Tabari, ii, 1249). It was by way of insult to their victim that Arab avengers would claim to have killed so-and-so for a mere mawālī or slave (al-
Azdi, Ta'rikh al-Mawsil, ed. A. Habiba, Cairo 1967, 62; al-Dinawari, al-Akhbar al-tiwdl, ed. V. Guirgass, Leiden 1888, 350; al-Tabari, i, 3276, ii, 710). All mawdli were felt to be unsuitable for positions of authority, such as that of prayer-leader, judge or governor (Goldziher, Muh. Stud., ii, 109 n.; S. a-Alli, Ta'rikh al-tigidmiyaa wa 'l-iktisadiyya fi 'l-Basra', Beirut 1969, 96f.; Ibn Kudama, al-Mughni, ed. T. M. al-Zayni and others, Cairo 1968-70, vii, 33; Judah, Aspekte, 182-f); as late as 133/750-1 the mawdli of Khulfa (or the Indian KTkdniyya. There were divisions in the Egyptian army already at the end of the First Civil War, when a freedman from Balhah was made 'arif [q.v.] of the mawdli of TudjJ. But the 'arif in question belongs to the end of the Second Civil War (cf. al-Kindi, Governors, 51), and it is only after the Second Civil War that such divisions are regularly mentioned, be it in Egypt, Khurassan or elsewhere (Crone, Slaves, 38). There were mawdli in the Syrian army too, for all that mawdli divisions are not mentioned after 'Abd al-Malik (cf. ibid., 274f.; we are incidentally given to understand that the Syrian troops in Egypt in 125/742-3 included mawdli al-Hims (al-Kindi, Governors, 83), and that those brought to Spain by Baldj b. Bishr [q.v.] included mawdli of the Umayyads, clearly among others (Lévi-Provençal, Hist. Esp. mus., i, 198;
Mawlā

cf. also Juda, Aspekte, 84–5). Mawali also participated in the revolt against al-Walid II, but whether as an excluded people passively exposed to the Umayyad treatment of such mawldī should not be seen as a violation of the law; the law on this question was what the later to command the Syrian army against Byzantium Tabari, ii, 1790). The Djazlra received its first non-Arab governor of B. Nasr (or Azd) who themselves. Sulayman chose Muhammad (or Umar II appointed Isma'il bin Ubayd Allah b. Yazid, a mawdlī of the Umayyads (Ibn al-Muhabbar, 'Adab al-Asa'id, ivb, 123). In Khurasan, the B. Shu'aybiyah, authored the B. Jaḥdar, envoy, position of eminence among the Rabi'ā and intervened in the local feuds during the Second Civil War (al-Tabarī, ii, 491f.). In the Third Civil War, a certain Muha'lab b. Mūsā, mawdlī of the B. Yashkur, emerged as 'azīm al-badr in Fārs, where he took to expelling Umayyad governors (ibid., 1976f.). And of Harīṣ, a mawdlī of Khuzā'ī who joined the 'Abbāsid revolution, we are told that he was 'azīm ahl Nazā (al-Dinawarī, Akhbār, 341).

All in all, the mawdī must thus be said to have penetrated Arab society extremely fast. They played a predominant role in most activities outside the world of politics, controlled the civil administration almost from the start and made their presence felt in military politics within a generation of the conquests. Certainly, the Arabs retained their control of military politics until the end of the Umayyad period, most governorship and other politically influential posts being allocated to them; but the popular image of mawdī as an excluded people passively exposed to Arab whim and prejudice is quite wrong. Given the cultural and numerical discrepancy between the conquerors and their subjects, it is not really surprising that the latter acquired influence so fast: the conquerors simply could not govern without non-Arab help, as later Shu'ūbīs were to point out; indeed, they needed their advice even in matters of food and drink (al-Süli, Adab al-kutub, ed. M. B. al-Athāri, Cairo 1341, 193). What is surprising is that the Arab integument of Muslim society withstood the pressure.

(c) Fiscal status. The secondary literature generally associates mawdī with fiscal disabilities. Thus all the Umayyads other than Umar II are said wrongly to have collected poll tax (dirhām [q. v.]) from converts and to have refused them registration in the army, being assisted in this by the leaders of the non-Muslim communities who had an interest in penalising conversion (J. Wellhausen, The Arab kingdom and its fall, Calcutta 1927, ch. 5; D. C. Dennett, Conversion and poll-tax in early Islam, Cambridge Mass. 1950; H. A. R. Gibb, The fiscal rights of 'Umar II, in Arabica iv/1 [1953], 1-16). But this view is in need of modification. On the one hand, the vast majority of mawdī were freedmen and descendants of freedmen who had never paid any poll-tax at all; and free converts who acquired a respectable patron also escaped fiscal disabilities (Crone, Slaves, 52). The conventional picture applies only to a special type of convert, the fugitive peasant. On the other hand, the Umayyad treatment of such mawdī should not be seen as a violation of the law; the law on this question was what the
Umayyads themselves decreed. The fact that the classical rules of taxation have been attributed to 'Umar I does not mean that they in fact existed so early (cf. K. Morimoto, The fiscal administration of the Umayyads, 1st ed. [Kyoto, 1981]). There would have been carriers had they been asked. Thus the classical rules lay down that the convert should be freed of his poll-tax, but not of his land-tax (khaddāfī [q.v.]). In the Umayyad period, however, no converter left without leaving his villages and thus also such land as he might possess: the distinction between a dhimmī poll-tax and a religiously neutral land-tax was quite irrelevant. Converts invariably left their land because the attraction of conversion lay in its promise of access to the ranks of the conquerors: converting without joining these ranks would have been pointless and, locally, extremely unpleasant. To convert was thus to make a hijra (q.v.) from the land of unbelief to the land of Islam, that is, the garrison cities, as 'Umar II explained (Ibn 'Abd al-Hakam, Strata 'Umar b. 'Abd al-'Aziz, ed. A. 'Ubayy, Beirut 1967, 931); and the problem confronting the Umayyads was not whether converts should be freed of this or that part of their fiscal burden, but whether they should be allowed to make their hijra and thus escape their fiscal burden altogether. Naturally, Umayyad policies varied. 'Umar II accepted such converts (his problem was thus the fate of their land, cf. ibid.). But most Umayyads adopted a harsh policy vis-à-vis fugitives regardless of whether they claimed conversion or not (cf. Morimoto, Fiscal administration, 120ff.; Crone, Slaves, 52), resettling them in their villages or at best allowing them to stay where they were in return for continuing fiscal liability. Three points follow from this. First, the fugitives in question were required to pay all their customary taxes, whatever these might be, not merely a religiously neutral land-tax: having been denied access to the conquest society, they were not Muslims at all in the eyes of the authorities; and all their taxes, not merely the poll-tax, were regarded as dhimmī taxes at this stage. Secondly, such converts were not eligible for membership of the army. Naturally, when 'Umar II decided to admit them to Muslim society, he admitted them to the army as well; but the fact that others refused them entry to the army does not mean that mawāli as such were kept out of the dawān. The numerous mawāli who fought in the army without pay were runaway peasants who were still being held to their fiscal obligations and were fought as volunteers in the hope of being picked up by a patron, as is clear from the story of Yūnus b. 'Abd Rabīḥ, who acquired a patron in Nasr b. Sayyār (Crone, Slaves, 52f.). Thirdly, it was such converts, not converts in general, who were open to penalisation by the leaders of the Christian, Jewish and Zoroastrian communities; had their hijra been accepted, they would of course have been placed under Muslim administration (cf. al-Tabārī, ii, 1688; Dennett, Conversion, 124ff.).

It should be clear that the entire problem of the fiscal treatment of converts was a problem for dhimmī, not for mawāli. It was dhimmīs who were frustrated by the closure of the "gate of the hijra" (cf. Ibn 'Abd al-Hakam, Sīra, 94); a mawālī, by contrast, was somebody already admitted. It was accordingly also dhimmīs, not mawāli, who would enrol in the service of anyone who promised them tax-relief. "Whoever converts is freed from khāridī" is a slogan on a par with that addressed to slaves, "whoever joins us is free" (cf. Crone, Slaves, nn. 399-400, 647). Both are addressed, usually by rebels, to malcontents outside free Muslim society, not to oppressed elements within it; it was only on responding to such slogans that the non-Muslims and slaves in question acquired client status.

(d) The issue of assimilation. The Umayyads are generally credited with an active policy of discrimination against non-Arab Muslims (cf. most recently, M. A. Shaban, Islamic history, I, Cambridge 1971). This impression arises largely from their treatment of fugitive peasants. But though they discouraged flight from the land and no doubt shared the common prejudice against non-Arabs, they do not seem to have had an actual policy of discrimination against accredited members of Muslim society. Practically every Umayyad caliph is known to have appointed a mawālī governor. Al-Hajjāj, a man notorious for his harsh treatment of runaway peasants, appointed the first non-Arab judges in Trāk (al-'Ali, Ta'zīmat, 96 n); he also appointed a mawālī to his ghāra (al-Ya'kūbī, ii, 326), an unusual step (for a later example, see al-Kindī, Governors, 70). 'Umar II, a caliph famous for his encouragement of conversion, is said to have disapproved of intermarriage between Arabs and mawāli (al-'Ali, Ta'zīmat, 96 n). But no prohibition of such unions has been recorded, and mawāli are known to have married female relatives of other Umayyads (al-Baladhuri, Anbā, i, 247; al-Tabārī, ii, 1420); the right to repudiate or endorse such unions presumably rested with the guardians of the bride (cf. also Jāda, Aṣākeb, 1288f.). The fact that mawāli formed quasi-tribal groups of their own in the army reflects the tribal organisation of this army, not a policy of segregation; and it was the Umayyads themselves, not Abū Muslim, who abolished this organisation in Khurāsān (Crone, Slaves, 38). The belief that mawāli were relegated to the infantry rests on a failure to distinguish mawālī inside Muslim society from runaway peasants trying to enter it: governors and generals such as Tārik b. Āmr, Dīnār b. Īsār, Nūsārī b. Ziyād or Irbrāhīm b. Bābahām were scarcely disqualified from riding horses. (See also al-Tabārī, ii, 111ff., 1599; Lévi-Provençal, Hist. Esp. mus., i, 98.) Conversely, the enemies of the Umayyads do not seem to have regarded assimilation as an issue of political opposition. No rebel of the Umayyad period mentioned the treatment of non-Arab Muslims in his proclamations, and the belief that the 'Abbāsīds (q.v.) regarded assimilation as their prime objective is gratuitous. Obviously, assimilation accelerated on the fall of the conquest society, but scarcely as a result of official encouragement. The legitimacy of favouring non-Arab Muslims in matters of appointment, vengeance and marriage clearly did become an object of debate in the Umayyad period, as did the refusal to accept runaway converts as Muslims, and in principle the question could have been taken up by politicians. In practice, however, the debate remained divorced from politics, and it continued long after the Umayyads had fallen.

(e) Mawālī grievances. As the prominence of non-Arab Muslims in Muslim society increased, so did their contribution to revolts. It is customary to interpret their participation in rebellious and/or heterodox movements as an expression of protest against a social inequality which ultimately led to the fall of the Umayyad dynasty. But for one thing, it is by no means clear that mawāli were disproportionately represented in movements of protest. For another, they scarcely clamoured for social equality. Not one revolt of the Umayyad period was conducted exclusively by mawālī in the name of concerns
exclusive to them; and the only two revolts in which such concerns came to the forefront, revealed some-thing which they were later to opt out of this society as followers of the Abbasid revolution deprived the Arabs of such social and political privileges as they retained. Access to political office, influence and wealth now rested overwhelmingly on membership of an army recruited mainly in 'Irak, as well as of the ruler's household. Non-Arab Muslims reached top positions through all three institutions (Crone, Slaves, appendix 5; cf. Barakma), while at the same time the majority of Arabs and mawdli found equality as ordinary subjects. Since Muslim society was no longer constituted by Arab privilege, non-Arab Muslims ceased to require a patron for membership of it. Freedmen continued to become clients of their manumitters, but most of the classical schools rejected the patronate over converts as offensive (below, section V), and the careers of free converts and the descendants of freedmen ceased to be shaped by wala'. Yet Arab superiority on the one hand and the institution of wala' on the other were still to be of major importance in other ways.

(a) The Shu'ubiyya. In cultural and religious terms, the Arabs continued to be regarded as a superior people, a fact which underlay the so-called Shu'ubism, the 'movement of the gentiles'. Shu'ubism essentially had an apologetic justification which already in the Umayyad period, but it was only in the early 'Abbasid period that they came into the open, clearly because the mawdli were now in a position to get a hearing for their case: the exponents of Shu'ubism were drawn primarily from among members of the caliphal bureaucracy and court. Purely literary in manifestation (cf. Goldziher, Muk. Stud., i, chs. 4-5), the movement campaigned for cultural rather than social or political objectives, its ultimate aim being to break the nexus between Islam and Arabism, partly because this nexus stood in the way of non-Arab self-esteem and more particularly because it obstructed the reception of non-Arab culture. Ultimately, the issue behind the controversy was the cultural orientation of Islam (cf. H. A. R. Gibb, Studies on the civilization of Islam, Princeton 1962, ch. 4). The controversy only petered out in the 6th/12th century (cf. R. P. Mottahedeh, The Shu'ubiyah controversy and the social history of early Islamic Iran, in IJMES, vii [1976]), and the issue was never properly resolved, though in practice the Shu'ubiyah was lost (cf. P. Crone and M. Cook, Hagarism, Cambridge 1977, 102 f.). For further details, see Shu`ubiyah.

(b) Wala`. Having lost its social importance, the institution of wala` acquired a new political significance. Unlike the Umayyads, the 'Abbasids trusted their freedmen and other private servants better than the public servants of the state. Thus al-Mansur [q.v.] is said to have esteemed mawdli (in the sense of clients, not non-Arab Muslims) for their loyalty and to have accumulated more of them than any caliph before him, recommending them to his son (al-Tabari, iii, 414, 444, 446). Clients of the caliphal household appear as a separate group at court soon after the revolution, and both al-Mansur and al-Mahdi [q.v.] selected a fair number of governors from their ranks (al-Tabari, iii, 429, 545, 1027; Crone, Slaves, appendix Vb). Al-Mahdi, who similarly expressed a preference for mawdli (al-Tabari, iii, 331), turned them into an army of their own (ibid., 459).

Mawdli of domestic origin continued to form troops of their own side by side with Turks and others far into the 'Abbasid period, as well as in Tulaid Egypt
The relationship between Arab and non-Arab Muslims in Spain differed from that of the east in three major respects. First, wallâ played virtually no role in it. On the one hand, many of the conquerors were Berbers, and such ties of wallâ as they had with Arab patrons lost all significance when they acquired the status of conquerors themselves. On the other hand, the conquerors settled all over the land, not merely in garrison cities. Muslim Spain thus lacked not only the purely Arab conquest elite characteristic of the east, but also the privileged amîdar which elsewhere attracted dhimmî immigrants and caused the Muslims to exclude from their ranks all converts without a patron. Conversion in Spain did not normally involve either hujjâ or wallâ, the converts adopting Islam wherever they happened to be. Indeed, they were not normally known as muwallad at all, but rather, in the first generation, as muslîma (originally meaning home-born slaves; Lévi-Provençal, Hist. Esp. mus., i, 75). Having adopted Islam in their own homes, the non-Arab Muslims of Spain failed to penetrate Arab society. Naturally Spain had its freedmen who, here as elsewhere, entered Arab society as clients. But whereas freedmen of the most diverse origin were exceedingly numerous in the cosmopolitan East, they were relatively few in Spain. Spanish society thus came to be characterised by the coexistence of three quite distinct ethnic groups, Arabs, Berbers and muwallads, rather than by relationship of dependence between Arabs and ethnically heterogeneous clients. Furthermore, since Spain escaped Khurasanî conquest, these groups were able to retain political importance right down to ʿAbd al-Rahmân III [q.v.].

Secondly, Spain saw armed conflicts between Arabs and indigenous Muslims. Throughout most of the Umayyad period, the muwallads of the East were ethnically too diverse and socially too dispersed in Arab society to rebel as muwallad against Arabs, while at the same time non-Arabs who had stayed together had also failed to adopt Islam. Only shortly before and after the Abbasid conquest, when on the one hand whole localities adopted Islam together, while on the other hand government was still identified as Arab, did non-Arab Muslims rebel against Arab rule. They did not, however, rebel as muwallad, but rather as heretics (as in North Africa) or even non-Muslims, rejecting the Arab state and all that it meant. In both cases, the only congregations of large numbers of non-Arab Muslims were Berbers. In Spain, where Arabs and muwallads coexisted as distinct groups, such revolts could in principle have erupted any time. In practice, they only came in the 3rd/9th century, perhaps provoked by the growth of the Umayyad state (Arab and Berber leaders also rebelled, and the upshot was the centralised state of ʿAbd al-Rahmân III); and here once the rebels took action as muwallad, explicitly invoking the cause of the non-Arab Muslims (dawlat al-muwalladât wa l-ʿajamîn, Ibn Hâyyân, al-Muktabis, ed. M. M. Antuña, Paris 1937, 24) under the leadership of men such as ʿUmar b. Hafsûn [q.v.]. Being short of traditions of their own, partly because they were natives of provincial Spain and partly because they were Muslims of long standing, they had no alternative to Cordovan Islam. Accordingly, they did not deny the legitimacy of the Cordovan state as heretics; and though Ibn Hafsûn did in the end reject Islam for Christianity, few muwallads followed suit (cf. Lévi-Provençal, Hist. Esp. mus., i, 295 ff.).

Thirdly, there were practically no Shûʿûbîs in Spain. The fact that the muwallads did not have much of a cultural legacy to vindicate would hardly in itself have prevented them from adopting Shûʿûbî arguments in response to Arab prejudice: the one Shûʿûbî author attested for Spain, a Slav secretary equally lacking in cultural traditions of his own, simply adopted the arguments of eastern writers (cf. J. T. Monroe, The Shûʿûbija in al-Andalus, Berkeley and Los Angeles 1970). But having avoided enslavement and migration, the muwallads also had to acquire culture and positions of influence in the society of their conquerors. Where eastern muwallad had spokesmen among bureaucrats and courtiers, the leaders of the muwallads were country squares more noted for their virtù than for their polish; indeed, the smarts and insults suffered by such rural lords at the court of Cordova played a role in the outbreak of several muwallad revolts. The muwallads thus lacked both the education and the influence required for a literary onslaught on Arab superiority. Instead, however, they were in a position to take up arms in their castles, as they did until ʿAbd al-Rahmân III reduced both them and their opponents to docile subjects.

In political terms, however, the institution of wallâ played much the same role in Spain as it did in the ʿAbbasid East. Thus ʿAbd al-Rahmân I [q.v.], who relied considerably on freedmen and clients of the Umayyads for the conquest of Spain, is said by some to have recruited an army among non-Arab Muslims; al-Hakam I [q.v.] expanded this army and created the palatial guard of ḥârû ("mute ones"), i.e. foreign slaves and freedmen as well as local Christians (Lévi-Provençal, Hist. Esp. mus., i, 129 f., iii, 71 ff.). The qabd [q.v.], however, survived much longer in Spain than it did elsewhere, being abolished only by Ibn Abî ʿAmîr [see al-Maszûmî]; and thanks to the geopolitical position of Spain, it was Berber mercenaries rather than Turkish slaves and freedmen who replaced it.
The manumitter acquires responsibility for the payment of *diya* on behalf of the freedman and qualifies for the role of marriage guardian to his freedwoman or freedman's daughter. In return, he is granted a title to the freedman's estate in all schools except that of the Ibâdis (not that of the Zâhirîs, as stated in *Abbâsî*). In Sunnî and Kâsimî Zaydi law, he inherits as the remotest agnate of the freedman; he is thus excluded by the freedman's own agnates (e.g. a son), but inherits together with Kur'ânîc heirs (e.g. a daughter) and himself excludes remoter relatives (*ghawwâr* a-*lirâhâm*, e.g. a sister's son). In 'Imâmî, 'Isââmîli and Nasîrî Zaydi law he is excluded by any blood relation of the freedman, though he inherits together with the spouse.

The freedman does not, on the whole, acquire any corresponding rights and duties. Only the 'Isââmîs call him to succession, and only in default of all other heirs. The Mâlikis do hold him responsible for the payment of *diya* on behalf of the manumitter if the latter has no agnates, *ahl al-dîwân* or patrons of his own; but a similar opinion transmitted from al-Shâfi‘î failed to become school doctrine, and all other schools exempt him. The possibility that he might act as marriage guardian is not excluded.

The relationship survives the death of both parties, passing to their heirs in perpetuity, though it loses practical importance as the client acquires agnates of his own. It also extends to the freedmen of the freedman and their freedmen in perpetuity, again with decreasing practical significance.

(c) *Wâlî*  a-*maulâlât*. The prospective patron must be a free, male and adult Muslim. The prospective client, according to the Hanafîs and 'Îmâmîs, must be a free and adult non-Muslim of either sex who has no agnates or patrons in Islam, that is a *dhîmmî*, convert, foundling or (in 'îmâmî law) a freedman without *wâlî*; the 'Îmâmîs, however, require him to be a *harîb* convert; conversion of a *dhîmmî* does not give rise to *wâlî*. The patron agrees to pay blood-money on behalf of the client in return for a title to the latter's estate; the parties may stipulate mutual succession. Either the heir by contractual *wâlî* is excluded by any blood-relation of the deceased. Whether the contractual patron may act as marriage guardian is disputed. Unlike *wâlî* a-*lîthik*, the contractual relationship may be terminated as long as the patron has not had occasion to pay, but it becomes permanent thereafter.

(d) The nature of *wâlî*. Practically every lawbook states that *wâlî* should be regarded as a fictitious kinship tie (*al-wâlî* 'u'mmah a-*lîbâs al-nasâb, as a famous maxim has it), and this view underlies a number of subsidiary rules generally accepted by Sunnîs and non-Sunnîs alike. Thus *wâlî* cannot be alienated by sale, gift or bequest in classical law, though such transfers were permitted in pre-classical law; one cannot sell or give away *nasâb*, as various authorities point out in *hâdîth*. Equally, *wâlî* cannot be inherited in the strict sense of the word; the devolution of the rights and duties vested in the tie follows special rules ensuring that the relationship functions like an agnatic tie (cf. R. Brunschvig, *Un système peu connu de succession agnatique dans le droit islamique anti-romain en Arabie*, Paris [1976]). Pace Brunschvig, however, this view of *wâlî* is not an archaic survival, but on the contrary a juristic interpretation of the late Umayyad and early 'Abbâsîd periods. It was adopted with particular forcefulness and consistency by the Sunnîs, to whom the essence of *wâlî* lies in *tâ'îth*, "agnatisation".

In fact, however, the legal nature of *wâlî* is quite different from that of an agnatic tie even in classical law. For one thing, it is only in Sunnî law that the patron inherits as an agnate, and then only if he is a manumitter, not a contractual patron. For another thing, the relationship lacks reciprocity. The client is a purely passive member of the patron's agnatic kin. Indeed, for some purposes he is not a member of it at all. Thus Sunnî lawyers do not usually consider clients of *wâlî* ([*khuddâwand*] *tâ'îth* al-*mawld*) eligible for the caliphate; and the question whether clients of the Hâghîmites were excluded from receipt of *sâkîth* ([*wâlî*] on a par with their patrons remained controversial; as Ibn al-Athîr pointed out, the maxim *maulâl  awâl-kaum minhum* (which originated in this very context) could be interpreted in a purely metaphorical vein (al-Nihâya, Cairo 1963, v, 228). In legal terms, *wâlî* is a tie of dependence which derives its efficacy from the fact that the client is detached from his natal group without acquiring full membership of another. The tie undoubtedly owes its existence primarily to administrative convenience, though the administrators may well have been influenced by the legal institutions of the pre-conquest Near East (see further Crane, *Roman provincial and Islamic law*, with full references).

(e) *Mawlâ*  a-*kafîtha* ([*wâlî*] law). Classical law does not in general attach any legal significance to servile unions, nonetheless allow an Arab woman to have her marriage dissolved if she marries a freedman in the belief that he is an Arab (as opposed to merely freeborn (Khall b. 'Isâh, *Mukhtasar*, tr. I. Guidi and D. Santillana, Milan 1919, ii, 37). Only the 'Ibâdis, the 'Îmâmîs and, following them, the 'Isââmîs, consistently refuse to distinguish between Arab and non-Arab, freeborn and freed for purposes of marriage ([*nikâh*]. The complete assimilation of Arab and non-Arab Muslims allegedly brought about by the 'Abbâsîds cannot be said ever to have been achieved.

Bibliography: Given in the article.

(P. Crane) **MAWLÂNA KHUNKÂR**, a title of the head of the Mawlâwî order of dervishes [see Mawlâwîyya]. The second word is the Turkish form of the Persian *Mâdîsândîgâr*, the equivalent of *maulâ*, which according to 'Abbâsî (Saints des derviches tourneurs, Paris 1928, i, 59) was bestowed on Djalâl al-Dîn by his father (the
derivation from Khán-kár, Persian "blood-shedder", must depend on popular etymology). Sámi in his Kömüs al-‘alâm states that the word, besides used for "Sultan", "Leader", is applied to certain persons, in such combinations as pîr khánkár or mulá khánkár. The underlying idea of such a title is probably that the saint has had committed to him the government of the world, if he choose to undertake it, an idea elaborated by Ibn ‘Arabi (Fusâhat Maktiyya, i, 202, ii, 407), who regards such a saint as the true khálíqa. The title lebel is more generally recognised as that belonging to the head of the Mawlawi order (Sámi, op. cit., 510a).

**Bibliography:** Given in the article.

(D. S. Margolliouth*)

MAWLAVI, MULLÁ ‘ABD AL-RÁHIM TAVJIAWZI, a Kurdish poet who composed an Al-Kidá-náma and a celebrated dîwan in the Hawramí dialect of Gurání. He was born ca. 1222/1807 at Tawagoz in Djawanrud and died at Sargjáto, on the river Sirwan near Halabjá, ca. 1300/1883.


MAWLAWIYYA, a Súfí order or tarīqa, in Turkish Mewlewiyye, modern Mevlevi, which takes its name from the Mawlana ("Our Master"), the saint having stated that he is acting on behalf of the Mawlana, he kisses the sîkke from the right, left and having stated that he is acting on behalf of the Mawlana, he kisses the sîkke from the right, left and center. It is more generally recognised as that belonging to the head of the Mawlawi order (Sámi, op. cit., 510a).

There is a great probability that the chief principles of the Mawlawiya, such as samá', were already established in the Mawlawiyya's era, and that after some further development they took the form they bear today.

After Sultan Walad's succession, a new centre for the tarîqa was formed with the building of the türbe, which survives today, by 'Alam al-Din Kayser. At this centre—as in a tekke—the Kurân and Madjnâniyya of the Mawlawiyya were read. The reader was seated and the tarîqa was conducted. At this period, as in the Mawlawiyya's time, samá' was performed individually and collectively (Afláki, i, 356, 104, ii, 759 ff.). Such gestures as that of salutation, which occur in today's samá' ceremony, were also encountered in the Mawlawiyya's samá' (ibid., i, 412). This type of element continued under Sultan Walad and Ulu 'Arif Čelebi (ibid., ii, 613, 795, 892, 966). However, none of the Mawlawi sources prior to 754/1353 refers to the na'ti, dawr-i walad', pust dâ'âsi and the organised salutation which feature in the samá' ceremonies of later eras. In sum, at that period there was no samá' taught in advance. Rather, music or some event bringing a person to ecstasy was the occasion for samá'. As is apparent from its name, the dawr-i walad' was linked to Sultan Walad. However, it appears that the reading of the Kurân and of the madrasa took its final form, known as makâbala, in the time of Pir 'Adil Čelebi (d. 1864/1460).

In the hope of showing all the characteristics of the Mawlawiya, an account will be given of its customs and rules, beginning with entry or initiation to the tarîqa.

**Entry to the Mawlawiya.** Initial entry is as a musâhib, and for this, application is made to a Mawlawi shaykh. Having indicated to the candidate that he will be admitted to the tarîqa, the shaykh instructs him to bathe and appear on an appointed day. The musâhib, that is, the candidate marid, appears on the appointed day with a sikke (a type of conical cap). He kisses the shaykh's hand and then sits on his left. With the faces of both turned towards the kiba, the shaykh informs them that they will read together a prayer of repentance (see A. Gölpmãrlik, Mevlâvi adâb ve erkân, 133). After the prayer is read, the shaykh takes in both hands the sikke brought by the candidate marid, and three times—to the right, left and front of the sikke—reads the sûra Ih+sá (CXXII) and blows upon the sikke. Then he settles the candidate marid, with his face towards the kiba, down upon his left knee and holds the sikke towards the kiba, and having stated that he is acting on behalf of the Mawlânâ, he kisses the sikke from the right, left, and center.
and front and places it upon the candidate. With his hands upon the sikke he pronounces the takbir, and the sikke is thus said to be takbirinini. The shaykh then covers the back of the candidate, whose head is resting upon his knee, raises him to his feet, and with their right hands held together they kiss. Thus the person whose sikke has received the takbir acquires the name of muhibb. The shaykh takes the muhibb to the mabâkû in the kitchen. That night a sakkû pustu is performed, the candidate having removed his night clothes and put on a white skin called Sulân Walad pusû is spread. The mabâkû is thus said to be takbirinini. The candidate's head is removed and he is dressed in the muhibb. The mabâkû undertakes to devote himself completely to this path, and is then set for three days in the mabâkû upon a skin known as the sakkû pustu which is believed to remove the thirst of those who thirst for the tarîka. The muhibb, seated upon this skin upon his knees with his head bent, observes the services performed by other murids who are named djin (literally ‘soul’), does not speak without need and when required to urinate, he takes over his shoulders the kûsa or gown with sleeves of one of the âçins and goes to the latrine. When the three days are up, he is taken to the kazandji dede (the person responsible for the murids' discipline) and if he declares himself resolved to remain in the tarîka, he runs errands for eighteen days in the clothes in which he has come, that is to say, he carries and fetches at the double for the persons of the tekke. When this period ends, the position is explained to the muhibb. Upon his request, the clothes of the muhibb are removed and he is dressed in the matma' tennerîsi, and over this tennerî (or long, sleeveless gown) there is bound a belt called the elf-i nemed. Thus the muhibb intending to enter the Mawlawiya order (sawanan, 'changing his garments for work') is delivered to the kazandî, who explains to him the services which he will perform (errands, floor-sweeping etc.). While these services continue, the muhibb is also taught to perform the samûd. The muhibb may not wear the sikke until successful in samûd. Once his success in this matter has been demonstrated, he is given a temporary sikke and only after participating in the mabâkû, maskâbîsî (a samûd ceremony for beginners) does he acquire the real name of djin. While the real ceremony, he removes the tennerî worn for service (hizmet tenneresi) and wears instead the samûd tenneresi, with a narrow shirt (deste-gul) over it and a kûsa upon his back.

Upon completing the service of errand-runner, the muhibb leaves his service and undertakes the functions of kazandî, that is to say, he does the tekke's daily shopping. While performing this service he wears a towel on his back, a chain upon his waist and tongs upon his belt (elf-i nemed). At prayer times, he goes to the masjidî of the dargâh or sâwiyâ, and in the mornings joins the circle where the ism-i dâjalî ('glorious name [of God]') is repeated. He carries out the shopping, sets and clears the table, does internal housework and other services. Thus the muhibb completes 1,001 days of service. The mâyândî dede informs him when he has completed his trial (îliâ), and explains that one week later a cîle will be performed for this occasion, that sharbat will be drunk at this ceremony and gives the name of the murid (djin) who will distribute the sharbat.

One week later, having completed his trial (îliâ), the dervish goes to the hamâm and bâthms, and coming to the kitchen, he removes his tennerî and puts on the cîle costume of mîntan and kûsa and again sits upon the sakkû pustu in the kitchen. That might a candlestick of 35 or 70 branches is lit. After all but the dervish performing the trial (îliâ) have eaten, the sharbatî serves the prepared sharbat to those present. The cîlesî (a prepared prayer) for cîle consists in the head of the muhibb drinking the ascîh dede or the dedes, and proceeds to the middle and performs a salutation (niyâz). The tarîkatî or the ascîh dede recites the gûlban (a prepared prayer) for him (for the text of the gûlban, see Gûlpanah, Mevlâna'dâ's sona mevdlevî, Istanbul 1953, 393). After all have departed from this ceremony, the mâyândî takes him first to the türbâdîr and then to the kitchen and gives him sharbat to drink and food to eat. Then he puts on a white skin called Sulân Walad pusû is spread. The mâyândî seats the ascîh dede upon the skin, and brings the dervish who has completed his trial to him. After praying that he may continue upon the path (reading the gûlban), the ascîh dede goes to his cell. The new dervish too is taken to the cell set aside for him. The dedes come there to congratulate him, each bringing with him a different present. He does not leave his cell for three days, and his meals are brought to his cell. After this period he is taken by the mâyândî dede to the shaykh of the tekke and the ceremony of bay'aî is performed (for details, see ibid., 394). The shaykh cuts some hairs from the middle of the eyebrow and from the moustache of the dervish and pronouncing the takbir, he dresses him in the kûsa of the dervish. He then tells him to perform the trial of the cell (bâdîr cîle). This trial consists of not leaving the cell for 18 days. When this period, too, has ended he is dressed by the shaykh in the sakkû. With this, he acquires the title of dervish or simply of dede (Gûlpanah, Melevî zedî ve erkânî, 135). Thereafter, he begins to teach the knowledge and arts (music, etc.) which he has acquired to date to the muhibb who come after him. A dervish, depending upon his ability, may become a shaykh and kâlîfî [see kuîma]. 3. In Islamic mysticism. The shaykh represent the Mawlawiya order. If shaykhs are not sayyids, they wear white turbans; if they are sayyids, they wear turbans of a smoky colour close to purple.
opposite the mihrāb [q.v.]; it is assumed that a line stretches from the edge of this skin to the middle of the khatt-i tstita?2. This line must in no way be stepped upon. The sama? ceremony—also known as mukābele (see Ankarawī, Minbādār al-fukard?3, 68)—is performed after prayers. Beforehand, the meydāndiḏ who supervises the affairs of the dargāh or meydān goes to the sama?khāna on the day or night when sama? will be performed, and takes the shaykh's skin which is there to his apartment. With the approval of the shaykh, the meydāndiḏ does not stand facing the kibla opposite the location of the cell, and summons the derviš to perform their actions and don the tennār. Afterwards he goes to the sama?khāna and spreads the skin of the shaykh. He emerges to tell the mu?ṣafat to call the adīn. After this person has called the adīn, the dedes and the muḥkbs perform their ablutions, don their tennār and with their khirka on their backs proceed to the sama?khāna. After the performance of prayer, the shaykh sits upon his skin, and those who are to perform the sama? also sit together with him. After all have taken their places, the band of musicians takes its position. The Mathnawīḏ?ḏ?n reads an extract from the Mathnawī, while the shaykh reads his punt du?āsāt. They then listen to the na? dam performed by the musicians, and afterwards the shaykh and the sama?zans or participants all rise, striking their hands to the ground. The shaykh, in harmony with the music of the musicians, walks very slowly to the right, and once he has taken three steps from the skin, the person behind him takes up a position near the skin and, bowing his head in salutation, passes in front of the skin to the other side without stepping upon the khatt-i tstita? and stands with his face towards the skin. The one who follows him also passes before the skin. These two participants, standing opposite one another, look at one another face to face. They then salute one another, drawing the right hand from above the left from within the khirka to the heart, and the left hand to the right side. Next, one turns and follows the other who goes in front. All the ḍams act in this way before the skin. Then they walk in harmony with the tempo. When the shaykh comes before the skin, he stops and finds the most senior naw-nijāz before him. They exchange mutual salutations. Thus the first ḍams of all sequence is completed. Second and third ḍams follow in the same fashion. When the third ḍams is finished, the shaykh goes towards his skin and at this moment a nay or flute improvisation begins and continues until the shaykh sits upon his skin: once he has done, so the ceremony begins. The shaykh and the sama?zans salute. The sama?zans remove their khirkas and place them on the ground. Then, passing over the arm of the skin that they link arms in a diagonal fashion, with the left hand holding the left shoulder and the right hand the right shoulder. The shaykh walks in front of the skin, salutes, and the others perform the same movement. Next the sama?zans, setting off on the right foot, approach the shaykh one by one, salute him and kiss his hand. They then open their arms, the left hand being a little higher, take three short steps and begin to turn. The same?zans bashi or leader of the participants has charge of the sama?. The first to turn is followed in identical fashion by the others. When the galam is to be given, the shaykh, who is beside the skin, advances and makes salutation. The sama?zans come together in two and threes, touching each other's shoulders diagonally, and form groups. The second ḍams is then begun: this resembles the first. This time the same?zans perform a salutation before the shaykh and kiss his hand. The third and fourth ḍams follow in the same fashion.

According to a tradition among the Mawlawiyya, until the reign of Selim I (1789-1807 [q.v.]) the custom of the Mawlawīs' era was maintained and sama? was performed only at memorial occasions; nonetheless, it was performed on specific days. D'Ohsson (Tableau général de l'empire Ottoman, Paris 1789, ii, 304) records that Tuesdays and Fridays were chosen for sama? ceremonies. There is a strong probability that Selim III's frequent visits to mawlāvī-khānas and the need to perform sama? in his honour led to the ending of this custom, and sama? began to be performed every day. However, the difficulty of performing sama? when any single sama?khāna was recognised, and it became the practice to perform it in a different mawlāvī-khāna on each day of the week. Yet in cities outside Istanbul, the sama? ceremony was performed only on Fridays, after Friday prayers. Nowadays, for reasons which are touristic rather than religious, the sama? ceremony is performed for one week annually in Konya between 11 and 17 December (see H. Ritter, Die Mevlanafeier in Konya vom 11-17 Dezember 1960, in Oriens, xx, 249-70; cf. Gülpinarlı, Mevlâna dan sonra mevlletik, 371-80, and Mevlevî âade ve erkân, 77-89).

The Mawlawiya have a further sama? ceremony, called 'ayn-i ġams ('ayn al-ğams). It is used in the sense of uniting or gathering. This was often performed at night, when the Mawlawi brothers gathered in ecstasy and love in the consciousness of unity with God. This ceremony was performed either to fulfil a condition set by a donator of a waqf [q.v.] to the tekke, or for the sake of someone who had made a vow, or upon the personal request of an 'aṣḥāf or devotee of the Mawlānā. This sama? was not performed in the sama?khāna but in a rectangular room. If the sama? took place at night, it was performed after the eating of a meal and the performance of the evening prayer (details in Gülpinarlı, op. cit., 101). This ceremony was also performed on the anniversary of the Mawlawī's death (6 Dümādā 2172/17 December 1273). For according to the Mawlawiya, this day marks the Mawlānā's birth into eternity. As this date changes annually in accordance with the hijrd? calendars, when the anniversary occurred in summer or spring, rush mats and rugs would be spread on the tarbe-facing side of the room, which lies outside the meydān odāsāl of the dargāh in Konya, and the 'ayn-i ġams would be performed in the open air.

The Mawlawiya have striven to give meanings to the sama?khāna and to the gestures made by the sama?zans during sama?. Thus the right-hand arc of the circular sama?khāna represents the apparent world, while the left-hand arc represents the unseen world of meaning within the apparent world. Similarly, the right-hand arc represents the descent from absolute being to humanity, the left, spiritual ascent, maturity and the path to God (salâh). The starting-point of the khatt-i tstita? (i.e. the place of the shaykh) is a sign of the world of absolute being, while the point directly opposite is a sign of the rank of humanity.

The derviš who performs the sama? is called sama?z. During the sama?, the sama?z's hand raised to heaven is a sign of taking from God, while his downward-pointing left hand is a sign that what is taken from God with the right hand is given to the people. The sama?z believes that what has thus been taken from God is given to the people, that he himself exists only in appearance and in reality does not exist, and that he is nothing but an intermediary between God and the people. In this position, his arms resemble a ġam alif (y?), while the body between the two arms is like an alif, thus giving the form of La tilâh tilâh.
The first dawra of the samad ceremony shows the manifestation of God, in whom all names and qualities reach the degree of vision (ayn al-yakim). Thus the siddik's knowledge of God's unity reaches the degree of vision. In the second dawra, this knowledge reaches the degree of unity (tevai al-yakim). The third dawra is what he sees, i.e., his knowledge becomes hukk al-yakim. The fourth dawra shows the manifestation of God, in whom all names and qualities reach the degree of vision. Thus the siddik's knowledge of God's unity reaches the degree of vision.

In conclusion, this order took its basic principles from the Mawlawan. These principles, which rest upon a limitless love of humanity and a moderate pertinacity, secured the popularity of these orders within a short period. To these principles should be added the importance given to music and dance, which were not well-viewed in religious circles, but which human beings cannot do without. The considerable interest which was shown by outsiders (borne) for these reasons further developed the order. Just as the customs and rules of the tariqa were from time to time re-ordered on this pretext, so also new ones were added to them. Further, the Mawlawi literature has been formed. This has not been confined simply to the members of this order, but has also left its imprint upon a number of famous poets of the Ottoman Diwan literature. Amongst the poets of this literature, Nefti, Nabif and Shaykh Çahâb (see) were Mawlawis.

From the Mawlawan's era to most recent times, music has always occupied an important place among the members of this tariqa. To the musical instruments which were naturally consigned solely to the men and the rabâh, there were subsequently added the sûd, kaman, kânân, sanûr, jâmb, kemence and girif, and most recently the piano and the violincello. The first piano brought to Istanbul was played in the mawlâwiyya at Kumkapî. However, the piano and violincello have not won much favour. It is most probable that the musical compositions recited in the Mawlawan's time were anonymous; but later, especially during samâ, the recitations were selected from the poems of the Mawlawân, Sultan Walad and Ulu 'Arif Çelebi. The Mawlawis produced a number of composers (see Gölpınarlı, Mêlevân'dan sonra mêuvelitik, 456 ff.).
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2. Relations with other orders.

Although the earlier mystics, such as al-Djunayd, Bistâmî and al-Hallâdî, are mentioned in Aflaki's Manâsîhî with profound reverence, the treatment of the founders of orders who came near Djalal al-Dîn's time is very different. 4 Abd al-Kadir al-Dîlânî is ignored, Ibn 'Arabi mentioned with contempt, and al-Rifâîî with severe condemnation. Hâdîdji Bektâşî is represented as having sent a messenger to inquire into the proceedings of Djalal al-Dîn and to have acknowledged the supremacy of the latter. At a later period, the rivalry of the Mawlawî with the Bektâshî order became acute.

It has been shown by F. W. Hasluck (Christianity and Islam under the Sultan, Oxford 1929, ii, 370 ff.) that the environment wherein the Mawlawî order originated was favourable to Christians, and that throughout its history it showed itself tolerant and inclined to regard all religions as reconcilable on a philosophic basis. He suggests that the veneration of the Muslims of Konya for the supposed burial-place of Plato (in a mosque which was once the church of St. Amphelochius) may have been intentionally favoured by the Mawlawî dervishes, or possibly their founder, in order to provide an object of veneration to the adherents of both systems. Plato (in a mosque which was once the church of St. Amphelochius) may have been intentionally favoured by the Mawlawî order, or possibly its founder, in order to provide an object of veneration to the adherents of both systems.

3. Spread of the order.

Alâ'î had its propagation outside Konya to Djâlal al-Dîn's son and second successor, Sultan Bahâ'î al-Dîn Walad who "filled Asia Minor with his lieutenants" (tr. Huard, ii, 262). It would appear, however, from Ibn Baṭûtâ's narrative (Râbi'a, ii, 282-4, Eng. tr. Gibb, ii, 430-1) that the order's following was not as at that time extensive outside Konya and was largely confined to Anatolia, although it does seem that in the time of Ulu 'Arîd Celebi (d. 790/1386), the Mawlawî darâghî existed in the Il-Khânî centre of Sultâniyya in Adharbaydâjîn (see Aflaki, ii, 896). At this period, zâwiyas or tekkes were set up in such Anatolian towns as Tokat, Lâranda and Kîtahîyâ, and thanks to the efforts of Djâwânä Mûhâmîd Celebi (d. in the first half of the 10th/16th century), others were founded in Istanbul, Rumelia and other Anatolian towns, and in the Arab lands, at Lâhghâktîya and Aleppo and in Egypt and Algiers.

The story told after Sa'd al-Dîn by Von Hammer (GOR, i, 147) and others, that as early as 759/1357, Sulaymân son of Orkhan received a cap from a Mawlawî dervish at Bula'yâr, has been shown by Hasluck (ii, 613) to be a fiction. The historians make no allusion to any importance attaching to the Mawlawî doctrine in towns alone (details in A. Golpinarh, Les saints des dervîches tourneurs, Paris 1897, 788/1386; but when the area was taken by Murâd II in 838/1435, peace was negotiated, according to Sa'd al-Dîn (i, 358) by Mawlânä Hamza, but according to Neghri (quoted in ibid.) by the descendant of Mawlânä Djâlal al-Dîn al-Rûmî, 'Arîf Celebi, "who united all the glories of worth and pedigree, and possessed mystic attainments"; the rebellious vassal supposed that a holy man of the family of the Mawlânä would inspire more confidence. The same person performed a similar service in 846/1442 (Sa'd al-Dîn, i, 371). According to V. Cuinet (La Turquie d'Asie, i, 829) Selîm I when passing through Konya in 922/1516 in pursuit of the Persians (?), ordered the destruction of the Mawlawî zâwiyâ, at the instance of the Shâykh al-Islâm; and though this command was repealed, the moral and religious authority of the head of the order was gravely compromised. That the saints of Konya were highly revered in the Ottoman Empire later in the 10th/16th century appears from the list of graves visited by Sayyîd 'Alî Kapûdân in 961/1554, which commences with those of Djâlal al-Dîn, his father and his son (Pecewî, Tavâfât, Istanbul 1283/1866-7, i, 371). In 1043/1634 Murâd IV assigned the zâwiyâ of Konya to the Celebî. Yet the first reference to "dancing dervishes" in Istanbul which Hasluck produces is from the time of Sultan İbrahim (1049-58/1640-8).

Mawlawî tekkes were divided into two classes, the âstana and the zâwiyâ, the former being considered as more prestigious, with the âle (see section 1. above) being performed there. During the high Ottoman period, there were âstanas, apart from the âstana-yî zâwiyâ called Huşarlî-î Pir at Konya itself, at Bursa, Kîtahîyâ, Karâhisar, Manîsa, Esikêhîr, Kastamonu and Gelibolu in Anatolia, at Yeşîbeychîr in Rumelia, and at Aleppo and in Egypt, plus the âstana which served as the fourth of the Mawlawî tekkes in Istanbul. During this period, there were 76 Mawlawî zâwiyas in towns alone (details in A. Gölpınarlı, Mawlânâ'dan sonra mevlevî, 335). Of European authors writing towards the end or just after the Ottoman era, Cuinet mentions three Mawlawî zâwiyas of the first rank and one tekke of the second in Istanbul and the neighbourhood; he gives the names of the
saints whose tombs they contain, without dates. He
mentions seven other Mawlawi-khdnas of the first ...
their title was therefore Sayyidi/Sidl (but the form Mahammad
freely altered does not exclude the usage of Mawlay in
Jerusalem. To these, Hasluck adds 
tekkes to have obtained recognition in the 19th century. It
mentions in February-April 1925, which had been led by
Anatolia against the new Republican Turkish govern-
ment as a privileged community against the Bektashis, who
supported the treatment of the Muslim
Arab world and the Balkans.
In later Ottoman times, Sultans
would seem that reforming sultans used the Mawlawi
cannot be traced earlier than 1058/1648, and appears
the supposed "traditional right" of the Mawlawi
shaykh to gird the new sultan with a sword. This right
cannot be traced earlier than 1058/1648, and appears to have obtained recognition in the 19th century. It
would seem that reforming sultans used the Mawlawi order as a makeweight against the Bektashi, who
supported the Janissaries, and then against the
'sultan?', who supported the treatment of the Muslim community as a privileged community against the
dhimmit. In later Ottoman times, Sultans 'Abd al-
Aziz and Mehemmed Resshâd were members of the order.
(D. S. MARGOLIOUHT*)
5. The last vestiges of the order in the Arab world and the Balkans.
Five members of the Sufi orders in Turkey, the last Celbe (Muhammad Bâkîr) took up
residence in the āšînân of the Mawlawiyya in Aleppo (L. Massignon, Annuarie du monde musulman 1954, Paris 1955, 201). Ritual gatherings were held regularly till the early 1950s, when the last active
shaykh of this āšînân (Muhammad Shahu) died. In the
takiyya of the Mawlawiyya in Hîms (last shaykh, Nûr
Urğmân), ritual gatherings were held into the 1940s, and in the
takiyya in Latakia (last shaykh, Bâkîr Efendi) gatherings continued into the 1950s.
The small but active Mawlawiyya community in Damascus, where the āšînân dates back to the late 10th/16th century (Muhammad Kurd 'Ali, Khîbat al-
Şâm, Beirut 1972, vi, 139), disappeared in the 1960s.
His son, Muhammad Djâlâl, published a new edition of the awrâd (Awrâd al-śâda al-Mawlawiyya, Damascus 1935/1975) and tried to revive the order without much success. In Damascus, the Mawlawiya played a prominent role in the religious celebrations in which the Sûf orders used to participate (cf. Muhammad Djâwâd Mâshkîr and Hasan Qhurawi
Ibsânî, Sûfîyan-i Mawlawî dar Dimashq, in Honor sa Mardom, Tehran [April 1975], 2-6, and Munir
In Lebanon, the Mawlawiya had takiyyas in Tripoli and in Beirut. The takiyya in Tripoli still func-
tioned in the 1960s. It fell into a state of dilapidation after the death of its last shaykh, Anwar al-Şârâbulust. In the early 1970s, the takiyya was restored ('Abd al-
Şâlim al-Šârâbulust Shîrûkî, takiyya wa-lâjdîn masâdir wa-mudâdâr min-Târîhul Bursa, and as the more
Uthman), ritual gatherings were held into the 1940s, 
and dispersed. Thereafter, the takiyya was used as a primary school.
In the Balkans, the Mawlawiya survived into the post-Ottoman era in Greece and in Yugoslavia only.
In Greece, the tekke in Thessaloniki seems to have functioned till the exchange of the Orthodox and Muslim populations between Greece and Turkey in 1923-4 (Cf. B. Dz. Cehajic, "Mojhodani pravoslavni i moheandani sectanti iz Makedonije, in Makedonski pregled, 1/4 [sofia 1925], 63, and Na. Hafiz, Yugoslavysa da Mesevi tekkeleri, in Fevzi Halici (ed.), Medevna ve şapma review, Ankara 1978, 175 ff. (also published in Çeşen, vi [Prîştine 1978], no. 20, 37-43). The tekke in Peć ceased to function in 1941, and the tekke in Skopje in 1945 (Hafiz, 40).

Bibliography: Given in the article.

(F. DE JONG)
Wallil, no longer known as Volubilis, continued throughout this long lapse of time to lead an independent existence. This period, corresponding in the general history of Morocco to the ascendency of the Vandals and Byzantium, is one of almost total obscurity with regard to Morocco. All that can be stated with certainty is that this land had facing it, in the Iberian peninsula, the kingdom of the Visigoths, and was inhabited by Christians, Jews (N. Slousch, *Histoire des Phéniciens et Judeo-Berberes*, in *AM*, xiv [1908], 1-473), and no doubt also by animists and idolators.

This strange gap in our knowledge is one of the most perplexing features of the history of Morocco, in view of the fact that we are relatively well informed as to the history of other North African countries and, in particular, of Tunisia and eastern Numidia.

With the arrival of Islam, according to the Arabic texts, ‘Ukbah b. Nafi’ presented himself before Walli and there routed a Berber army (cf. Ibn *‘Idhari*, tr. *Lévi-Provencal*, in *Arabia*, i/1 [1934], 38), but he does not seem to have entered the town, which from this time onward began to serve as a magnet for numerous Muslim arrivals.

It seems that the two Idris [q.v.] were not the first Muslims to establish themselves on the site of the former Roman settlement, since Muslim coinage of a time prior to the arrival of the former has been discovered. The tribe of the Awarba, also fugitives from the East, apparently preceded him there. In his work *Essai sur l'histoire du massif de Mawlay Idris* (tr. Beaumier, 24, 29), Ibn Abi Zar‘ indicates also that a mosque, of which no trace has been discovered, existed at Walli, and it was there, he says, that Râghid presented Idris, son of Idris, to the people in order to have him recognised as sovereign of the Maghrib.

Evidence that all these events did indeed take place on the former site of the Roman town exists in the form of the many coins of the Muslim period which have been discovered there; these discoveries in fact include not only Muslim coins originating in the East, sometimes in the form of treasure, but also products of other Moroccan mints such as Tugdha as well as Walli itself, which possessed a mint of its own (see P. Berthier, *Essai*, 59, G. S. Colin, *Monnaies de la période idrisside trouvées à Volubilis*, in *Hespéris*, 1936/2, 113-25; D. Eustache, *Monnaies de la periode idrisside trouvées à Volubilis*, in *Hespéris*, 1956/1-2, 133-97; idem, *Monnaies musulmanes trouvées dans la maison au compas*, in *Bulletin de l’Archéologie marocaine*, vi [1966], 349-64; on the entire question of coinages, idem, * Corpus des dirhams idrissites et contemporains*, Rabat 1970-1, is extremely informative, in particular with regard to Walli, 162-9).

Volubilis was still in existence at the time of the foundation of Fas by the two Idris since it is known, thanks to the famous article of Lévi-Provencal quoted above, that the two Idris participated in the foundation of this capital. To find the demise of the old Roman town, it is apparently necessary to look to the Almohads who, throughout North Africa, brought extinction to towns which had, hitherto, sheltered Christians. According to some historians, this behaviour of the Almohads was a consequence of the tension between Islam and Christianity caused by the Crusades (on the massacres perpetrated by the Almohads, see D. Jacques-Meunié, *Le Maroc saharien des origines à 1670*, Paris 1982, i, 260-1).

There is thus no doubt that the Roman town of Volubilis was the scene upon which the first stage of the Idrisid drama was performed. It is now necessary to attempt to discover how the events of history have been transferred, no doubt gradually, towards the site of the mountain known today by the name of Mawlay
Idris. First, it should be noted that all the Arabic texts prior to the 9th/15th century declare that both Idris died at Walil and were buried there, not however within the town but "extra muros": Ibn Abi Zar' in the Rawd al-kr'tan, says simply "near Walil"; al-Djalnaz' specifies "outside the gate of Walil"; Ibn al-Kadiri, "in a guard-tower opposite Walil"; and al-Halabi, "in the courtyard of the guard-tower situated at the gate of Walil" (see M. Ben Talha, Mawlay-Idris du Zarhun, passim).

It would be inappropriate to give an exhaustive account of the detailed information provided by these and other texts. The general fact which needs to be stressed is that the burial of the two Idris did not take place at Walil but in the immediate proximity. It is therefore logical to suppose that it took place, specifically, on the site where the Zarhun is currently located, i.e. in that fold of land (al-hufra) between the two heights of Khaybar and Tazgha, upon which the two main quarters of the new town were to be erected. All those who have visited Volubilis know, in fact, that Mawlay Idris is very clearly visible beyond the ruins of the Roman town. This is, furthermore, the conclusion offered by D. Eustache in his Corpus (165 n. 5). The names of Khaybar and Tazgha appear for the first time in the writings of Ibn Ghazi, author in the 9th-10th/15th-16th century of al-Rawd al-hatun, though it is impossible to tell whether these are simple place names or the quarters of a town in the process of construction.

The 16th century texts of Leo Africanus and of Marmol are confusing. These two authors describe, in fact, two different sites: Gualili and the Palace of Pharaoh in one case, Tuilit and Ca'car Faraon in the other. But none of these descriptions corresponds exactly either to Volubilis or to Mawlay Idris. It is hard to understand, in fact, how these authors were able to speak of towns situated on the "summit of the mountain", a description applying neither to Volubilis nor Mawlay Idris. A further complication is introduced by the existence of the Kasbat al-Nasrani which seems to have been known to these authors and which is also situated "on the summit of the mountain." Possibly the Kasbat al-Nasrani should be located across the Pietra Rossa or Dar al-Hamra by Leo Africanus and Marmol.

Amid all this confusion, which seems to prove that these authors had a very poor knowledge of the region or described it on the basis of hearsay, there nevertheless emerges from a comparison of the two texts a glimmer of light which could provide the key to the mystery that surrounds the origin of the new city. It may be observed that the former, the work of Leo Africanus, mentions only two or three houses around the tomb of the two Idris, while the latter, the work of Marmol, who wrote a half-century after him, mentions fifteen to twenty. Circumstantial evidence points to this as the origin of Mawlay Idris, a town which must have begun to develop around a venerable tomb during the 10th/16th century and the period of the great maraboutic movement in Morocco.

This, then, is the time at which the town under discussion began to develop. Obviously, there is a long gap between the 10th/16th century and the end of the 2nd/8th or the beginning of the 3rd/9th. The factor which enables us to fill the space framed between these two dates would be the cult of Idris, since Leo Africanus tells us that his grave, at that time separate from any urban settlement, "is venerated and visited by almost all the tribes of Mauritania" (tr. Épaulard, 245).

It is thus from the 10th/16th century onward that the Zarhun attained its full dimensions and made, so to speak, its début in history. The best evidence attesting to this relatively recent appearance of the urban settlement which bears this name today, consists in the complete silence of Arab or European historians and geographers prior to the 17th century. Here may be added the text of Mouët'te (beginning of the 17th century) declaring that at this time there were, in the Zarhun, only small villages forming a dispersed habitat "here and there", but "no town" (Mouët'te, Histoire des conquêtes de Moulay Archy, in Sources inédites de l'histoire du Maroc, 2nd series, France, ii, 1924, 182-3). On the other hand, with the start of the 'Alawi dynasty, the town entered a phase of lively prosperity. A curious text contained in the Kitab al-Istikyafa places it, at this early stage, alongside the most eminent Muslim sanctuaries: the Ka'ba, Jerusalem, the Mausoleum of Siddi Ali Sharif at Tafilalt and that of Mawlay Idris II at Fas. Its sanctified nature led to the following consequences: (1) all non-Muslims, whether Jews or Christians, were excluded from its territory; (2) this territory, and especially the Zarhun, became an inviolable place of sanctuary for any political criminal or fugitive from common law; and (3) its prestige, or what might be termed its baraka, extended over the entire range of the Zarhun. Current evidence of the Lauricb of Jews and Christians is still sanctioned by the law which prohibits them from acquiring property there. The protection of criminals has never been other than relative, even in the most prestigious times of the sanctuary. Some have found there an effective refuge, for others it has proved less advantageous. As for access to the locality for Europeans, although it was rigorously controlled before the Protectorate, as certain travellers discovered to their advantage, as for access to the locality for Europeans, although it was rigorously controlled before the Protectorate, as certain travellers discovered to their advantage, most restrictions have now ceased to exist, and a visit to Mawlay Idris is recommended to tourists visiting Morocco.

In history, the piety of the sultans is attested not only through pious visits but also through the care shown for the maintenance and embellishment of the sanctuary and the mosques (details may be found in Berthier's Essai). These visits sometimes take on a political nature, as to a place of symbolic meetings, where alliances are sealed and treaties or truces concluded. A visit to Mawlay Idris is obligatory for every newly-installed sovereign. In the course of his campaign against Muhammad V, in 1953, EI-Glawi did not fail to comply with this tradition, and Muhammad V did likewise on his return from Madagascar. Such evidence shows that the cult of Mawlay Idris has today lost none of its prestige, and it may legitimately be supposed that it could play a similar role in the future.
In the cultural sphere, it is known that distinguished scholars have taught at the Zawiya. A madrasa of some repute exists in the locality, and this has been endowed, quite recently, with a cylindrical minaret, a form most unusual in the Muslim architecture of Morocco. Its decorative frieze, made of green pottery, is inscribed with verses from the Koran in a very stylised Kufic script (cf. Guide bleu, Marrak, 1975, 206; A. Paccard, Le Maroc et l'artisanat traditionnel, i, 315).

Although Idris al-Akbar has numerous saintly rivals in the massif of the Zarhun, such as Sidi 'Ali Ibn Hamdush, Sidi Ahmad Dghaïhi and Sidi 'Abd Allah al-Nakib, the latter corps, the cadre of which was formed by several hundred carefully selected cAb!d Allah al-Khayyat of Talaghza, in the urban settlement itself his cult is challenged only by that of his barber, Sidi 'Abd Allah al-Hadjidja, to whom a mosque is dedicated.

The population of the small town consists of a teeming mass of Idrisid Shurfa and 'Alawids subdivided into a multitude of branches which the author of this article will not attempt to enumerate.

It is necessary, however, to indicate the importance not of the moussem (maâwiya) of Mawlay Idris but of the moussems which are conducted there almost daily at certain times of the year. The present writer was able, in 1934, to witness a moussem of the Sûs people, a crowd of two or three thousand, climbing towards the sanctuary and chanting a curious recitative which has been described by A. Chottin (see his Tableau de la musique marrakchis, Paris 1938).

Naturally enough, there is a vast number of brotherhoods, ranging from the most aristocratic to the most coarse and primitive. The disciples of Sidi 'Ali Ibn Hamdush and of Sidi Ahmad Dghaïhi honour their founders not only on the southern slope of the mountain where their sanctuaries are located, but also in the town of Mawlay Idris itself, and this seven days after the mouloud (maâwiya). In his Essai (134-5), the present writer has hesitated to assess the influence from the Roman period which could have stimulated the appearance in Morocco of extravagant rites on the part of certain religious brotherhoods. In his recent article Le Temple B. de Volubilis, H. Morestin has prompted the present writer to revive this hypothesis. At the conclusion of his excellent archaeological study, Morestin indicates, in fact, that the sanctity and the mysticisms of the Zarhun could be no less than that of the temple of Saturn or was it not? Prudently, Morestin refrains from making this identification, which does not prevent him from declaring, in the last sentence of his book, that "indirectly the spiritual heritage of Temple B. could have played a role, at the dawn of the history of Muslim Morocco".

**Bibliography:** All questions concerning the Zarhun, the Muslim phase of the history of Volubilis, the mystery surrounding the name of Walli (from a Berber word signifying rose-laurel), the history of the Zawiya, etc., have been examined by the author of this article in his Essai sur l'histoire du massif de Mawlay Idris, Rabat 1938; the remarkable preface contributed by H. Terrasse would be sufficient, in its own right, to convey an impression of all these issues. It concentrates, however, on the Zarhun as a whole rather than on the town of Mawlay Idris in particular. For Terrasse, the Zarhun represents irrefutable evidence of pre-Hilalian Morocco; in this, he is in agreement with X. de Planhol in his Fondements géographiques de l'histoire de l'Islam, 146. More recently, a work by N. Ben Talha, former director of the Museum of Dîr Djâma' at Meknès, Mawlay Idris du Zarhun, 1965, has provided a very thorough study of daily life in the Holy City; it is to be noted that the closed and unique nature of the milieu examined contributes considerably to the interest of this work.

Some useful material is to be found in the works of L. Chatelain and R. Trouvenon on Le Maroc des Romains, Volubilis and Banasa, also in the publications of the Service des Antiquités Marocaines (P.S.A.M.) in the time of the Protectorate, superseded since independence by the Bulletin d'Archéologie Marocaine. On the Zarhun in general, recourse may be had to the doctoral thesis of M. Belarbi, Etude de géographie rurale, Bordeaux 1980, which is as delicate as it is well the tale which the author has given to it. (P. Berthier)

**Mawlay Ismaïl**

**B. al-'Ashrif, Abu 'l-Nasr**, the second ruler of the Moroccan dynasty of the 'Alawids [see 'ala'wîs and hâsâni].

On the death of sultan Mawlay al-Rashîd, the empire of Morocco was divided. Mawlay Ismaïl, governor of Meknès [see mknas] and brother of the deceased sultan, was proclaimed sultan in this town. He advanced once more on the capital Fas, which had declared against him and seized it. He was proclaimed there on 11 Dhî 'l-Hijja 1082/14 April 1672, being then 26 years of age.

But three rivals, his brother Mawlay al-Harrâni in Taffilalt, his nephew Ahmad b. Muhriz, proclaimed in Marrakesh and in Sûs, and thirdly the guerilla chief al-Khidr Ghaylân in the north-west, took the field against him. They were supported by the Turks of the Regency of Algiers, who feared the establishment of a solid power in the west of the Maghrib and endeavoured to make trouble there. Muhriz Ismaïl at first drove his nephew Ahmad b. Muhriz out of the town of Marrakesh, defeated Ghaylân to the north of Fas and had him put to death. But Ahmad b. Muhriz once more raised the lands of the south and the Atlas. To obtain peace, Ismaïl had to recognise his nephew as amîr of the lands south of the Atlas and his brother al-Harrâni as amîr of Taffilalt.

These civil wars, which had lasted five years, had hardly terminated when a descendant of the Marabouts of Dîlîz [q.v. in Suppl.], Ahmad b. 'Abd Allâh (d. 1091/1680), also supported by the Turks of Algiers, fomented a terrible rebellion in the country of Tâdla and the provinces of western Morocco. But his Berber troops could not withstand Mawlay Ismaïl's disciplined troops, especially his artillery. Marrakesh fell in Rabî' II 1088/June 1677. The victorious Ismaïl terrorised the people to keep them quiet; more than 10,000 were beheaded; thousands of prisoners of war along with Christian slaves had to help to build the palace of Meknès, which the sultan made his military capital. At the same time, the plague carried off thousands of victims (1090/1679) in the regions of the Gharb and the Rif.

The vigorous repression of the Berber revolts and the epidemic afforded Mawlay Ismaïl a certain respite. He took advantage of it to raise a professional army. He enlisted former negro slaves, gave them wives, allotted estates to them, trained them in the use of arms, and made of them the famous Black Guard of the 'Abîd al-Buhârî (so-called because they took their oath on a copy of the Koran) which was to assure him supremacy over all Morocco.

At the same time, allegedly to favour the intran- 
significant religious party, but in reality to watch the dealings of the Turks and Europeans in the seaports, 
and to counteract the influence of the corsairs, he organised the corps of the Mugiabîhidin or "volunteers of the faith". The latter corps, the cadre of which was formed by several hundred carefully selected 'Abîd,
waged an unceasing irregular warfare against the European possessions. They took La Mamora (al-Ma‘mūra), the modern al-Mahdiyya, by surprise from the Spaniards, and Mawlay Isma‘īl collected over 100 pieces of artillery there (15 Rab‘ II 1092/26 May 1681). They harassed the English at Tangiers and the latter evacuated the town after blowing up the mole and the fortifications (1 Dżumādā I 1095/15 April 1684) (cf. Davis, The history of the Second Queen’s Royal Regiment, i, London 1883, 118 ff.). Larche (al-‘Arāgh) also was forced to succumb to the blow of the “volunteers of the faith” in 1689, and Asilà in 1691 which were driven against Mollila and Ceuta.

It was in vain that Mawlay Isma‘īl endeavoured to get Louis XIV to aid him against Spain. French commerce had to suffer for some time as a result.

But the Peace of Ryswick in 1697 raised Louis XIV’s prestige considerably above his enemies. Mawlay Isma‘īl then sought his alliance against the Turks of Algiers, who were mixed up in all the plots hatched in the Atlas against the shari‘ā of Fās. An entente between France, the Bey of Tunis and the sultan of Fās was then concluded. The latter even tried to cement it by a matrimonial alliance and demanded the hand of the Princess de Conti (cf. Plantet, Mouley Ismail et la Princesse de Conti, Paris 1893). In spite of the failure of the latter plan, the entente secured to France great commercial benefits as Safe, Tétouan and Safi. Frenchmen superintended the building of the palaces, roads, and forts of the sultan and sometimes (like Pillet) accompanied his artillery. On his part, Mawlay Isma‘īl organised several expeditions against the Turks with the help of France, whose merchants supplied him with arms and munitions. But the slowness of the Moroccan armies did not enable Isma‘īl to reap the advantages expected. He even allowed his ally, the Bey of Tunisia, to be defeated near Constantine, which enabled the Turks of Algiers to come to fight the Moroccans in the west in full strength in 1701 and to drive them back.

The expeditions of Mawlay Isma‘īl against the Turks, in spite of their relative lack of success, enabled him to pacify his frontiers where he built or renovated the fortifications. He built the fort of Reggida in the mountain of the Banū Yā‘la, commanding the high valley of the Wād Šāhre and the lands of the Arab tribes of the High Plateaux. He built the fort of ‘Uyun Sīdī Māllūk in the plain of Anqād and that of Salwān in the land of the Trīfa. He thus closed the exits on his north-east frontier. Forts built in the lands of each tribe kept the country quiet, especially the marabouts, the natural allies of the Turks, whose privileges were tending to pass into the hands of the sāhibs. The latter gradually took over the direction of the religious elements, which were organised into brotherhoods. Isma‘īl completed his system of domination by the creation of military zones. Tāzā, notably, had its walls rebuilt. This town became the headquarters of the eastern march. A garrison of 2,500 ‘Abīd secured the passage from western to eastern Morocco by the pass of Tāzā. It also had to keep in control the Berbers of the Rif in the north of this region and the Berbers of the middle Atlas in the south.

Apart from his constructions of a military nature, Mawlay Isma‘īl was very active as a builder in the various towns of Morocco, and especially at Meknès, where thousands or European slaves worked on the erection of palaces, mosques and madrasas. In order to raise the resources for all the expenses of the army’s upkeep and its building enterprises, he derived money from taxes raised brutally and regardlessly by his agents, from continual raids on the tribes, from custom duties, from the sixth levied on the spoils of the corsairs, from the ransoms of captives and from the presents which are given by the chroniclers and writers of memoirs. The monopoly of trade, by supplying the treasury, prevented moreover the illicit sale of horses and arms.

Mawlay Isma‘īl was a man of vigorous character, of adroitness and of an uncommon agility and bravery, but these positive qualities were accompanied by an unparalleled cruelty and sadism, many examples of which are given by the chroniclers and writers of memoirs. On the other hand, he gave the appearance of being interested in the intellectual activities of his subjects and showed himself respectful of the external aspects of the Islamic cult; he even went as far as engaging in proselytisation and tried to convert Louis XIV.

In regard to foreign policy, he enjoyed fairly good relations with Britain and France, shown by the despatch of embassies which were more or less successful. The French were thus left with a free hand in the Mediterranean, but he did not utilise profitably this diversion of their energies in order to combat victoriously the Turks of Algiers, the aim of his North African policy. Nevertheless, he was able to reduce considerably the foreign occupation of Moroccan ports. In regard to internal policy, much of his reign was filled with the suppression of tribal revolts, which the army was not always able to contain within bounds, whilst his main effort was involved in consolidating the makhzan [q.v.], upholding it against the turbulent Berbers through the use of Arab and Negro troops.

He had thus succeeded, as much by the reign of terror which he evoked as by his own skillfulness, in imposing peace on the internal regions of his possessions, when he died, after a reign of 55 years, on 27 Radjab 1139/20 March 1727 at the age of 80. Amongst the several hundred children which his innumerable wives had given him, it was Mawlay Abūmād al-Dhāhabī who succeeded him.


MAWLAY MAHAMMAD AL-SHAYKH, name of three Moroccan sultans belonging to the dynasty of the Sa'dids [q.v.].

I. The first, Abu ʿAbd Allah, who also bore the title of al-Mahdi and is sometimes known as al-Imam, is generally counted second or third in the list of members of the dynasty, but he may to a certain extent be considered its true founder, since it was he who put an end to that of the Marinids [q.v.]. Born probably at Tagmaddart (a district of the Dar a) in 896/1490-1, he was the younger son of Muhammad b. ʿAbd al-Rahman al-Ka'im bi-amr Allah, who was proclaimed sultan in 916/1510 and died in 923/1517. According to legend, the great destiny to which he was called was predicted to him in his infancy when, at the Kur'ânic school which he attended, a cock came and perched on his head, as well as on that of his elder brother, Ahmad al-Arraj. The two young boys received a quite extensive religious and literary education and were sent on the Pilgrimage to Mecca in ca. 911/1506. The lack of precision and the contradictions in the chronology of events found in the sources make any attempt at biography particularly difficult, but it seems clear that al-Arraj was appointed by his father governor of the Sus, where he too received the bay'a [q.v.] in the same year (916/1510). With his younger brother as his subordinate, he waged without much success a holy war against the Christians established in the region, especially at Santa Cruz, the coastal outlet of the Sus which was to become Agadir [q.v.]. The two ʿgarifs also profited at this time from the aid of the Waṭṭasid ruler [q.v.] of Marrakesh, who supplied them with arms. Muhammad al-Shaykh was not slow, however, to free himself from the tutelary power of this elder brother and to take into his own hands the administration of the plain and of the southern flank of the High Atlas, over which his authority extended at the time that Leo Africanus [q.v.] visited the region (919/1513). Moreover, the entire province came under his control on the death of al-Ka'im. Ahmad was then in power to the north of the Atlas.

Making his capital at Taradant [q.v.] which he fortified and renamed Mahmamdiyya and where he built the citadel, the great mosque, the madrasa and sugar refineries, he was obliged to solve problems of an economic and political, even religious nature, since he needed to trade with the Christians in order to obtain arms and munitions, but he availed of the fact that Santa Cruz was occupied by the Portuguese, who in addition exercised a monopoly over the export of sugar. As a result of treaties concluded with the Portuguese rulers of Safi and Azemmour in 930/1524, and then renewed in the two following years, and after ill-fated expeditions against Santa Cruz, relative peace reigned in the south of Morocco. On the one hand, Mawlāy Maḥammad remained on good terms with the influential marabout of the locality where his family had resided, Tālīs, and even married his daughter; on the other, he attracted Christian merchants to the Sus in order to develop trade in the leather, wax and sugar produced in the region.

In Dhu 'l-Hijjād 930/October 1524, Ahmad al-Arraj had taken Marrakesh from the Waṭṭasids, and the two brothers had further attacks on the last sovereigns of this dynasty who ruled at Fās; they had also taken a large quantity of artillery with which they were able once more to undertake an expedition against the port of Funti [see AGADIR], which was besieged and captured on 13 Dhu 'l-Ka'da 947/1541. The Christian captives were taken to Taradant, while the arms and munitions seized from the encampment of Mahammad al-Shaykh went to Fās. But the Berbers of the region, always an unruly element. Until this point the two brothers had, apparently, made common cause, but a quarrel broke out between them, the specific grounds of the rift being a dispute over the sharing of the booty. A few months after the capture of Funti, al-Arraj attacked and defeated Maḥammad, who was determined to avenge himself and succeeded, in 951/1544, in taking possession of Marrakesh, capturing his elder brother and exiling him to Tafilaлит with all his followers. Although theoretically a vassal of his brother for a few months more, Mawlay Maḥammad al-Shaykh, henceforward sole master of the territory controlled by the Sa'dids, was able to contemplate putting an end to the power of the Waṭṭasids and unifying Morocco to his own advantage. The outcome of the first encounter, which took place on the Unum al-Rābī', was favourable to him. The treaty concluded on that occasion was, however, soon to be broken, and the Sa'dīd called upon his adversary to submit; when the latter refused, Fās was attacked in 952/1545, and the ruler of the town, Ahmad al-Waṭṭasī, captured and then released. While his son took possession of numerous towns of the Atlantic coast, Mawlay Maḥammad, who had lost Fās in the meantime, was obliged to put the place under a prolonged siege, capturing it on 2 Muharram 956/31 January 1549. It may be reckoned that this considerable event marks the beginning of the dynasty.

The following year, around the month of Dju'mādā' I 957/June 1550, al-Shaykh sent two of his sons, al-Harrān, governor of the Sus, and ʿAbd al-Kādir, to conquer Tetouan; but this enterprise was unsuccessful and a Berber tribe called the Tamrīn seized Mawlay Maḥammad al-Shaykh and to defeat him on a tributary of the Sebou, the Innawen, in Safar 961/January 1554. Forced to leave Fās and to abandon all his property, al-Shaykh rapidly returned to the fray, recaptured the capital which had been pillaged by the Turks and on 24 Shawal 961/22 September 1554, executed Abu Hassān, whose head was sent to Marrakesh. He then stayed until the end of Ramadan 962/beginning of August 1555 at Fās, where he left his heir presumptive, ʿAbd Allah al-Ghālib bi 'llah [q.v.], and entrusted the administration of Meknēs to another of his numerous sons, ʿAbd al-Muʿāmin, before setting out once more for the Sus.

In 959/1552, the Ottoman sultan Sulaymān Kanūnī [q.v. (926-74/1520-66)] had written to Mawlay Maḥammad al-Shaykh on the subject of the eastern frontiers of Morocco, but the messenger had been very badly received by the new sultan, who thus
condemned himself to death. Resolved to settle definitively at Marrakesh, he left Fas, but a dozen hired assassins, sent from Algiers to execute him, mangled easily with his entourage which consisted almost wholly of Turks; they performed the deed on 29 Dhu 'l-Hijjah 964/25 October 1557 and bore his head, so it is said, to Istanbul. His body lies in Marrakesh, among the members of his dynasty, in the hall known as Lalla Mas'ūda which contains the famous "Sa'dian tombs", where his epitaph may be seen as well as a long commemorative plaque dedicated to him (see G. Deverdun, Inscriptions, nos. 123 and 85, pp. 125, and 82-6); another marble slab bearing a fairly long inscription (ibid., nos. 127-8, pp. 131-4) extols the merits of the sultan's Berber wife, Mas'ūda, who gave birth to Ahmad al-Mansūr [q.v.] and her name to the hall.

Diego de Torres has left a portrait of Mawlay Muhammad al-Shaykh from which it emerges that he had a round and pale face, large and vivid eyes, a long grey beard, curly hair and two teeth of great size; of modest stature, but robust, he was unscrupulous by nature, but a bold and valiant fighter (Histoire des Chefs, apud Marmol, iii, 212). He was also, according to the least sympathetic Arab sources, a man of piety. He was furthermore a scholar, knowing by heart the Dinān of al-Mutanabbi, and it was he who founded the library of the great mosque of Tarudant (teaching the Risdāla of al-Bukharī, the Mukhtāsar of Khalil b. Ishak).

When he was in Fas, he attended certain courses himself, but he did not refrain from inflicting cruel punishment on those fikāhī whose only crime was to have served the preceding dynasty, such as al-Wanāshārī [q.v.], put to death in Dhu 'l-Hijjah 960/January 1549, al-Askārī, and Sidi 'Alī Harrān. From his life in the south, he had retained simple manners, and many sources recall, not without irony, that a former vizier of the Marinids, Kāsim al-Zarhūni, and the matron of the harem (arfā'ī of Fas), were engaged in educating the numerous members of the court in refinement and instructing them on such topics as etiquette, dress, cuisine and even administration.

In an economic and financial point of view, Mawlay Muhammad al-Shaykh caused some problems as a result of the weight of taxation that he imposed but, he was at pains to increase the wealth of the country and to develop both the cultivation of cane and a negro who gave birth to Ahmad al-Mansūr [q.v.] and her name to the hall.

II. The second, who bore the regal title of al-Ma'mūn, was the grandson of the preceding and the son of Ahmad al-Mansūr [q.v.] and a negro woman named Khayyūrān. After the battle of Wādi 'l-Mākhāzin (or Battle of the Three Kings) which took place on 30 Dūrādārādārā 1586/4 August 1578, and the proclamation of Ahmad al-Mansūr as sultan, Muhammad al-Shaykh II was declared heir presumptive by his father who appointed him governor of Fas. But he abandoned himself to debauchery, neglected his religious duties and antagonised the population, to such an extent that the sultan sent him to Sidjilmasa, whence he was impatient to return. After the death of his father (1012/1603), he was obliged to compete with his brothers, who disputed his claim to the throne, raised an army which, under the command of his son 'Abd Allāh, marched on Marrakesh and captured the town, and he was finally proclaimed sultan at Fas in 1015/1606. The concession of Larache (al-'Arāqīsh [q.v.]) to the Spanish on 4 Ramadān 1019/20 November 1610 incited the rebel Abu Māḥallā [q.v. in Suppl.] to launch an appeal to holy war, and three years later (1022/1615), Mawlay al-Shaykh II was assassinated near Tetouan.

Bibliography: To the Arab historians of the 11th/17th century and to the comprehensive works cited in the preceding article, the following should be added: R. Le Tourneur, La décadence sa’dienne et l'anarchie marocaine au XVIIIe siècle, in Annales de la Faculté des Lettres d'Aix, xxxii (1960), 173-223; J. M. Gandin, in Hommes et destin (Publ. of Acad. des Sciences d'Outre-Mer), Paris-Aix-en-Provence, vii (1986), 369-71, with Bibl. See also the Bibl. of the article A hu maḥālī.
which had not recognised the sultan of Marrakesh, had become a temporal power to be reckoned with, at a time when, in addition, the emergence of the Sharif of Tafilaît began to be a troublesome influence. An important event in the reign of this sultan was the defeat inflicted on him by the army of al-Dîlā between the Wâdi 1 Abîd, on 17 Dîjâmâdâ II 1048/26 October 1638. In spite of this reverse, he succeeded in reigning for some twenty years and died on 22 Râbî' I 1065/30 January 1655 (date indicated, according to an official document, by the Tarîkh al-Sudân, which contains effusive eulogies on the conduct of this sultan).

1. Typology of the mawlid and its diffusion through the Islamic world. See that of the preceding article. (Ch. Pellat)

MAWILD (A.), or MAWLUD (pl. mawlid), is the term for (1) the time, place or celebration of the birth of a person, especially that of the Prophet Muhammad or of a saint (see waiz, and (2) a panegyric poem in honour of the Prophet.

From the moment when Islam began to bring the personality of Muhammad within the sphere of the supernatural, the scenes among which his earthly life had been passed naturally began to assume a higher sanctity in the eyes of his followers. Among these, the house in which he was born, the Mawlid al-Nabî, in the modern Sûk al-Layî in Mecca, the history of which is preserved principally in the chronicles of the town (Chroniken der Stadt Mecka, ed. Wustenfeld, i, 422), does not seem at first to have played a part of any note. It was al-Khayzûrî (d. 173/789 [q.v.]), the mother of Hârûn al-Rashîd, who first transformed it from a humble dwelling-house to a place of prayer. Just as the pious made pilgrimages to the tomb of the Prophet in Medina, so they now visited the site of his birth to show their reverence for it and to receive a share of its blessings (Ib. l-tabarruk). In time, the reverence in which the house was held also found expression in its development in a fitting architectural fashion (Ibn Djabayr, Ritha, 114, 163; and see for a description of the house in the late 19th century, Snouck Hurgronje, Mecca, 1, 106, ii, 27).

Records of the observation of the birthday of the Prophet as a holy day only begin at a late date; according to the generally accepted view, the day was celebrated at his court (cf. M. D’Ohsson, Tableau général, Paris 1787, i, 255 ff.; Von Hammer,GOR, viii, 441). From 1910, it was celebrated as a national festival in the Ottoman Empire. Today, the festival comprises one or more official holidays in the Arab states and in most of the countries where Islam predominates. In many of these countries, an official celebration attended by the head of government or his representatives is held in one of the main mosques in their capitals.

In West Africa, the anniversary of the Prophet’s birthday is sometimes associated with pre- or non-Islamic festivals, e.g. among the Nupe in Nigeria, where it is identified with the gani age-grade ceremonies (F. Nadel, Nupe religion, London 1954, 217), and among the Kotoculi in Northern Togo, where it is associated with the traditional knife festival of the knives (R. Delval,Les musulmans au Togo, Paris 1980, 151-3). For some Sûfi orders in this area, notably for the Tijâniyya branches in Senegal (in Tivaouane, Dakar and Kaolack), the occasion has become the principal yearly gathering for the members of these orders. Poems exist in Hausa, classed technically as mâtû and siru, which are used as mawâlid (see M. Hiskett, A history of Hausa Islamic verse, London 1975, ch. 5), and in Fulani (Fulufule), are to be found several panegyrics of the Prophet with phraseology very similar to that of the mawâlid (see J. Haakens, Chants musulmans en Peul, Leiden 1983, 173-216). In Chad, the Sudan, North-East and East Africa (see below), the feast is regularly celebrated, and indications exist that the occasion is becoming more widely observed throughout West Africa. The celebrations staged on this occasion are more or less identical to the ones known in the Arab lands.

Central to these celebrations is the recitation of a mawâlid, i.e. of a panegyric poem of a legendary character. These poems normally follow a standard sequence of introductory praises to God, an invocation, a description of the creation of al-nur al-mâkummad (q.v.), then proceed through various stages and digressions (e.g. on the Prophet’s ancestry) to the actual physical birth, which is preceded by an account
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of a miraculous announcement to his mother Amina [q.v.] that she is bearing the Prophet. In the Arab world, mawlid recitation became a common feature of the Mawlid, Islam's celebration of the birth of the Prophet, and had become universal at the end of the 13th/19th century.

The origins of these recitals may be found in the religious ceremonies in Fattimid Cairo and in Irbil. The K. al-Tawârîkh fi mawlid al-sirâjî, which Ibn Dhiya composed during his stay in Irbil at the suggestion of Gökburî, was already famous as a mawlid at this period (Brockelmann, GAL ii, 310). It need not be till later times, however, that mawlids became a predominant phenomenon in the celebration, along with torchlight processions, feasting and the fairs in the street, ever increasing in size. The number of the poems used at mawlids is quite considerable. Beside the famous Bânât Su'âd of Ka'b b. Zuhayr of the older period, the Burda and the Hamziiyya of al-Bûsrî and their numerous imitations, there is a whole series of poems regularly employed here, some of which are intended to instruct employe that of Ibn Hâdjâr al-Haytâmî, while others are merely eulogistic.

One of the most widely recited mawlids in Arabic at present is one composed by Dâjî'far b. Hasan al-Barzangi (d. 1179/1765). It is also known under the title 'Idâl ad-dawârîh and has been published many times (cf. GAL ii, 384 and see J. Knappert, Swâhili Islamic poetry, Leiden 1971, 48-60, for a slightly abridged English tr.). The most popular of the mawlid songs in Turkish was composed by Süleyman Çelebi (d. 825/1421). It is still recited in mosques throughout Turkey and in mosques of the Turkish-speaking Sunni community in West and South-Eastern Europe as part of the celebrations for the birthday of the Prophet. This mawlid was recited during the official Ottoman court celebrations (for a full translation, see F. Lyman MacCallum, The Mawlid Sherif, London 1943; and E. J. W. Gibb, A history of Ottoman poetry, London 1900, i, 232-48, for a translation of extracts and data on the author).


Apart from the occasion of the Prophet's birthday, a mawlid recital is sometimes held as part of the ceremonial of the rites of passage. Occasionally, the recitation of a mawlid takes place in fulfilment of a religious vow (T. Canaan, in Jnl. Pal. Or. Soc. 7, 1926, 55). When a mawlid is recited on any of these occasions, it is normally followed by a dhikr [q.v.] session. In some Sûfi orders (e.g. in the Mirghaniyya and some branches of the Khawâliyya) a mawlid is recited as part of the standard liturgical ritual (see HADRA).

The mawlid celebration as an expression of reverence for Muhammad has found almost general recognition in Islam, partly in consequence of the strength of the Sûfi movement. At all times, however, there has also been vigorous opposition to it by those who considered it to be a bid'a [q.v.]

It is significant of the character of the opposition that its opponents object to those very forms which show the influence of Islamic mysticism (dancing, sama', ecstatic phenomena, etc.) or of Christianity (processions with lamps, etc.). An interesting document concerning this feud is a kind of fatâwa by al-Suyûtî (d. 911/1505, Brockelmann, ii, 157, HUEN an- makîd fi 'amal al-mawlid) which gives a brief survey of the history of the festival, then discusses the pros and cons very fully and concludes that the festival deserves approval as bid'a 'asana, provided that all abuses are avoided. Ibn Hâdjâr al-Haytâmî in his Mawlid, and Kuûb al-Dîn (Chroniken der Stadt Mekka, iii, 439 ff.), take the same view, while Ibn al-Hâdjâr (d. 737/1336-7), as a more strict Mâlikî, condemns it most vehemently (K. al-Mâlîkîyâ, i, 155 ff.).

Although the height of this struggle was apparently reached in the 8th-9th/14th-15th centuries, it did not really die down in later years. Indeed, it received new life with the coming of Wahhâbîsm [see WAHHABYYA]. This movement, while deriving its arguments for its opposition to the mawlid celebrations mainly from Ibn Taymiyya, inspired the growth of non- or anti-mystical Islam throughout the Islamic world and of the opposition to reference to the Prophet, including the celebration of his birthday, in consequence. Wahhâbî teaching is equally directed against the veneration of saints (auliyâ' [see WALI]) and against the mawlids held in many parts of the Islamic world in their honour. These mawlids normally follow the Islamic calendar, but there are exceptions. Accounts of such mawlid celebrations exist from many parts of the Islamic world.

The term mawlid (colloquial, mûlid) to denote a feast held in honour of a saint is used in Egypt and the Sudan in particular. Elsewhere, different terms are used, e.g. mawsum [q.v.] (coll. mas'um) in the Maghrib and parts of the Middle East, hawliyya (coll. hâliyya) in the Sudan and the horn of Africa, 'urs in the Indo-Pakistan sub-continent and hûlî in Malaysia. Everywhere, the characteristics of such celebrations are more or less the same: crowds gather for one or more days, a fair of varying size and importance accompanies the religious celebrations, dhîkr and/or Kur'ân reading sessions take place inside and/or outside the sanctuary of the saint concerned, one or more processions are held in which the keeper of the sanctuary (often the saint's descendant) and (frequently) Sûfi orders participate, and the cloth (kiswa) covering the saint's shrine is replaced by a new one in the course of the celebrations. Frequently, communal meals are staged and a centrally organised distribution of alms takes place.

In some parts of the Sunni world, like Afghanistan, no mawlids are celebrated, notwithstanding the widespread cult of saints in these areas; in the Shi'i world no mawlids of the type described here seem to be known.

In Egypt, the celebration of the numerous mawlids (about 300 mawlids of varying size were celebrated yearly with official permission in the 1970s) is centrally co-ordinated and supervised (by the madhâykhat al-turûq al-i'tifâ'iyû, in consultation with the Ministry of Awkâlâ'), so as to prevent these celebrations from overlapping and to guarantee public order. Some of these mawlids were or still are known for special rituals or customs observed as part of the celebrations [see DAWSÂ]. During most of the mawlids, special sugar dolls ('arâsû, sing. 'arâs) are sold (cf. 'Abd al-Qânhî al-Nabawî al-Shâlî, 'Arâsî al-mawlid, Cairo 1977). In Egypt, the celebration of mawlids is not limited to Islamic saints but extends to Coptic Christian ones as well.

The predominance of mawlid celebrations in Egypt...
would seem to explain why it is in this country above all that the most abundant polemical literature concerning the religious status of mawlid celebrations was produced. Those critical of such celebrations range in their demands from minor reforms of ritual, such as the prohibition of musical instruments in processions and the staging of profane forms of amusement in the mawlid grounds, to total abolition. Most of those who have declared against the celebration of mawlid in their traditional form seem to have been of Wahhabi inspiration. Some of the most vocal and well-known 20th century critics who deserve mention were Muhammad Rashid Ridây, Mahmud Khattab al-Sukhi and Muhammad Hamid al-Fikhi. Elsewhere in the Islamic world, similarly inspired groups and individuals have opposed or are still actively opposing veneration of saints.

**Bibliography:** In addition to the works mentioned in the article, see: Hasan al-Sanoudi, Ta'rih al-Thalif bi l-mawlid al-nabawi, Cairo 1948 (mostly on the history of the mawlid in Cairo, with short excursions on the celebrations in Istanbul, Morocco and Tunisia in different eras; based upon published sources). For descriptions of mawlid al-nabi celebrations in different parts of the Islamic world and in various periods, see e.g. Wüstenfeld (ed.), **Chroniken**, iii, 438 ff.; Ibn Hadjar al-Hayyami, *Mawlid* (see Brockelman, *GA*; II, 389); Snouck Hurgronje, *Makka*, ii, 57 ff., 147 (for Mecca); idem, *The Achemen*, i, 210, 212; idem, *Verspreide Geschriften*, iii, 8 ff., 83-5; and R. A. Kern, *De Islam in Indoensia*, The Hague 1947 (for Indonesia); J. S. Trimmingham, *Islam in the Sudan*, Oxford 1949, 146 f. (for Omdurman), and also von Grunebaum, *Musnad*, (*Mawlid* festivals, a general discussion mainly derived from the article *Mawlid in Ef*).


2. In East Africa.

In a region of the Islamic periphery, such as East Africa, the desire to preserve the communal rituals and devotional ceremonies—of which the mawlid is the most popular celebration—is often stronger than in the heartlands of Islam (see Annemarie Schimmel, *Mystical dimensions of Islam*, Chapel Hill, N. C. 1975, 216-17; J. Knappert, *Traditional Suhrawi poetry*, Leiden 1967, ch. 5). For the masses of people in the fringes, Muhammad is the personage behind whose banner the faithful will enter Paradise. Numerous popular tales and poems about him raise him almost to a superhuman level of deification, and these form the basis for much mawlid material; also, the Prophet's life forms the closing section of the voluminous popular cycle on the lives of the 24 prophets who preceded him (see idem, *Suhrawi Islamic poetry*, Leiden 1971, i, ch. 3; idem, *Islamic legends*, Leiden 1985, i, 56-184; and cf. Th. G. Pigou, *The literature of Java*, The Hague 1967, 132). In East Africa, proper *mawlid* poems contain at least some of the successive episodes of Muhammad's life, culminating in his death—the date of this being popularly regarded as the same date as his birth—and the *wafat al-nabi* may comprise an entire book, in prose or verse (see Hemedi bin Abdallah bin Saaid el Buhriy, *Utenzi wa kutawafu nabi*, tr. R. Allen, ed. J. W. T. Allen, Kampaia 1956; similar examples can be quoted in Malaysia and Indonesia). Of these *mawlid* texts proper, by far the most popular in Kenya, Tanzania and Somalia (as also in Malaysia and Indonesia) is al-Barzanjji's one (see section 1. above), contained in a book—first printed ca. 1885 and noted as a red-bound book by Snouck Hurgronje in Atjéh (q.v.) and by Becker in Dar es Salaam—called the Maajma wa l-mawlid sharaf al-andm, the best-known single prayer book in the Islamic world. It comprises prose and poetic verses (nafr and nazm) of al-Barzanjji's mawlid (both also translated into Swahili), the Bunda of al-Bāṣīrī and several other prayers. In Somalia, al-Barzanjji's *mawlidiyya* composition is widely recited during the mawlid celebrations in Arabic form, although a Somali poetic version exists. In *The library of Muhammad b. 'Ali b. 'Abd al-Shaḥkār, Sulūm of Harar*, 1272-921836-75, in *Arabian and Islamic studies ... presented to R. B. Serjeant*, ed. R. L. Bidwell and G. R. Smith, London 1983, 68-79, A. J. Drewes has mentioned three mawlid texts, including apparently Abu '1-Hasan Nūr al-Dīn's *Unṣawāl al-gharif*. After al-Barzanjji's, the most popular mawlid in Kenya and Somalia is the *mawlid* of Shaykh 'Abd al-Rahmān b. 'Ali al-Dībāt al-Zabīdī; the printed editions of this, from Cairo and Aden-Singapore respectively, contain at the end a dated by the mufti of Mecca permitting the use of drums at the mawlid festival. But the mawlid is often performed at other times too, e.g. 14 days after the birth of a child in Tanzania (see C. Velten, *Sitten und Gebräuche der Swaheli*, Göttingen 1903, ch. 2).

**Bibliography:** Given in the article.

(J. Knappert)

*MAWLIDIYYA* (a.) (or *mildiyda*; dial. *mildiyda*), pl. *al*; a poem composed in honour of the Prophet on the occasion of the anniversary of his birth (see *mawlid*) and recited as a rule before the sovereign
and court after ceremonies marking the Laylat al-
mawlid.

A relatively large number of mawlidiyya are extant, drawing their inspiration from the famous Baniat Sa'id of Ka'b b. Zuhayr [q.v.] so often imitated by versifiers, of whom the best known is certainly al-Buṣrī (608-94/1212-97) [q.v. in Suppl.], whose poems enjoy a renown which has never diminished, especially the Burda [q.v.] and, to a lesser extent, the Hamzīyya, which is recited in mosques and zawiyyas during the month of Rabī' I, between the maghrib and 'ishā prayers. Among the mediaeval authors who have left poems classifiable within the category of mawlidiyya may be cited al-Barī (9th/11th century), al-Sansari (d. 556/1160), Ibn al-Djawāzi (510-97/1116-1200 [q.v.]), Ibn Hadjār al-Haytami (909-74/1504-67 [q.v.]) and al-Barzandžī (1040-1103/1630-90). Furthermore, it is possible to gain an overall idea of this production thanks to the four-volume collection made at the beginning of the century by Yūsuf b. Ismā'īl al-Nablānī and published in Beirut in 1920/1922.

In the Islamic West, mawlidiyya were mainly the work of court poets, but also of administrative officials and viziers for whom the composition of poems of this type constituted a part of their professional education; some well-known personalities figure among them, such as Ibn Marzūk (710-81/1310-79 [q.v.]), Ibn al-Khaṭīb (715-76/1313-75 [q.v.]), and above all, Ibn Zamrāk (733-95/1333-93 [q.v.]). Due to the occasional nature of these poems, it is understandable that a large number of poems have not been preserved; the majority of those that survive, thanks, in particular, to the four-volume collection made at the end of the century by Yūsuf b. Ismā'īl al-Nablānī and published in Beirut in 1920/1922.

Generally, the framework of the kātida is respected, but adapted to suit the fundamental purpose of the poet in the sense that, while the apology of the Prophet is preceded by a nasib and a rabīl, it is followed instead by the story of the sovereign which is explicable by the circumstances in which these poems were recited. The nasib contains the traditional recollection of the remains of an encampment, but the author must avoid any allusion to a woman and show the decency appropriate to the situation. He expresses on the contrary the violent passion which he feels for the Prophet, leaving some doubt as to this love, whose true mystical nature is not at all clear. The abandoned encampment is situated on the route that the poet must follow to visit the Holy Places, but, as he is very far distant from them, he calls upon a caravan guide or some pilgrims in order to ask them to bear his greetings to the Prophet and describe to him the ardour of his passion.

This sentimental and moving prologue is followed by a lyrical expansion on the theme, or, more frequently, a narrative full of details borrowed from the traditional rabīl, of an imaginary journey across deserts as far as Medina. It goes without saying that this general theme undergoes numerous variants ranging from an account of the pilgrimage to Mecca to the insertion of panegyric verses or commonplaces on the flight of time, white hair, etc. The Spanish mawlidiyya are always distinguished by a large number of descriptions.

The recollection of the Holy Places introduces the cULogy of the Prophet, which must theoretically be based on reality and never drift into hyperbole. The principal themes concern the birth, foretold by earlier prophets, the signs of prophecy visible from infancy, his miraculous education, etc.; next, the epithets of Muhammad are enumerated; then come his physical and moral portraits; and finally, the description of the miracles that he performed. In this central part of the mawlidiyya, the elements of the panegyric, expressed by means of a profusion of superlatives, are drawn from the Kūfan and kātīlī as well as popular beliefs which have embellished the life of the Prophet with legendary details. It may be remarked further that the poets, idealising his image, adopt some characteristics taken from the Gospels so as to invest the founder of Islam with an aura of sanctity which makes him vie with Jesus.

After the account of the miracles, the versifiers generally express a wish to be able to visit the Holy Places, offer supplications to their "saviour" and invoke God's blessing on him and his Companions.

This invocation, followed by a similar invocation on behalf of the sovereign and mention of the Laylat al-
mawlid, marks the transition to the third part of the mawlidiyya which is often as developed as the second and consists of the panegyric of the reigning prince. This part offers nothing really new corresponding to the classical nasib [q.v.]. The author attributes all the virtues to the mandīsh, who is the restorer of the kingdom and whose arms are always victorious; but his cardinal virtue is naturally generosity, which is appealed to more or less discreetly. After the sovereign come the turns of the heir presumptive and the royal family. To conclude, the poet wishes that the prince's prosperity may endure.

One can hardly expect to find much originality in these compositions crammed with rhetorical flourishes and adorned with clichés which savour of affectation and artificiality. However, the choice of images, the variety of stylistic devices, the subtle play on vocabulary and the constant appeal to the religious or literary culture of the listener, retain a certain attraction.

As well as some poems in classical Arabic, there are many mawlidiyya in dialect which generally contain only the elements of the Prophet: among those which have been preserved—or those which are still composed today—some follow the classical tradition and contain moreover the nasib and the rabīl, but the eulogy of the sovereign does not figure at all in them [see MAMLŪN].


(A. Salmi)

MAWRUR, name given to the kūra of Mornón, currently Mornón de la Frontera, in the province of Seville, to the south-east of the latter and of Carmona and to the south-west of Cordova. The Arabo-Islamic conquest of the territory occupied today by Mornón and its dependencies must have taken place in 927/1427 shortly after that of Shaṭūnā [q.v.] by Tārik b. Ziyād [q.v.].

Mawrūr is also the name of a kūra of the province of Málaga (see J. Valvé, De nuevo sobre Bobastro, in And., xxx [1965], 142, no. 11) and of one (known by the name of el-Mauror) of the hills at the foot of which Granada is situated [see DHRNĀTĀ].

The population of the kūra was constituted of Butr Berbers, or Arabs of the tribe of Djuğāhīm, of neo-Muslims and, to a lesser degree, of Mozarabbs. The region combined all the advantages of plain and
mountain. Cereals, olives and fruit-trees were cultivated there, according to al-Razi and other writers, who add that the area possessed good wells and substantial fortresses, in particular that of Carpio, which is not located today but which some have identified with the Kalb which, according to Ibn Ghālib, al-Himyari and perhaps other writers, was the regional capital (kāʾidāt) of the kāris and the seat of the waṭīl and which possessed a Great Mosque and a very busy market.

Under the amirate, Mawrūr seems to have been nothing more than an agricultural region of which the neighbouring territories were subjected to a raids on the part of the Madāṣis [q.v.], if reliance is to be placed on the Aḥkār madāṣisūt (text, 64; tr. 51). Mawrūr is also mentioned in connection with events occurring at Seville in the period of Ibrāhīm b. al-Hādjī ṣādiqī (al-Udhrī, 103), and with an invasion mounted by Muṣṭarīf, son of the amīr ʿAbd Allāh (ibid., 104). In the time of the amīr al-Hakam [q.v.], the total sum of taxation contributed by the kāri of Mawrūr rose to 21,000 dīnār (al-Himyari, Raʾuf, text, 186, tr. 227) and the number of horses that it supplied for the summer campaigns against the Christians commanded by ʿAbd al-Rahmān b. Muhāmmad, stood at 1403 (Ibn Hayyān, Muktabāt, ed. Makki, text 272). The fortress of Mawrūr was also affected by the consequences of the rebellion of ʿUmar b. Ḥafsūn [q.v.], to such an extent that it became necessary to send several expeditions against these territories, which were ultimately subjected to the authority of Cordova in 31/923-4 (Ibn Hayyān, op. cit., text 115, 167; tr. 139, 192). During the fitna, Mawrūr became the seat of the Berber idšīya of the Banū Dammār or Banū Nūḥ, until the time when, under the third king of the dynasty, Manād b. Muḥāmmad b. Nūḥ (449/1057-66), it was incorporated into the Aḥbāṣīd kingdom of Seville [see ʿAmrānīs and ʿĪsābīlīyah] and experienced the same fate as the latter when it was conquered by the Almoravids.

Judging by the silence of the sources, it may be stated with confidence that no event of note took place at Mawrūr and on its territory under the Almoravids and the Almohads. Cordova fell in 1236, and in 1240 Mawrūr rose to 311/923-4 (Ibn Hayyān, op. cit., 167; tr. 139, 192). Lastly, Bar Ḥaldūs says that an old Persian king gave it the name Bir Hormiz-Kawadh (G. Hoffmann, Auszüge aus syr. Akten pers. Märtynen, 178).

As the metropolis of the diocese of Abdūr, al-Mawṣil took the place of Nineveh, whither Christianity had penetrated by the beginning of the 2nd century A.D. Rabban Ishāʿyahbū, called Bar Kusrā, about 570 A.D. founded on the west bank of the Tigris opposite Nineveh a monastery (still called Mawṣil); its earlier name was Khawālan. The Persian satrap of al-Mawṣil bore the title Būḥā-Adaṣhīrānshāh, so that the official name of the town was Būḥā-Adaṣhīr (Le Strange, Lands, 87; Herzfeld, op. cit., 208). Lastly, Bar Ḥaldūs knew that an old Persian king gave it the name Bir Hormiz-Kawadh (G. Hoffmann, Auszüge aus syr. Akten pers. Märtynen, 178).
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city to whom the Hamdânids belonged. Abu 'l-
Haydâ
came to al-Mawsil in the beginning of
Muharram 293/October 906 and in the following
year subdued the Kurds, whose leader Muhammed b.
Bâllû submitted and came to live in the city.
From this time, the Hamdânîs [q. v.] ruled there,
first as governors for the caliph, then from 317/929
(Nâşir al-Dawla Hasan) as sovereign rulers.
The Uâyûlîs who followed them (386-498/996-
1096) belonged to the tribe of the Banû Ka'b. Their
kingdom, founded by Husâm al-Dawla al-Mukallad,
whose independence was recognised by the Bûyûds,
extended as far as Tâ'ûk (Dâkûkû), the Madâ'in and
Kûlûth. In 489/1095-6, al-Mawsil passed to the
Sâlûjûks.
The town developed considerably under the Atâbêg
Ibrâhîm al-Dîn Zangî, who put an end to Sâlûjî rule in
521/1127-8. The city which was for the most part in
ruins, was given splendid buildings by him; the for-
tifications were restored and flourishing gardens sur-
rounded the town. Under one of his successors, "Izz
al-Dîn Muhammed i, it was twice unsuccessfully besieged
by the Ayyûbîd al-Sâlîh al-Dîn (1182 and 1185 A.D.);
after the conclusion of peace, "Izz al-Dîn, however,
found himself forced to recognise al-Sâlîh al-Dîn as his
suzerain.
The town was at this time defended by a strong citadel
and a double wall, the towers of which were washed on
the east side by the Tigris. To the south lay a great suburb, laid out by the vizier Muhammed al-Dîn
Kâ'tîmâz (d. 595/1199). From 607/1210-11 his son
Badr al-Dîn Lu'lu' [q. v.] ruled over al-Mawsil first as
vizier of the last Zangîds and from 631/1234 as an
independent ruler. In 642/1244-5 he submitted to
Hûlâgû and accompanied him on his campaigns, so
that al-Mawsil was spared the usual sacking. When
however his son al-Malik al-Sâlîh Ismâ'il joined
Baybars against the Mongols, the town was plundered
in 660/1261-2; the ruler himself fell in battle (van Ber-
chem, in Festschrift für Th. Noldeke, Giessen 1906,
197 ff.).
The Arab geographers compare its plan to a
headcloth (lajâsân), i. e. to an elongated rectangle. Ibn
Hawqâl, who visited al-Mawsil in 338/946-7, describes it as a beautiful town with fertile surround-
ings. The population in his time consisted mainly of
Kurds. According to al-Mukaddasî (ca. 375/985-6, the
town was very beautifully built. Its plan was in the
form of a semi-circle. The citadel was called al-
Murâbahâb'a and stood where the Nahr Zubayda canal
joined the Tigris (now I-Kaf'a or Bâsh Tâbiya?; cf.
Hersfeld, op. cit., 209). Within its walls were a
Wednesday market (Sâk al-Arba'â), after which it was
sometimes called. The Friday Mosque built by Mar-
wân stood on an eminence not far from the Tigris to
which steps led up. The streets in the market were for
the most part roofed over. The same geographer (136)
gives the eight main streets of the town (discussed in
Hersfeld, op. cit., 209). The castle of the caliph (Râr
al-Khalîfâ) stood on the east bank, half a mile from the
town, and commanded Nineveh; in the time of al-
Mukaddasî it was already in ruins, through which the
Nahr al-Khawsar flowed.
Ibn Dujayr visited al-Mawsil on 22-6 Safar 580/
4-8 June 1184. Shortly before, Nûr al-Dîn had built
a new Friday Mosque on the market place. At the
highest point in the town was the citadel (now Bâsh Tâbiya); it was known as al-Hadba' "the hunch-
backed", and perhaps as the synonymous al-Dafâ'a
(G. Hoffmann, Auszüge aus syr. Akten pers. Martyren,
178-9; Hersfeld, op. cit., 210), and according to al-
Kâzîmî was surrounded by a deep ditch and high
walls. The city walls, which had strong towers, ran down to the river and along its bank. A broad highway (Şanlı) connected the upper and lower towns (the north-south road called Darb Dayr al-'Aṣā'). In front of the walls suburbs stretched into the distance with many smaller mosques, inns and baths. The hospital (märzān) and the great covered market (şayvariya) were celebrated.

Most houses in al-Mawsil were built of tufa or marble (from the Dja'bal Ḍuklûb east of the town) and had domed roofs (Yâkût, op. cit.). Later, it was given a third Friday Mosque which commanded the Tigris and was perhaps the building admired by Hamd Allâh al-Mustawfi (ca. 740/1339-40).

The site of the ancient Nineveh (Arabic Ninaway) was in al-Muḳādasi's time called Tall al-Tawba and was said to be the place where the prophet Ūnûs stayed when he wished to convert the people of Nineveh. There was a mosque there around which the Ḥamāndân Nâṣîr al-Dawla built hostels for pilgrims. Half a mile away was the healing spring of 'Ayn Ūnûs with a mosque beside it, perhaps also the Şâdjarat al-Yâkîn, said to have been planted by the Prophet himself. The tomb of Nabi Djîrîs (q.v.), who according to Muslim legend had suffered martyrdom in al-Mawsil, was in the east town, as was also that of Nabi Shîth (Seth; cf. Herzfeld, op. cit., 206-7).

The textiles of al-Mawsil were especially famed, and from the city's name came Eng. muslin and Fr. mousseline, although it appears from Marco Polo's mention of muslin cloth as made with gold and silver threads that these luxury cloths differed from the present-day thin and delicate cottons (see Sir Henry Yule, The book of Sir Marco Polo the Venetian, London 1871, i, 57-9; R. B. Serjeant, Islamic textiles, material for a history up to the Mongol conquest, Beirut 1972, 38-9).

The Mongol dynasty of the DjalâliTs succeeded the İlkâns in Baghdâd, and Sultan Şâhâykh Uways in 766/1364-5 incorporated al-Mawsil in his kingdom. The world-querenour Timûr not only spared the city but gave rich endowments to the tombs of Nabi Ūnûs and Nabi Djîrîs, to which he made a pilgrimage, and restored the bridge of boats between al-Mawsil and these holy places.

The Turkoman dynasty of the Ak Köyunlû, whose founder Bahâ? al-Dîn Karâ Uthmân had been appointed governor of Diyârbakr by Timûr, was followed by the Safawids, who took over al-Mawsil after their conquest of Baghdâd in 914/late 1508, but lost it again to Sulaymân the Magnificent in 941/1535, who appointed Sâyîdî Ahmad of Dja'zîrât Ibn 'Umar as its governor. From the year 1000/1592 onwards, we have lists of the Ottoman pağas of the şanîq of al-Mawsil (for long attached to the eyâlet of Diyârbakr), whose tenure of power was usually short-lived; thus from 1048/1638 to 1111/1699-700 there were 40 pağas. Nâdir Şîhâ besieged it in 1156/1743, but the governor Husayn Djalîlî reformed the city and heroically defended it. It was at this time and thereafter that the paşâlîk of al-Mawsil was fairly continuously in the hands of the local family, originally Christians, of ʿAbî Djalîl; Husayn b. İsmâil held this office on eight separate occasions, and the hold of the Djalîlîs was only broken in 1834, when Sultan Mahmûd II extended his centralising power over the derebeyûs and other previously largely autonomous local potentates and removed Yabûb b. Nu mân al-Djalîlî.

European travellers frequently passed through al-Mawsil and mention it in their travel narratives; they often comment unfavourably on the unclean streets and on the sectarian strife there amongst both Muslims and the rival Christian churches. After 1879, the şanîq of al-Mawsil, after being attached to Vân, Hakkârî and then Baghdâd, became a separate vilayet. There was a long tradition of French missionary and educational work in the city, by Carmelites and Dominicans, largely amongst the indigenous Eastern Christian churches. In the later 19th century, travellers describe al-Mawsil's mud brick walls, with their seven gates, as largely ruinous, and record the dominant form of domestic architecture as stone-built houses with sardâb; the population then was around 40,000, including 7,000 Christians and 1,300 Jews.

Bibliography (in addition to references given in the text): al-Mukaddasi, 136-8; Ibn Khurramadîbêh, 17; Yâkût, Mu'âgam, iv, 682-4; Şafi al-Dîn, Marâsid al-ittîhâd, ed. Juynobîlî, i, 84; Ibn al-Ashâr, Ta'rikh al-Dawla al-Atâbakiyya Mu'âlî al-Mawsil, in Recueil des Histoires des Crusades, iv/2, Paris 1876, 1-394; A. Socin, Mosul and Mûrûd, in ZDMG, xxxvi (1882), 1-53, 238-77; xxxvii (1883), 188-222; Le Strange, The lands of the eastern caliphate, Cambridge 1905, 87-9; M. van Berchem, Arabeische Inschriften von Mosul, in F. Sarre-E. Herzfeld, Archäologische Reise im Euphrat- und Tigrisgebiet, i, Berlin 1911, 16-30; Herzfeld, tibd., ii, 190, 203-304 (ch. vii); iii, tables vi-x, lxviii-xx; Sir Charles Wilson, Murray's handbook for travellers in Asia Minor, Transcaucasia, Persia, etc., London 1895, 292-9; H. Longrigg, Four centuries of modern Iraq, Oxford 1925, 35-7, 95-7, 149-52, 158, 233, 284; A. Birken, Die Provinzen des Osmanischen Reiches, Wiesbaden 1976, 179, 192, 203, 222. For the 10th/16th century Ottoman muftîs of al-Mawsil, see B. Lewis, The Ottoman archives as a source for the history of the Arab lands, in JRAI (1951), 149. (E. Honigmann [C. E. Bosworth])

2. Since 1900.

By the beginning of the 20th century, the prosperity and political importance of al-Mawsil were evidently waning, largely because of the opening of the Suez Canal in 1869 had occasioned an immediate reduction in the overland trade between the city and its traditional commercial partners, Aleppo and Damascus. Furthermore, the development of the port of Baṣra and of steam navigation on the Tigris gradually had the effect of substituting the economy of al-Mawsil to that of Baghdâd, which became the entrepot for all the former city's imports and exports.

The effects of the Tanzimât were even more lightly felt in the province of al-Mawsil than in the rest of ʿIrâk, and there is no sign that the various administrative changes had any particular effect in curbing the powers of the local notables and tribal leaders. As noted above, in 1879 the city itself became the headquarters of a vilayet of the same name, comprising the kadi's of al-Mawsil, Kirkûk, Arbil and Sulaymânîyâ, but for the rest of the period of Ottoman rule, the state's control over most of what is now ʿIrâk Kurdîstân was purely nominal, and between 1895 and 1911, one man, Muṣṭâfâ Ẓaḥîbî Şâbindî, was virtual dictator of al-Mawsil town. Far more powerful than any of the numerous ulema sent from Istanbul (see Hanna Batatu, The old social classes and the revolutionary movements of Iraq: a study of Iraq's old landed and commercial classes, and of its Communists, Ba'ithists and Free Officers, Princeton 1978, 289-92). Using Ottoman sources, J. McCarthy (The population of Ottoman Syria and Iraq, 1678-1914, in AAS, xv [1981], 3-44) has calculated that the population of al-Mawsil was 13,500 in 1750, and 6,500 in 1775, and 3,000 in 1834; it was therefore considerably higher than earlier estimates (e.g., see S. H. Longrigg, Iraq 1900 to 1950, 1970, London)
1953, 7). It is even more difficult to establish an accurate figure for al-Mawsil town itself, as it contained several smaller villages, each with its own distinct characteristics. Given in al-`Iraq Yearbook for 1922 (Batau, op. cit., 35).

For most of the First World War, the fighting on the `Iraqi front took place in the Başra and Bağdâd wilâyêts, with the result that al-Mawsil town itself was relatively little affected, and was in fact only occupied by British troops some days after the Armistice of Mudros (30 October 1918; see A. T. Wilson, Mesopotamia 1917-1920: a clash of loyalties, London 1931, 11). The area had been assigned to France in the Sykes-Picot Agreement of 1916, but Clemenceau immediately acquiesced in Lloyd George's request in December 1918 that it should be attached to `Iraq, and thus to the British sphere of influence, provided that France would be assured of equality in the exploitation of Mesopotamian oil (see J. Nevakivi, Britain, France and the Arab Middle East 1914-1920, London 1969, 91-2). Although the mandate for `Iraq was assigned to Britain under the Treaty of San Remo (April 1920 [see mandates]), the Turkish Republican government continued to contest the new `Iraqi state's right to al-Mawsil and the wilâyet was only finally awarded to `Iraq in 1925 after an enquiry carried out by the League of Nations (for details, see C. J. Edmonds, Kurds, Turks and Arabs: politics, travel and research in North-eastern Iraq 1919-1925, London 1957). Oil was struck in commercial quantities near Kirkûk in 1927, and these northern oilfields, exploited until nationalisation in 1973 by the Iraq Petroleum Company, an Anglo-French-Dutch-American consortium, form one of the country's most valuable economic assets.

Under the mandate and monarchy (1920-32; 1932-58) the status of al-Mawsil continued to decline, partly because the inauguration of the new state and the establishment of Bağdâd as its capital inevitably deprived it of its importance as an independent provincial centre, and partly because al-Mawsil wilâyet itself was further sub-divided into four provinces (al-Mawsil, Sulaymaniyya, Kirkûk and Arbût). The city maintained its somewhat conservative reputation throughout the period, and in comparison with Bağdâd and Başra seems to have been relatively little affected by the independence struggles of the 1940s and 1950s. During this period, members of the city's prominent families, notably the Shammar family and members of the Kâshmûla, Khudayr and Shâllâl families, gradually came to acquire legal ownership of much of the land in the surrounding countryside. Such individuals naturally felt threatened by the avowedly revolutionary aims of the government of `Abd al-Karîm Kâsim [q. e.], which came to power on 14 July 1958, and in particular by its immediate introduction of an agrarian reform law.

In March 1959, some of the landowners and their followers joined together with local Arab nationalists and a number of Kâsim's former supporters in the armed forces in an attempt to overthrow his régime, with assistance promised (but not ultimately forthcoming) from Cairo and Damascus. Four days of fighting broke out in the city between the supporters and opponents of Kâsim, in which some 200 people were killed. The attempted coup was unsuccessful, but the incident was to be used many times in the future as a rallying cry for revenge on the part of Ba`thists and nationalists against Kâsim and his leftist allies (ibid. as a visual threat, esp. 58-61, 866-89).

Al-Mawsil was finally connected with the rest of the `Iraqi railway system in 1939, and served by Iraqi Airways after 1946; the existing tertiary colleges in the city were amalgamated into a university in 1967, which has since been expanded considerably. In the course of a provincial reorganisation in 1969, al-Mawsil province was divided into two new units, Nineveh (Ninawâ) and Duhûk. In the 1977 census, al-Mawsil emerged as the third largest city in `Iraq with a population of 430,000, preceded by Başra (450,000) and Bağdâd (2.86 million). In spite of attempts on the part of the central government to promote regional economic development, al-Mawsil is inevitably at a disadvantage through being some distance from the country's main industrial concentrations, 75% of which are located around Bağdâd and Başra. Its principal industries are agriculturally-based, including food-processing, and leather working, but textiles and cement are also produced, and an oil refinery was opened in 1976. The city retains much of its traditional ethnic and religious heterogeneity, and its mediaeval core still remains clearly distinct, despite the intrusion of various unattractive manifestations of modern town planning.


AL-MAWSIL [see IBRİMÎ and İSMÂÎL B. IBRİMÎ].

AL-MAWSİLİ, BAĞ B. AL-KÂSIM B. ABÎ THAWIR, philosopher, writer, is known only as the author of an epitaphological philosophical work entitled Fi l-nafs ("Concerning the soul"). It was written between 278/900 and 328/950 and sent to the distinguished translator and doctor Abî Ubûmûn Saâ'id b. Ya`kûb al-Dimashkî. The author seems to have lived in the Mawsil region, and is not to be confused with another philosopher from that area, Ibn Abî Saâ'id al-Mawsilî. The text deals not with the soul as such, but only with a part of it, the rational soul (nafs nûdha) or intellect (sàfîh). His technique is explicitly that of Thâbit b. Qurra and Plato in analysing the characteristics of the definition of the intellect in order to draw out its essence. The intellect impresses a form upon our sense-data, and what we know can either be acquired (mustafad) from outside of ourselves or not. As Aristotle put it, it is a question of whether the intellect which forms all things is part of the soul or rather something outside the soul—the latter being the normal religious interpretation. Al-Mawsilî argues that the intellect does not acquire knowledge of its own nature, but knowing of itself is being, but rather by reflection of the intellect upon itself. We can indeed make mistakes (e.g. be misled
by imagination), but not if we reflect rationally upon
the first principles (al-awd^it) of logical thought, since
(al-awd^it) are true, real in themselves and their own
emerge, which con-
ments, an encyclopaedic aspect and was given
the indices of the works concerned, but further,
itive sciences
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panies in order to locate the details relating to the various animals presented in the body of the text. It is quite different in the ʿAddār ibn al-madhīkābah of al-Kazwīnī (608-82/1210-93 [q.v.]), which contains an alphabetical series of notes concerning animals in its section on the description of the universe dealing with terrestrial matters. But the efforts deployed in this field reach their culmination in the Ḥayūl al-bayāzin al-kubrā of al-Damārī (742-808/1341-1405 [q.v.]), a true zoological encyclopedia whose great merit is the alphabetical classification adopted by the author and the division of the entries into philological remarks, description of the animal concerned, mentions which are made of it in the Qurʾān and Sunna, whether the consumption of its flesh is allowed or forbidden, proverbs concerning it, medicinal qualities and interpretation of dreams in which it appears. The above details show the spirit in which this compilation was conceived: a useful one, but deprived of originality due to a writer of traditional training who had been unable to draw on works already founded on the mass of texts written initially in Arabic or translated into that language that the public did not always have the leisure or the taste to procure. In any case, al-Damārī lived in an age when intellectual curiosity had waned considerably and had largely lost the openness which had marked the century of al-Djahiz and the Muʿtazila. All the same, shortly after the death of this latter scholar, the religious policy of the caliphate brought to the forefront Muslims disturbed by the turn taken by the rather anarchic quest for knowledge and by the danger to the integrity of Islam that they perceived to be posed by a curiosity which appeared reprehensible. This resulted in according primacy to the Islamic and Arab sciences, to the detriment of foreign ideas already partly acclimatized. Among those who were noted for their conservative attitude, the most characteristic is certainly Ibn Kutayba (d. 276/889 [q.v.]), who opposed the liberalism and eclecticism of al-Djahiz with a programme limited to the needs of various social categories. To the secretaries of the administration, who began to be the real preservers of culture, he proposed a vade-mecum, the Adab al-kāth, in which he adopts the following classification of non-religious knowledge: philosophical disciplines, applied sciences, techniques of public works, principles of jurisprudence, history and ethics. When he is concerned with the training of religious scholars, he adds to philology and ethics the Kurʾān and Sunna, plus some rudiments of falsa [q.v.]. The programme recommended by Ibn Kutayba appeared not to allow any improvement or amplification.

On this point, some progress was nevertheless achieved by his successor, the Cordovan Ibn ʿAbd Rabbih (246-328/850-940 [q.v.]), who remarks that each generation leaves its gift of new knowledge and that consequently, one should summarise and complete periodically the elements of the common patrimony that have been accumulated. In his practical encyclopedia, the Ṣīd, which is richer and more subtle than the Uṣūn al-ḥabbār, the subject matter is divided into 25 chapters, each bearing the name of one of the precious stones of which the "necklace" (ṣīd) is made up. The list is as follows: the ruler, war, generosity, delegations (to the Prophet), addressing kings, "ilm and adab, proverbs, moral exhortations, elegies, virtues of the Arabs, language of the Arabs, retorts, speeches, epistles, the caliphs, Ziyād b. Abīhi, the pre-Islamic battles, poetry, metrics, song, false prophets, madmen, misers, human temperaments, food and drink and pleasures. The coverage of this encyclopedia, whose popular character is evident, hardly allows to glimpse the bounds where it was compiled. Spain, for everything, or almost everything, is borrowed from the Eastern tradition.

After the Ṣīd, the encyclopaedic tendency appears in a more diffuse manner, in the sense that the same writer, when he possesses wide erudition, multiplies the specialised treatises and abstains from proceeding to a synthesis. It is only in the 9th/10th century that the series represented by the Uṣūn al-ḥabbār and the Ṣīd is resumed by a new popular encyclopedia, the Muṣarrat of the Egyptian Ibn ʿĪbghīlī (d. after 850/1446 [q.v.]), who, claiming to be inspired by Ibn ʿAbd Rabbih, nevertheless shows a concern for edification and manages to combine, in a manual written on a relatively limited scale, all that a good Muslim ought to know. It is of some value to enumerate the 84 chapters of this work: the justice of Islam; reason; the Kurʾān; religious and secular knowledge; good manners; proverbs; rhetoric; retorts; oratorical art and poetry; trust in God; advice; moral exhortations; modesty, the sovereign; courtiers; ministers; escaping observation; magistrature; justice; injustice; the way of treating the people; the happiness of the people; qualities and faults; social life; concord; simplicity; pride; boarfulness; nobility; saints; miracles; rogues; generosity; avarice; table manners; magnanimity; promises kept; discretion; perfidy; courage; heroes; praises and gratitude; satires; sincerity and falsehood; filial piety; physical beauty; ornaments and care for the body; youth and health; names; journeys; wealth; kinship, the manner of begging; presents; work; acceptance of one's lot; changes of fortune; slavery; early Arab poetry; oratory; magic; animals; wonders of creation; the djinn; wonders of the waters; wonders of the earth; mines and precious stones; music and song; singers and musicians; singing girls; love; specimens of songs; women; wine; pleasures; anecdotes; invocations; fate; return to God; illnesses; death; patience; the lower world; prayers upon Muḥammad. It would not be impossible to discover in this sequence of chapters an ordering concept, an effort to logical classification which the apparent disorder of the arrangement betrays. Besides, the adab which underpins Ibn ʿĪbghīlī's work is less secular and more ethical. For this author, the best answer for those minds who are profoundly disturbed by the situation of the Arabo-Islamic world is a return to the sources, a recollection of the records of the classical period, which represents a perfect ideal for the average Muslim.

The authors that we are about to cite are not at all concerned with what is happening beyond the frontiers of dār al-Īlam, and the Kitāb al-Maʿṣūrī of Ibn Kutayba is, in this respect, characteristic, for it limits the historical ideas that a good Sunni ought to have: a sacred history from Adam to Jesus followed up by means of traditions relating to the personalities of the "Interval" [see FATRA], genealogies of the Arabs, a somewhat anecdotal history of the caliphs and some celebrities, the religion of the ancient Arabs, sects of
Islam, and finally the kings of Yemen, Syria, al-Hira and Persia. To put it another way, this historian is too mutilated to be assessed, the first author whose Kitāb al-Mahāsin, (225-310/839-934 [q.v.]), Ta'rikh (d. 1056/1645) of al-Tabarî (225-310/839-934 [q.v.]), which has some of the same character as a universal history, much more developed, but the real successor of al-Ya'kūbî is the polygraph al-Mas'ūdi (d. 345/956 [q.v.]) who was led by an extraordinary intellectual curiosity to acquire a truly encyclopaedic knowledge which was able to nourish a series of general works in a historico-geographical framework, of which only some resumés have survived, such as the Ta'rikh and especially the Murūdī. Here, before embarking on his discussion of the history of Muslim rulers also in an anecdotal fashion (this being one of the features of adāb), al-Mas'ūdi presents essential information on the outstanding characters of the world and reproduces lists of kings of peoples foreign to Islam, and notably those of France since Clovis. The encyclopaedic nature of the Murūdī is evident from the index in two volumes which the present author has added to his edition of the Arabic text; it is also illustrated by the citations to be found mainly in later encyclopaedists.

The summaries which we have reproduced above reveal a concern for exhaustiveness which is not, however, accompanied by a logical classification, and it is only among the fulfilta [q.v.], heirs of Greek thought, that one can discover the first attempts if not to establish a hierarchy of the sciences, at least to classify them. Among them, al-Farabī (d. 339/950 [q.v.]) covers human knowledge in a rich and diverse work which lies outside Islam and suggests a classification of the sciences well-known in the Western Middle Ages, thanks to the translation made by Gerard of Cremona (d. 1187) [De scientiis] (i) Linguistic sciences (morphology, lexicalography; syntax; art of writing; art of reading well; poetry and metre). (ii) Logic. (iii) Mathematics (arithmetic; geometry; optics; astronomy; music; metrology; mechanics). (iv) Physics and metaphysics. (v) Political science, jurisprudence and theology.

Whereas the concessions of al-Farabī to Arabism and Islam consist merely of expressing in Arabic terms the linguistic sciences and in Islamic terms jurisprudence (fikāh) and theology (kālim), al-Khāražmī (wrote ca. 366/976 [q.v.]) divides the branches of knowledge into two main categories in his Mafāthīl al-ilmām: sciences of the Islamic law (sharī'ah) and subjects connected with it (fikāh; kālim; grammar; artistic composition; poetry and prosody; history), and foreign sciences (philosophy; logic; medicine; arithmetic; geometry; astronomy. If one excepts: astrology; music; mechanics; alchemy).

Later, the respective parts of the "Arab" sciences and the "foreign" sciences were to distinguish various classifications, which could be illustrated by more developed encyclopaedias than that of al-Farabī (on the classifications of the sciences, see L. Gardet and M.-M. Anawati, Introduction à la théologie musulmane, Paris 1944; 101 ff.; and Ahi Haya' al-Tawbî, Risāla fi l-ilm al-dīn, by M. Bergé, in BEO Damas, xvii [1963-4], 240-98; Ibn Hazm, Marātib al-ilmām. For his part, Ibn Khaldūn (732-808/1332-1406 [q.v.]) distinguishes two main categories of sciences, the religious and the philosophical, but confines himself to a theoretical discussion without encyclopaedic elaboration. It is only right that we should regard as an encyclopaedia the collective work of the Ikhwan al-Safā`ī [q.v.] who discuss in 52 treatises or epistles (risāla) the all the accessible knowledge of their time (second half of the 4th/10th century). Rationalists and heirs of the Greek philosophers, the Mu’tazilis and al-Ḍīhabī, they accept all that can contribute to enrich the cultural patrimony. Their treatises (arranged as follows: 1 to 14: mathematics, logic and ethics; 15 to 30: natural sciences (including philosophy), 31 to 42: metaphysics; and 43 to 52: religion, mysticism, astrology, magic, do not correspond to their own classification which figures in the seventh risāla: I. Sciences of adāb (writing and reading; lexicography and grammar, arithmetic and commercial transactions; poetry and prosody; division, magic; alchemy and mechanics; arts and crafts; commerce, agriculture; animal husbandry; biography and history). II. Positive sciences of the Ṣarī‘a (revelation; interpretation of scriptures; Tradition of the Prophet; jurisprudence; judgments; moral exhortations; preaching; asceticism; Sufism; interpretation of dreams). III. Truly philosophical sciences: mathematics (arithmetic; geometry; astronomy; music); logical sciences (poetics; rhetoric; topoi; apodeictic demonstration; sophistry); natural sciences (basic principles, heaven and earth; generation and decay; meteorology; mineralogy; botany; zoology; medicine; veterinary skill; dressage; agriculture; animal husbandry; crafts); divine sciences (knowledge of the Creator; angelology; psychology; politics; eschatology).

This encyclopaedia, written by Ibn Ṣīnā, is far from having a disinterested goal, for its authors uphold some kind of a thesis; they advocate indeed a radical reform of Islam in order to establish an extremist Ṣīnāism combining the Ṣarī‘a and Greek philosophy as well as the wisdom of the Indians and Persians and ancient paganisms. It corresponds to the modern definition of the encyclopaedia in the breadth of its coverage and the collaboration of a number of authors, mainly anonymous. All the same, it was only favourably received in limited circles of philosophers and Ṣīnāis, and provoked in the following century a remarkable reaction from al-Ghazālī (450-505/1058-1111 [q.v.]) who, in his Ḥaṣā al-dīn al-dīn al-dīn seeks to defend orthodoxy. For him, there are two kinds of sciences: religious, which are obligatory, and non-religious, which are optional, when they are not harmful. The first comprise the usul al-dīn (Kurān; Tradition; consensus omnium; traditions of the Companions) and the fuṣūl (jurisprudence; sciences of the soul), the prophetic sciences (language; grammar; writing) and advanced ones (on the Kurān, Tradition, etc.); theology and philosophy (geometry and arithmetic; logic; natural theology; sciences of nature) are set in order. The second are sometimes commendable (medicine and calculation for example), sometimes blamed (notably magic and talismans; conjuring; spells), sometimes simply allowed (poetry and history for example). This classification appears in the first quarter of the Ḥaṣā on practices of the Islamic cult; it is followed by social customs, causes of perdition and how to ensure one’s salvation. It is in respecting an Islamic ethic developed in this large work that the Muslim
can prepare his salvation in the Hereafter. The collections that we have cited are distinguished by a subjective which is opposed to the relative objectivity of the bibliographical catalogues, which are the most perfect encyclopedia of guidance. The best, the Fihrist, was composed in 377/987-8, hence in the period of the Ikhwan al-Safa', by the Baghdadi librarian Ibn al-Nadim [q.v.], according to a logical plan corresponding to a personal classification of knowledge; generalities on known languages and scripts, materials for writing; revealed books; the Kur'an and Kur'anic sciences; grammar; lexicography; history; poetry and poets; theology according to the various schools and sects; Sufism; Isma'ilism; juriconsults of different schools; ancient and modern philosophers; mathematicians; music; medicine; folklore; various anecdotes; conjuring; magic; equitation; engines of war; games; moral exhortations, maxims; interpretation of dreams; cookery; enchantments; religions other than Islam (notably Manichaeism, in which the Fihrist is one of the principal sources, and the religions of India and China); and alchemy. After Ibn al-Nadim, a number of specialised bibliographies were produced, notably the Fihrist of Muhammad b. al-Hasan al-Tusi (385-460/995-1067 [q.v.]) who reviewed the works written by Shihab, up to the compiling of the famous Kulliyat al-umni of Hadji Khalifa (1017-67/1608-57 [q.v.]), which marks the last stage before the modern catalogues of libraries.

Previously, the biographical genre had undergone considerable development, at first in order to meet the need for knowing the life of the transmitters of traditions in order to know whether the chains of guarantors had any gaps in continuity. The logical division of biographies by tradition had finally given way to an alphabetical classification and resulted in dictionaries such as the Mu'sjam al-adab (to which the Mu'jam al-baladun was added) of Yaqut (d. 568/1270/1271), the three-volume work by Shihab, and the Kufr of Muhammad b. al-Hasan al-Tusi (385-460/995-1067 [q.v.]), the works of Ibn Khallikan (608-660/1211-1268 [q.v.]), and many histories of towns and countries presented in the form of biographies of personalities who were famous in them.

All these works and many others besides, even if it is difficult to regard them as encyclopaedias since they only contain one specific section of information, were to become the instruments of a new form of encyclopaedia born of the vicissitudes of history, particularly of the fear of seeing the disappearance of the vast mass of knowledge accumulated over the centuries and of the concern to salvage at least a part from the irreparable catastrophe represented by the Mongol invasions and the fall of Baghdad in 656/1258. The latter events certainly provoked serious disquiet which was translated into the composition of enormous encyclopaedias intended to some extent to preserve the acquisitions of preceding generations at the moment when the Arabo-Islamic world could be seen as despairing of achieving new progress and felt itself threatened by the worst calamities. In the following centuries, the Black Death (749/1348) was further to aggravate this feeling of insecurity.

Ibn Manzur (630-711/1232-1311 [q.v.]), who left the most highly-developed dictionary of the Arabic language, already clearly expresses this disquiet and the wish to salvage whatever could be rescued from total destruction, when he writes in the preface of the Lisân al-'Arab: "My sole purpose is to preserve the elements of this language of the Prophet... I assert indeed that, in our days, the use of the Arabic language is regarded as a vice. The letter writers are better in foreign languages and rival one another in the eloquence in idioms other than Arabic. I have composed the present work in an age in which men boast of [using] a language different from that which I have recorded and I have built it like Noah built the ark, enduring the sarcasm of his own people."

What applies to the language also applies to the other cultural elements and, setting aside the stylistic clause about sarcasm, Ibn Manzur's enterprise has parallels in other fields. During the "Alexandrine" period (F. Gabrieli, Storia della letteratura araba, Milan 1951, 259), the decline of Arabic culture, under the influence of the events which seriously affected the Islamic world, who benefitted from the translation of the caliphate to Cairo, to launch a new encyclopaedic movement whose principal actors were the high-ranking kuttab.

The earliest is al-Nuwayri (677-732/1279-1332 [q.v.]), whose Nihayat al-arab fi funun al-adab contains all the knowledge that would be necessary for a kuttab assuming important responsibilities: cosmography, zoology, botany, ethics, history. The materials gathered were summarised and methodically arranged according to an Islamic conception of the world, but in a form that was both literary and practical. Then comes Ibn Fadl Allah al-Umari (700-749/1301-49 [q.v.], author of the Masalik al-adab, which seems to be intended on the whole for men of culture and constitutes a geographical-historical encyclopaedia containing a cosmography and information of a religious, juridical, political and administrative character. In spite of evident differences, it is tempting to liken the Masalik to the Adab al-makhlabik of al-Kazwini (see above), who describes the celestial and earthly worlds by borrowing extensively, like al-Umari, from his predecessors. The last encyclopaedia to be mentioned is al-Kalkashandi (d. 721/1418 [q.v.]), whose huge Suhbat al-adab really places at the disposal of its users all that a good secretary could need to know in order to be able to acquire himself perfectly in his profession as writer in the chancellery (sim'at al-inshâ'). In his highly suggestive article on Les classiques du scribe égyptien (in SI, 1963) and 41-80, G. Wiet reproduces the classification of the sciences adopted by al-Kalkashandi: I. BeHs (lettres, lexicography; morphology, grammar; style; rhetoric; the science of tropes; metrics; rhyme; calligraphy; Kur'ân reading). II. Sciences of the law (Kur'an; Sunna; law, etc.). III. Physical sciences (medicine; veterinary skill; falconry; physiognomy; oneiromancy; astrology; magic; talismans; conjuring; alchemy; agriculture; geomancy). IV. Geometry (construction methods; optics; mirrors; centre of gravity; surveying; water-catchment; mechanisms for hoisting objects; water-clocks; engines of war; pneumatic machines). V. Astronomy (astronomical tables; projection of the sphere on a flat surface; sundials). IV. Arithmetic (arithmetically proper so-called; algebra, abacuses, etc.). VII. Practical sciences (politics; ethics; domestic economy). Although these notions did not all undergo considerable development, al-Kalkashandi's encyclopaedia proves that in spite of the reversals experienced by the Islamic world, Arabic culture had lost nothing of its richness in books, but it had exhausted itself since the already distant age of its great prosperity and it was scarcely able to make any more obvious progress. The information gathered scarcely bears, in relation to the preceding centuries, any new features, owing much more to the march of history than to a calculated concern for enrichment.

Thus we have to pass over those authors whose total
work has an encyclopaedic aspect, as for example, al-Suyūtī (849-911/1445-1505 [q.v.]), in order to arrive at the Turk Tashkhoprūzdā (901-68/1495-1561 [q.v.]) who, through his encyclopaedia of arts and letters written in Arabic and then translated into Turkish, aimed to put at the disposal of his compatriots a summary of the knowledge possessed by the Arabic speakers.

Then we have to wait until the second half of the 19th century in order to encounter the first attempt made in the Near East to offer the educated public a working instrument and reference work meeting modern scientific criteria, the Dārīrat al-maḍārif published in Beirut from 1876 by Buṭrus al-Būstānī and continued by other members of his family [see Būstānī in Suppl.]. This encyclopaedia was resumed on a larger scale, from 1956, by F. E. al-Būstānī, who enlisted the collaboration of specialists from all disciplines; the new Dārīrat al-maḍārif is only distinguishable from Western encyclopaedias by language and the place legitimately occupied by the Arabs.

Finally, we should remark that the word mawsūʿa has been used correctly to describe dictionaries of a technical nature, such as al-Mawsūʿa fi ilām al-tābīʿa of E. Ghaleb (Beirut 1965), and also some collections in which each fascicle is devoted to a particular subject, such as al-Mawsūʿa al-saghira published in Baghdad, which is a “cultural, bi-monthly series dealing with sciences, arts and letters”. For example, it contains some studies on “philosophical thought among the Arabs”, as well as on “the petrochemical industries and the future of Arab oil”.

Bibliography: Apart from the EI notices relating to the authors cited, see A. Zaki, Études bibliographiques sur les encyclopédies arabes, Būlāk 1308 (not seen); Ch. Pellat, Les encyclopédies dans le monde arabe, in Cahiers d’histoire mondiale/Journal of World History/Cahiers d’histoire mondiale, UNESCO, ix/3 (1966), 631-58; R. Blachère, Quelques réflexions sur les formes de l’encyclopedisme en Égypte et en Syrie du VIIIe/XIVe siècle à la fin du XVIe/XVIIe siècle, in BEO Damas, xxii (1970), 7-19, repr. in R. Blachère, Andalucia, Damascus 1973, 321-40. For a comparison with the composition of encyclopaedias in Anti-

2. In Persian.

Persian writings of an encyclopaedic character begin to appear about a century after the constituting of Persian as a language of culture. From then onwards they were to enjoy an important florescence until a late date, as much in India as in Persia. According to their contents, they can be divided into different groups. Here, only the major works will be mentioned; for an exhaustive examination of this genre, including the old translations into Persian, see the Persian manuscript catalogues (A. Munzawi, Fihrist-i nushka-hā-yi khafi-yi fāst, i, Tehran 1348-1969, ch. 9; idem, Fihrist-i nushka-hā-yi khafi-yi kitābkhāna-yi Gandbhākhsh, i, Islāmābād 1979, ch. 10; Storey, ii, section F, etc.). One should also consult Z. Vesel, Les encyclopédies persanes. Essai de typologie et de classification des sciences, Paris 1986.

The first Persian encyclopaedia of philosophy is Ibn Sinā’s Dānīgh-nāma-yi ālāt, composed between 414-28/1023-37 for the Kākūyid ruler of Isfahān ālāt al-Dawla Muhammad b. Daḡmānīzāy. This is a compilation of the Aristotelian speculative sciences laid out here in an order different from that of the Shīʿa and the Naḍīq: logic, metaphysics, physics and mathematics. The final section, which includes geometry, astronomy, arithmetic and music, was put together on the basis of the Arabic works of Ibn Sinā and after the death, by his disciple and biographer H. M. Dūr zdānī, the Dānīgh-nāma, in which Ibn Sinā sets forth the hierarchy of the Aristotelian sciences and for the first time elaborates in Persian a vocabulary of philosophical concepts, exercised a great influence on Persian authors (partial edn., Ābū Ḫalīfa Sārū, Dānīgh-nāma-yi ālāt, 2 vols., Tehran 1335-1917; 3 vols., Tehran 1355-1977; a tr. of the whole text by M. Aḥreṣa and H. M. Dūr zdānī, L’encyclopédie de science, Paris 1986, 2nd. edn. revised and corrected by M. Aḥreṣa). Another encyclopaedia of philosophy of great importance is the Durrat al-tādīl li-ghurarat al-Dībhādī of Ḫūṭ al-Dīn Shīrāzī [q.v.], written between 693-705/1294-1306 for the prince of Ghilān Dībādī b. Fīlshāḥ (ed. Mīkhāṭ, 2 vols., Tehran 1317-1990/1938-41). In this, the author deals successively with logic, with the first philosophy (al-falsafa al-ilā), with physics, with mathematics (the quadrivium) and with metaphysics. In an epilogue, he starts on Islamic theology, practical philosophy (hikmat-i tāmāl) and Sūfism. The author was a philos-
subordinate sciences of physics and mathematics is richer than that of the *Djamali* al-ṣawā'id. These encyclopaedias enjoyed wide popularity, and two Persian encyclopaedists tried later to imitate them: Muzann 'Aqīl Rustamashdī in his *Riyāḍ al-dawla*, written in 979/1571 (cf. Munzawi, op. cit., 669; Storey, ii, 359), and Muhammad Fāṭīm Ġaɔrn aikn dusterkî in his *Qāwšār al-ṣawā'id-i hamşāyari* written in ca. 962/1555 (cf. Storey, ii, 358-9). An interesting example is the evolution of the Persian encyclopaedia is provided by Wajīd ʿAli Khān’s *Matlaʿ al-ṣawā'id wa-madārnâ* al-funūn, written in 1261-2/1845-6 (cf. Storey, ii, 366-7).

For other types of encyclopaedic writing in Persian, whether of a specialised nature or from the sphere of *adab* works, see the catalogues of Munzawi, Storey, etc. But regarding the question of the originality of this literature in relation to the Arabic models by which it was largely inspired, this work of evaluation still remains to be done for the majority of the texts.

*Bibliography*: Given in the text.

(Ž. Vesel)

3. In Turkish. (see Supplement).


The Encyclopaedia of Islam owes its existence to the renewed interest in Islam and the Islamic peoples which manifested itself in Europe at the turn of the twentieth century. The idea of such an enterprise, however, dates from a much earlier period. Already in 1697 the French Orientalist Barthélemi d’Herbelot had published in Paris the *Bibliothèque Orientale* or *dictionnaire universel contenant généralement tout ce qui regarde la connaissance des Peuples de l’Orient* (see H. Laurens, *Aux sources de l’Orientalisme*, la Bibliothèque Orientale de Barthélemi d’Herbelot. Publications du Département de l’Islamologie de l’Université de Paris-Sorbonne (Paris IV), vi, Paris 1978). It was to be followed by other classics like the *Déktrat al-ma`ārif* (1876-98) of the Bustānī family (q.v. in Suppl.), T. P. Hughes, *Dictionary of Islam* (London 1885, 2nd ed. 1896), and W. Beale, *An oriental biographical dictionary* (Calcutta 1881, 2nd ed. by H. G. Keene, 1894). But these publications, notwithstanding their merits, could no longer satisfy the increasing general public interested in things Islamic, let alone the European scholars.

Around 1890, Messrs. Trübner in Strassburg envisaged a series of monographs on Semitic philology, in the same way as they had done for Iranian and Indian philology. However, the plan could not be carried out because of the untimely death in 1892 of A. Müller, to whom the work had been confided (see ZDMG, xlii [1892], 776).

In the same year 1892, at the International Congress of Orientalists in London (see *Transactions of the IXth International Congress of Orientalists*, i, pp. xxxviii), W. Robertson Smith proposed the idea of an *Encyclopaedia of Islam*. The initiative of the man who may be considered as the *auctor intellectualis* of the enterprise was accepted by the members attending the Congress, and an international committee of twelve members was established.

At the International Congress of Orientalists held in Geneva in 1894, it was clear that no progress had been made, the more so because Robertson Smith had meanwhile died. I. Goldziher then proposed to put together the direction of the enterprise in the hands of M. J. de Goeje. When the latter declined, the Hungarian orientalist found himself charged with the organisation of the *Encyclopaedia of Islam* (see *Transactions of the IXth International Congress of Orientalists*, i, p. 195, 1305). However, to the dismay of all those who con-
sidered him as the man able to realise the idea, Goldziher handed in his resignation at the Interna
tional Congress of Orientalists held in Paris in 1897 (see Transactions, 1897, Bulletin no. 11; ZDMG, li [1897], 766).

One of the reasons brought forward by Goldziher for his resignation was the decision, taken meanwhile, to have the work printed in Leiden. Consequently, he opined, the editor should reside in Holland. The scientific advisor of Messrs. Brill, Dr. P. Herzsohn, had already started assembling a certain number of entries. A specimen was published in 1897 under the title Erste Sammlung von Stichwörtern für eine Encyclopädie des Islam. Mit erörternden Bemerkungen. Gedruckt als Manuskript, mit Verbehalt einer hier und da noch auszuführenden genaueren Verification, pp. 63, 8°.

At De Goeje's request, Professor Houtsma, not
withstanding a certain scepticism, accepted to replace Goldziher "because I knew to what trouble De Goeje was going to realise the Encyclopædia of Islam".

In 1897 a new international committee had been appointed in Paris, consisting of A. G. Barbier de Meynard (Paris), E. G. Browne (Cambridge), I. Goldziher (Budapest), M. J. de Goeje (Leiden), I. Guidi (Rome), J. Karabacek (Vienna), C. Landberg (Tübingen), V. von Rosen (St. Petersburg), A. Socin (Leipzig) and F. de Stoppelaar (Leiden).

In order to get some idea of the readiness of his col-
leagues to collaborate, Houtsma asked several of them what kind of articles they were ready to write, and invited them to send one or more articles in order to have them printed at Brill's and to submit them to the opinion of the experts. The answers were positive, and in 1899 Houtsma was able to publish a Specimen of a Muslim Encyclopædia by a number of Orientalists. It consisted of several monographs, arranged alphabetically and written in English, French and German by sixteen future collaborators. In the Preface, Houtsma remarks that no agreement had as yet been reached about the language in which the Encyclopædia was to be published. In the same year 1899, Goldziher presented this Specimen to the members of the Com-
mittee present at the xiii International Congress of Orientalists in Rome (see Acta, i, pp. clxxix ff.), who accepted it favourably. While waiting for the resolu-
tion of the financial problems, Houtsma and Herz-
sohn were correcting and completing the list of entries.

At the first session of the recently-founded Interna-
tional Association of Academies (Paris 1901), a proposi-
tion of the Academies of Leipzig, Munich and Vienna for the publication of an Encyclopædia of Islam was admitted into the working plan, after approval by the literary section. Under the presidency of De Goeje, a Committee was appointed in order to study the project of the enterprise, and Houtsma was charged with the editorship. The Committee consisted of Goldziher, Browne, Barbier de Meynard, Von Rosen, Guidi, Karabacek (all already appointed at the Paris Congress of 1897), and Chauvin (Brussels Academy), Buhl (Copenhagen Academy) and Fischer (Leipzig Academy, Socin having died in 1899).

A smaller Committee, consisting of De Goeje, Goldziher and Karabacek, was charged with drafting by-laws, which were completed in 1902. The costs were calculated at 140,000-150,000 marks for ten years. Financial support was promised by the Academies of Amsterdam, Budapest, Christiania, Copenhagen, Lisbon, Madrid, Munich, St. Petersburg, Vienna, the Academy of Saxon, the Academy for Inscriptions et Belles Lettres, the Reale Accademia dei Lincei, the Gouvernement Général de l'Algérie, the British Academy, the Dutch Colonial Government, the Italian Government, the Dutch Company of Commerce in Amsterdam, the Deutsche Morgenländische Gesellschaft, the Deutsche Kolonialgesellschaft, the Senate and municipal council of Hamburg, the Egyptian Government, the Johns Hopkins University of Baltimore, the Theological Seminary of Hartmann, who resigned in the same year, was replaced by H. Bauer. As president of the Executive Committee, De Goeje had been succeeded by Chr. Snouck Hurgronje, who had been able to redress the financial position.

As for the editorial work, Houtsma may be quoted. "Apart from a few exceptions, my collaborators are all Christians, and belong to quite different peoples. It is the Editor's task to maintain the scientific and neutral character of the work on a high and impartial level, and to be very careful not to entrust articles to incompetent hands. On the other hand, scholars whose scientific qualities are above all suspicion, can-
man un, radd, haldk, such as and its variant mânun, radd, haldk, himdm, hayn and bilâ convey particular connotations and are less frequently used and regarded as more literary. The term for death waâfât, more exactly "accomplishment, fulfilment", i.e. of a man's term of life, is in origin Kurânîc, and stems from the use in the early Medinan period of the verb tawwûf fâ'în to describe how God brings to its close a man's foreordained period of life and gathers the man to Himself; hence the use of the passive form of this verb tawwûffya "his term was brought to an end [by God]" = "he died". The idea behind the use of this verb is closely connected with the use in the Kurân of other verbs like kadârân and kadâ which carry the sense of God's predetermining a man's lifespan or executing His decree concerning a man's term of life (see T. O'Shaughnessy, Muhammad's thoughts on death, Leiden 1969, 37 ff.). In modern Arabic, waâfât has a more delicate and euphemistic sense than the stark word maut, something like Eng. "demise, decease" and Fr. "décès", with al-mutawaffd meaning therefore "the deceased". The same distinction is made in Turkish between the bald âlam "death" and waâfât, modern Turkish ooffat, and in Persian between morg and waâfât and such terms as faaze (A., literally "passing away, disappearing").

The conception of death held by the Arabs prior to the advent of Islam was deeply rooted in the animist beliefs inherited from their distant past. Taken to be a manifestation of disruptive action on the part of dahr [g.v.] "time-destiny", death was considered the specific delimitation of the animate world, a concept uniting humans and animals as opposed to the physical world, inanimate and therefore imperishable. It was defined, in these terms, as the extinction of the vital spirit which animates beings endowed with life, as the separation of the body and the organic soul. As it is known that the residences most frequently attributed to a man's "double" are the blood and the breath, it may be understood how the Arabs could believe that in the case of violent death, the double (karâma) is released through the flowing of the blood and that, in the case of "natural" death, it escapes through the nose; hence the expression mâta hafta anfhi.

Furthermore, while it is accepted, as stressed by the Kurân, that the ancient Arabs had no conception either of the resurrection of the dead or of life in the Beyond, they seem nevertheless to have believed in the survival of the dead. Two terms which evoke wandering and thirst, hâmâ and sadâ, denote these spirits of the dead. But, unlike other Semitic peoples, such as the Hebrews for example (cf. A. Lods, La croyance à la vie future et le culte des morts dans l'antiquité israélite, Paris 1906), the ancient Arabs did not entertain the idea of a special world of the dead, a world of shadows and of gloom. In addition, for them it was inconceivable that their dead might be disgraced.
Only the spirits of the dead deprived of burial and those whose blood had not been avenged were left to wander, thirsting, in desert lands. To abandon its fate, to re-affirm with respect to their dead the validity and permanence of tribal solidarity. But, while doing this, they did not also seek to assure themselves of the protection of these dead? The existence of a cult of the dead among the ancient Arabs is a much debated question (see in particular: I. Goldziher, Le culte des ancêtres et le culte des morts chez les Arabes, Fr. tr., Paris 1885; Lods, op. cit.; H. Lammens, L’Arabie occidentale avant l’hégire, Beirut 1928, 151 f.). In spite of differing opinions and the scarcity of reference documents, it seems probable that the Arabs did, at one point in their history, practice the cult of the dead. But this cult, which belongs, as Lods emphasises, to “an inferior stage of religion”, seems, in the period immediately before Islam, to have completely disappeared under the combined impact of the sedentarisation of the tribes and the emergence of polytheism. Only the rites rendered to the deceased immediately after death (washing of corpses, mourning and interment) were perpetuated. The other rites, such as sacrifice or offering, were reserved for the gods. (On the funeral rites and their significance, see M. Abdesselem, Le thème de la mort dans la poésie arabe, des origines à la fin du III/IX siècle, Tunis 1977, ch. ii).

But this ancient cult of the dead has, by extending beyond death the fulfilment of the duty of tribal solidarity, contributed to the sanctification of blood lineage, thus giving solid foundations to the social system of the Arabs and perpetuating, over the generations, the same moral ideal (cf. B. Farès, L’honneur chez les Arabes avant l’Islam, Paris, and id.). This ideal enables the Arab to contemplate death without fear and to place the preservation of his honour and the honour of his group above the preservation of his life. This is clearly shown in the themes developed in pre-Islamic poetry and especially in the eulogistic nature of the dirges [see MAHTABA].

Islam is to appeal to the Arabs to adopt a radically different conception of death. This conception results from a new definition of the soul and of life. According to the Qurʾān, man is moved by two distinct principles, one thinking and the other vital: nafs and ruḥ, as the washing of the dead, the shroud and interment; ruḥ is the principle of life which proceeds from God and is enlivened and given substance by Him. Birth and death are divine decrees. Parents do not give life. Events are not the cause of death. These are only the intermediaries through which the will of God is realised.

This new definition of life revolutionised the metaphysical and moral conceptions of the Arabs. Life being no longer immanent, the opposition between the animate and inanimate world loses all foundation and gives way to a new conception whereby God, the creator, source of life, is opposed to everything that is not Him and which, therefore, is the creation, including the physical world whose permanence is only an illusory appearance.

The existence of, and by affirming that life proceeds from God and not from the group and that “the loins

of fathers and the womb of mothers are [only] receptacles” (Qurʾān, VI, 98), Islam confers on the life of the individual a new significance and on his action a new perspective. First, the life of the individual becomes sacred. “Except with justice, do not kill your fellow-man whom God has declared sacred” (Qurʾān XVII, 33). This is a new precept for the Arabs. Hitherto, only the blood of the group could not be spilled. Henceforward, only those who refuse to recognise the authority of God or seriously contravene His commandments may legitimately be killed. By substituting the notion of the community of faith for that of the community of blood, Islam led the Arabs to liberate themselves from the ascendancy of the clan and to take cognisance of their existence as free and responsible persons. Even though the believers are declared brothers, they are individually responsible for their actions before their judges in this world as well as before God on the final day of judgment.

The echoes of the debates which have brought into prominence these notions and the place occupied by the evocation of the afterlife and the final day of judgement in the Qurʾān, show to what an extent such a message would overturn the beliefs of the Arabs. Death is no longer the end of life. It is only the appointed time (aggal), decreed by God to conclude the period of man’s testing in this world. The post-mortem fate of man is no longer dependent on the solidarity of the group, but on the action of the individual and the mercy of God. External happiness or damnation is now the question that each person is required to ask himself and to which none can reply with certainty. This lack of certainty led the Arabs to experience a sentiment which had until then been unknown to them, anguish. This was quite clearly reflected in a new poetic genre, the zubhitayn [q.f.].

Thus it was not only the beliefs of the Arabs which were revolutionised by the Qurʾānic message, but also their attitudes and their behaviour. It may be noted, in this context, that the funeral ceremony, the djennaz [q.f.], also underwent profound modifications. Certainly, Islam has retained some ancient practices such as the washing of the dead, the shroud and interment; but is has forbidden certain pagan rites such as lamentations or offerings and, above all, it has introduced a new obligation, the prayer for the dead which confers upon the entire funeral ceremony a radically different significance. This is no longer a glorification of the dead but an appeal for divine mercy. For an ethic of exaltation Islam has substituted a morality of humility.

Bibliography: Given in the article.

MAWWAL [see MAWWALAY]  
AL-MAWZÃ”, SHAAMS AL-DIN ABD AL-SAMAD B. ISMAIL B. ABU AL-SAMAD (d. after 1031/1621), the author of an important independent chronicle of early Ottoman Yemen to 1031/1621-2, particularly of the south and of the city of Taʾizz. As his nisba, al-Mawzaʾi (mistakenly given as al-Manzil in Brockelmann, S II., 550), indicates, the family originated in the Tihama town of Mawzâ, south of Zabid; but his residence was at Taʾizz, where, like his father before him, he served as a ʿAbbiʿ magistrate and teacher. Being a prominent member of the town’s Sunnites jallâd, and closely connected with the region’s Ottoman officials, it is not surprising that his chronicle, al-Thanū fī dhikrī himl al-Yaman taht sīl addâl al-Uthmân, which for the later period is rich in precise details, is sympathetic in tone to the Turks and hostile to the Zaydi imams. It is difficult to determine how much, if any, of the work’s
content was contributed by the author's father who, it is disclosed, planned a similar chronicle before his death.

Bibliography: As al-Mawzá’i’s name appears in none of the known biographical and other source books for the area and era, we have to rely on what he reveals about himself in his chronicle, and this has been summarised by Mustafá Sálim, Al-Mu‘arrífiyy al-Yamaniyyin, Cairo 1971, 55-63. For the mss. of al-Ilhán (in particular Paris 5973), consult A. F. Sayyid, Ma‘ādir ta‘rikh al-Yaman, Cairo 1974, 225-6. See also F. Babinger, GOW, 150-1. (J. R. Blackburn)

Mawzúna [see sikra].

Maybudi, a small town in the shahrastán of Ardakan [q.v.] in the modern Persian šūtr or province of Yazd, situated 32 miles/48 km. to the northwest of Yazd. The mediaeval geographers (e.g. Ibn Hawkâf, 263, 287, tr. Kramers and Wiet, 260, 281; Hudud al-šām, tr. Minorsky, § 29.45; 6. Strange, Lands, 265) describe it as being on the Farsá-Yazd road, 10 farágás from Yazd. Lying as it does on the southern fringe of the Great Desert, its irrigation comes from kandts [q.v.].

West of Yazd. The mediaeval geographers (e.g. Ibn Hudsúd al-^dlam, [q.v.]) describes it in the form there to the limits of their strength. Of these three propositions, it seems the attribution of maydân to the m-y-d is the most plausible.

According to the sporting activities which took place there, the maydân represented the hippodrome or race course (balâhe) when used for horse races (šîbk), the ring or display ground for equestrian manoeuvres and exercises which grew out of the arena or has for mock-battles, jousts and symbolic armed tournaments between the mounted groups, and the pitch for the ancient and traditional games of polo and “lacrósse”, saulagádân, avčgán [q.v.] and gdér [q.v.] or burgági/birgági. In his Khātā, al-Ma‘ǎrzî relates, with regard to the ancient site of Sanarita in the Oasis district of Egypt, that its founder, the Coptic king Mināktuš, also founder of the town of Aḥmâm [q.v.], was the first to construct maydâns for the equestrian training of his courtiers; in its use as a drill-ground, the maydân soon became indispensable for the training of cavalry, a military element which grew considerably in importance with the rise of Islam.

When not engaged in military campaigns, the Muslim trooper (quandî) spent much of his time on the maydân, perfecting his skills in mounted archery, shooting either at a target (burgági) placed at the top of a lance or at “gourd-shooting” (kaｂâk) suspended from the end of a long sparrow; this latter exercise, introduced by the Turks, became the object of keen competitions. Shooting of the style known as uktî (Turkish ủkî) at a large target (hadaf tamâm) placed at long distance (500 yards), and with a wheel, was a kind of pattern called maydân, required archers capable of a range of 200 metres and more. Short-range precision shooting (uktî kâşî) was aimed at a small target at a distance of no more than 70 metres. Pure long-distance shooting without a target (nifâfî) was practised only at a fairly late stage by the sultans. To the north of Istanbul there still exists the Ok Meydân “field of the arrow” founded by sultan Mehmed II (855-86/1451-58), at the end of which stand some twenty commemorative plaques marking the record distances achieved since this period; thus it is known that in 1213/1798 sultan Selim III shot an arrow to a distance of almost 900 metres. It was also at a late stage that there was practised, on the maydân, shooting with the crossbow, at a target, with bolts and quarrels.

All these sporting activities had, in fact, no object other than military training, and every town with a Muslim garrison of any importance had one or more maydâns; al-Fūrūzābâdi mentions in this context (al-Kâmûs al-muḫti, s.v.) those of Nîshâpûr, Iṣfâhân, Khârâzam and Baghdâd. In the last-named, the first maydân, according to al-Yâ’kûbî, Baldûn, tr. Wiet, 37, 41), extended along the left bank of the Tigirs, near the palace of the vizier al-Fâdî b. al-Râbî’i [q.v.].

Under the Mamlûk sultans, the construction of a maydân constituted a large-scale project and mobilised
a considerable labour-force; it was necessary, in
effect, to level a surface of sufficient size ... (terrestrial things).
They are divided up into numerous chapters, and
these, in their turn, into further not expressly

By metonymy, the term maydàn (sometimes with the plural maydān) was applied to the exercises of mounted formations, and works devoted to furūsiyya present diagrams of these exercises which were per-formed by numerous groups of horsemen according to a well-established pattern (tariib al-mayddn). The major western riding schools, even today, give an accurate impression in public performances of the likely nature of these complex and interwoven movements of squads of troopers with their colourful banners.

In figurative usage, maydan evokes the confronta-tion of two parties, in the expressions maydan al-barb ("field of battle"), talaba li-’l-maydân ("challenge to combat"), nābâr al-maydân (the day of battle). Among the Marazig of southern Tunisia, muddîn (pl. maddîn; "turf") denotes "fray" (see G. Bosis, Lexique..., Paris 1956, i: 92).

Alongside this limited sense, maydân is, like the French "champ", the English "field" and the German "Feld", extended to the broad sense of "domain of activity", physical, intellectual or spiritual.

characterised sub-chapters, arranged, as a rule, according to the subjects that are treated, and not alphabetically; said to have been lithographed at Tehran 1265/1849, 1267/1851, 1272/1856, 1273 and 1274/1857, 1275/1859, 1294/1877, and 1298/1880. India 1284/1867; numerous ms. (e.g. Bursa, Haraç-çadde/olug, lugat, no. 15 [556/1169; cf. H. Ritter, in Orients, ii (1949), 239; Berlin [Ahwardi], no. 7040 [ca. 600/1203]; Chester Beatty [Arberry], no. 3028 [631/1233]; Topkapi Sarayi [Karayat], no. 7556 [1237–635]; Cetin, in IA, vii, 178 f.; Şehen, op. cit., ii, 458, Tehran. Dünneğah [Dünsen Paghüh], no. 1373/ [629/1283]. Storey, iii, 81f; d. Täbris n.d. [q.v.]. The obliquity of the ecliptic is the basic parameter of spherical astronomy. Since it varies with time (Hudud al-Salam, tr. Minorsky, 103, § 23.12; Mustawfi, Nazha, 157–8, tr. 155; Le Strange, Lands, 394).

In mediaeval times, it was the chief settlement of the district of Khawaran or Khâvaran which lay between Ahwardi and Sarakhs [q.v.]; by Yakût’s time, Mayhana itself had largely decayed, though Mustawfi describes Khâvaran as a whole as flourishing, with good crops and cereals and fruit (Hudud al-Salam, tr. Minorsky, 103, § 23.12; Mustawfi, Nazha, 157–8, tr. 155; Le Strange, Lands, 394). Its main historical fame is as the birthplace in 357/967 of the Sufi saint and thaumaturge Abu Sa’d Fadl Allah b. Abi l-Khayr, who alternated between residence there and in Nishâpur for most of his life till his death at Mayhana in 440/1049 (see Abu Sa’d b. Abi l-Khayr to the references there add F. Meier, Abi Sa’d-i Abu l-Hayr (357–440/967–1049), Wirklieheit und Legende, Tehran–Lège 1976). Mustawfi quotes verses praising the Mayhânî and other great men from Khâvaran, including the minister of the Saljûq Topkâr Beg, Abî Sâlî Shâhdân, and the poet Anwâr [q.v.].

Mayhana is now a town situated some 14 miles/20 km. within the Turkmenistan SSR and appears on modern maps as Meana. Bibliography (in addition to references given in the article): H. Halm, Die Ausbreitung der städtischen Rechtsschule von den Anfängen bis zum 8. Jahrhundert, Wiesbaden 1974, 83; Meier, op. cit., 39 ff. (C. E. Bosworth)

**AL-MAYL (a.), declination, an important notion in spherical astronomy. Declination is a measure of the distance of a celestial body from the celestial equator. Muslim astronomers tabulated either the declination and right ascensions of stars or their ecliptic coordinates [see **MAŠTAM**]. Also of concern to them was the solar declination, mayl al-šams. They distinguished two kinds of solar declination, mayl al-aqwa’il, the distance δ₁ of the sun from the ecliptic measured perpendicular to the celestial equator, and mayl al-šâhî, the distance δ₂ of the sun from the ecliptic measured perpendicular to the ecliptic; see Fig. 1.

\[ \delta_1 = \sin \lambda \sin \varepsilon \] 
\[ \delta_2 = \arctan \left( \frac{\sin \lambda \sin \varepsilon}{\cos \lambda} \right) \]

Both functions were tabulated in zijîs [see zijî], usually for each degree of ecliptic longitude \( \lambda \). The underlying formulae in modern notation are

\[ \delta_1(\lambda) = \sin(\sin \lambda \sin \varepsilon) \]
\[ \delta_2(\lambda) = \arccos \left( \frac{\sin \lambda}{\cos \lambda} \right) \]

\( \varepsilon \) is the obliquity of the ecliptic, called in Arabic al-mayl al-a’lam or al-mayl al-kulî.

The obliquity of the ecliptic is the basic parameter of spherical astronomy. Since it varies with time,
Muslim astronomers over the centuries conducted observations to derive the current value. Most of them did this by means of meridian observations of the sun at the solstices. If $h_{\text{min}}$ and $h_{\text{max}}$ are the solar meridian altitudes at the winter and summer solstices at a locality with latitude $\phi$, then

$$h_{\text{min}} = 90^\circ - \phi - \text{e} \quad \text{and} \quad h_{\text{max}} = 90^\circ - \phi + \text{e}$$

see Fig. 2. Clearly, from such observations $\text{e}$ may be found using

$$\text{e} = \frac{1}{2} (h_{\text{max}} - h_{\text{min}}).$$

Fig. 2.

Likewise, the local latitude $\phi$ can be determined from the same observational data. The most complete discussions of the subject were by Ibn Yunus and, more especially, al-Biruni [q.v.].


**MAYMANA,** a town of northwestern Afghanistan (lat. 35° 55' N., long. 64° 67' E.), lying at an altitude of 2,854 feet/870 m. on the upper reaches of the Ab-i Maymana which pours out in the desert beyond Andkhûy [q.v.] and the sands of the Kâš Kum [q.v.].

The site of the settlement seems to be ancient. The *Vendidad* speaks of Nisâya, and the 8th century Armenian geography of Iran records Naisian = MP * Nisâk-i Miâyânâk “the Middle Nîsâ”, possibly identical with Proboly’s Nusâd in Margiana (Marquart, Kamârâb, 78-9). This seems to have been where lay the town known in early Islamic times as al-Yahûdîya (Horâdî al-sââm, tr. Minorsky, 107, § 23.53, cf. comm. 335: Dâhîdâlân), indicating a sizeable community of Jews there. Al-Yâkûbî, *Buldân*, 287, tr. Wiet, 99, al-Istakhri, 270, Ibn Hawkal, ed. Kramers, 442-3, tr. idem and Wiet, 427-9, al-Mukaddasi, 427-9, describe the town as a flourishing one, with a Friday mosque, and as the seat of the ruler of Faryabd of the principality of Güzûn, which remained independent till incorporated into the Ghaznavid empire by Sultan Mahmûd [see *mpûzân* and *fârîquûns*]. Yâkût, *Buldân*, ed. Beirut, ii, 194, calls it Dâhîdâlân al-Kubrâ, presumably to distinguish it from the Yahûdîya of Isfâhân.

The actual name Maymana “the auspicious, fortunate town” does not occur in the 3rd-4th/29th-10th century texts. It is possible that a form Maymand existed by the 7th/13th century, since it apparently occurs in some manuscripts of Dâhîdâlân’s *Tabâkât-i Nâşiri* (though the latest editor, *Abd al-Ha[y] Habibi, adopts the reading Maymana for his text, 2nd ed. Kâbul 1342-3/1963-4, i, 358, 374, whereas the manuscript(s) which Raverty used for his translation, London 1881-99, ostensibly had Maymand, cf. i, 378, 391, 399); but the Maymand which was the family origin of the great Ghaznavid vizier Ahmad b. Hasan Maymandi [q.v.] was almost certainly one in Zâbulistân, the region around Ghazna. It is certainly the form Maymana which is henceforth used for the town in Afghan Türkistân.

Towards the close of the 17th century, Maymana was under Uzbek control, being one of the petty, semi-independent kâhânates (together with Sâr-i Pul, Shîbârgâhân and Andkhûy) known as the Çahâr Wilâyât, and oriented essentially towards the Bukhârâ Kâhanât. The Hungarian traveller Vâmbéry visited it in 1863 and describes the town as possessing 1,500 mud-brick houses and a dilapidated bazaar. The Afghân amîr of Kâbul Dûst Muhammad [q.v.] disputed possession of Maymana with Bukhârâ in 1855, and only with the Anglo-Russian agreement of 1873 did the four kâhânates come definitely within the orbit of Kâbul; not till 1844 did the amîr *Abd al-Rahmân Kâhân [q.v.] secure the submission of the *awliyâ* of Maymana.

At present, Maymana, lying as it does within a fertile agricultural area, and being on the Harat to Mazar-ı Sharif road, is a flourishing town, the administrative centre of a wilâyât or province (since 1964, called that of Faryâb), and with a population (mainly Uzbek, but with some Tadjiks and Pushtuns) estimated by Humlum at 30,000. It has an airfield and is important for the weaving of fine carpets and for wool and camels’-hair textiles.


**MAYMANDI,** Abu ’l-Kâsîm Ahmad b. Hasan, called Shams al-Kûfî “sun of the capable ones”, vizier of sultans Mahmûd and Mahmûd b. Ghazna [q.v.]. He was a foster-brother of Mahmûd, and had been brought up and educated with him. His father had been *gambari* of Bust under Sebûtîgin, and apparently stemmed from Maymand in Zâbulistân; but on a charge of misappropriation of the revenue, he was put to death. In 384/994, when the Amir Nûb b. Mansûr the Sâmânî conferred on Mahmûd the command of the troops of Khurâsan, Mahmûd put Ahmad at the head of his correspondence department. After this, Ahmad rapidly rose in the service of his master, and occupied in succession, the posts of *mufti*-i Mamlakât (Accountant General), *Sibîh-i Divân-i ‘Arâf (Head of the War Department), and *gambari* of the provinces of Bust and Ruhkhalâhid. In 404/1013, Sultan Mahmûd appointed him wa‘iz in place of Abu ‘l-‘Abâs b. ‘Abâs b. Daiqân. Ahmad Isfârî’î, for twelve years, Ahmad managed the military and financial affairs of the growing empire of Sultan Mahmûd with great tact and diplomacy. Ahmad was very strict and exacting, and did not tolerate any evasion of duty or departure from the usual official procedure, with the
result that many of the dignitaries of the Empire became his enemies and worked to bring about his ruin. He was disgraced and dismissed in 415/1024, and sent as a prisoner to the fort of Qal'ān, in the southern Kāshmar hills.

After his accession to the throne in 421/1030, the new sultan Mas'ūd b. Māhmūd, whose cause Ahmad had always favoured, wished to re-appoint him vizier in 422/1031 in place of the disgraced Ḥasanak [q.v.]; ostensibly on account of his age, Ahmad was reluctant to accept, and before doing so, insisted on a mawdu'a [q.v.] or contract defining his own duties and rights wāsii-vāsii the sultan and other ministers. He died in Muharram 424/December 1032, much mourned, according to Bayḫākī, by other members of the bureaucracy.

From both his competence and learning, Ahmad subsequently enjoyed a great reputation as a vizier and stylist; Ṭabī'ī expressly prai sm him for his restoration of Arabic as the official language of the āwāli, whereas Ḥisārānī had—no doubt—more realistically—introduced the use of Persian, so that “the bazaar of eloquence had suffered loss, the traffic in fine expressions and beautiful language had perished, whereas Isfahān—no doubt, more realistically—introduced the use of Persian, so that “the

Maymanī contributed actively to the MMIA, and it is typical of him that in his capacity as a corresponding member (being of Pakistani nationality) of the recently-created Indian Academy of the Arabic Language, he contributed the first article to the first issue of the Majallat al-Mādīnā [q.v., Simt al-laṭīfī fi Ṭabārā Amālī ‘l-Kāli, Cairo 1354/1936, 3 vols.]

A member of the Arabic Academy of Damascus, al-Maymanī contributed actively to the MMIA, and it is typical of him that in his capacity as a corresponding member (being of Pakistani nationality) of the recently-created Indian Academy of the Arabic Language, he contributed the first article to the first issue of the Majallat al-Mādīnā [q.v., Simt al-laṭīfī fi Ṭabārā Amālī ‘l-Kāli, Cairo 1354/1936, 3 vols.]

After winning his freedom, he remained in Kūfa until the turbulence of the Dayr al-Dajmāʾīm [q.v.], which pitted the Shāfs to the Umayyads and the Shīʿīs against the Umayyad authorities; presumably because of his neutral or pro-Umayyad sympathies, Maymūn moved at this time to the Djiṭāra, where he became the leading figure among the local men of religion at Ṭakka. A few accounts describe him as having made the pilgrimage to Mecca and as having visited Baṣra, where he had an interview with the famous saint al-Ḥasan al-Baṣri; but travelling does not seem to have been his main activity, and most sources describe him simply as the sage of Ṭakka.

Maymūn is remembered in numerous accounts for his religious and ethical maxims. Most of these emphasise such themes as the dangers of wealth and gluttony or the importance of God-fearing piety and of good works, but they also include some which can be considered as at least mildly anti-Shīʿī, while others suggest an effort to strike a politically non-committal pose: “Do not speak about four things: ‘Ali, ʿUthmān, kudur, and the stars”. Although he served as a source of religious and ethical guidance, however, he does not seem to have been much concerned with the transmission of hadiths, which were just beginning to be circulated widely in his day. As a transmitter of hadiths he is generally adjudged reliable (ṣīḥa); but among his maxims is one that stresses the primacy of the Kurān over the “hadiths of men” as a source of guidance, and only about two dozen hadiths on his authority (mostly via Ibn ʿAbbās or ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿUmar); others are extant. A good number of these hadiths deal with ritual law; a few deal with sectarian or political issues, which of clearly major ʿAlī (e.g. Abū Nuʿaym, Ḫalīfa, iv, 49 on the Rāḍḥaf), and which generally are slightly anti-ʿAlīd in tone. Some of these “hadiths” are doubtful sayings of Maymūn himself or of his informants, which his pupils “raised” to the status of prophetic utterances. Accounts going back to Maymūn also convey considerable information about several central figures among the Companions of the Prophet and their successors, e.g. ʿUthmān, ʿĀlī, Muʿāwiya, Ibn ʿAbbās, ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿUmar, Ibn Sirīn, al-Ḥasan al-Baṣri and Saīd b. al-Muṣayyab—including several significant awālī (e.g. Muʿāwiya who is the first who sat between the two khaṭhas; ʿĪd al-ḥarām, v, 105).
Maymún's close ties to the Umayyads are reflected both by the fact that he held office for some of them and by his many accounts of the activities of 'Umar b. 'Abd al-'Azîz (ruled 99/1017-20) and some other members of the dynasty. He is first said to have administered the treasury in Harrân for 'Abd al-Malik's brother, Muhammad b. Marwân, who served that caliph and his successor al-Walîd as governor of the Dîzâria. Maymûn was then appointed by 'Umar b. 'Abd al-'Azîz over the kadi' and hâragî (judgeship and tax-collection) of the Dîzâria—offices he apparently held only with some mental reservations—while his son 'Amr ran 'Umar's dîwan (Ibn Sa'd, vii/1, 178). After 'Umar's death he was retained in his post for a time by Yazîd b. 'Abd al-Malik. He was still evidently part of the official establishment in Harrân under Highâm (al-Baladhuri, Anšâb, Beirut iii, 100), and is also said to have commanded the army of Syria that went to Cyprus in 106/724-5 for Highâm (al-Tabârî, ii, 1487). Maymûn appears to have been one of 'Umar b. 'Abd al-'Azîz's close confidants, and the two were evidently bound by mutual admiration, to judge from the many extant accounts in which one relates anecdotes emphasising the piety and wisdom of the other.

Maymûn died, according to most authorities, in the Dîzâria in 1177/35-6. He does not seem to have left behind any written works—further evidence, perhaps, that he was primarily a šîkhî known for his piety and good judgement in religious matters rather than a muhaddîth—but he did bring to Rakka a tradition of religious piety that lived on in his pupils bearing the nisba "al-Maymûnî", among them Dîsîfîr b. Burkân, Abu 'l-Malîh, and his own son 'Amr b. Maymûn. The esteem in which he was held by later authorities is aptly summed up in a statement ascribed to Umar b. al-Fadl while his son (Ibn Sa'd, i, 509), "Maymûn b. Mihrân, we accepted it" (Abû Zur'a, Ta'ârikh, 315 [no. 508]).


F. M. DONNER

Maymûn b. al-Aswad al-Kaddàh, obscure Meccan transmitter from the Imâmîs Muhamm-ad al-Bâkîr and Dîsîfîr al-Sâdîk who, two centuries after his death, gained such notoriety as the father of the alleged founder of Imâmîs 'Abî al-Aswad al-Kaddàh and the father of the Fâtimid caliphs, 'Abî Allah b. Maymûn [q.v.]. According to the Imâmî sources, he was a client of Makhzûm and a shaper of arrow shafts (gabîrî al-kîdâh). He became a personal servant of al-Bâkîr and al-Sâdîk in Mecca. A few traditions of the two Imâmîs related on his authority are contained in the canonical collections of Imâmîs al-Ṭûsî, but they do not count him among the companions of Imâm 'Ali Zayn al-Âbidîn (d. 9/1513-14) (Ridjâl al-Tâ'îsî, ed. Muhammad Sâdîk Al Bâbîr al-Âlûm, Najfâb 1318/1961, 101, 315, 337). He died probably during the imâmât of al-Sâdîk (d. 148/765). W. Ivanov's suggestion that he had, besides 'Abî Allah, another son called Abân (The alleged founder of Imâmîs, 68) rests on a faulty tanâdîm in some copies of al-Kulayî's K. al-Kafî (see Muhammad b. 'Ali al-Ashbâhî al-Hârîrî, Dâmah' al-ru'ddît, Kûmûn 1405, ii, 287).

Neither Imâmî nor Sunni biographical dictionaries and heresiographies of the 3rd/9th century suggest that Maymûn al-Kaddàh or his son inclined to Shi'i extremism or was involved in the sect backing Ismâ'îl b. Dîsîfîr. The earliest mention of him as a heresiarch is by the Shi'i polemicist Ibn Râzîm (writing ca. 340/951) who describes him as a Daylamī duṣûdî and founder of a sect called the Mâyminyâîa which backed the heretic Abu 'l-Khâṭîb [q.v.], teaching the divinity of 'Ali. Later anti-Ismâ'îlî authors greatly elaborated Ibn Râzîm's story and added to the catalogue of his heresies. Akgûzâ Muhsîn (writing ca. 573/983) calls him Maymûn b. Dâyân, making him a son of Barâzâsh, another son called Abân al-Shâhdî (d. ca. 509/1115) gives him the kunya Abû Shâdî, evidently identifying him with a Dâyânî of the time of al-Sâdîk notorious in Imâmî tradition. Muhammad b. al-Hâsân al-Dâyâmî (writing in 707/1307) calls him Maymûn b. Dâyân al-Kaddàh al-Ahwâzî al-Fârsî and asserts that he appeared in Kufa in 176/792 after having been nominally converted to Islam by al-Sâdîk. All these accounts are caricatures of pure fiction.

Ibn Râzîm's story is based, however, on information from Kannât Ismâ'îlîs' sources. There is clear evidence of a wide-spread belief among Ismâ'îlîs in the pre-Fâtimid and early Fâtimid age that the leadership after the disappearance of Muhammad b. Ismâ'îl b. Dîsîfîr had been transferred to one 'Abî Allah b. Maymûn al-Kaddàh, who was not of 'Abîl ascendant. He and his successors were not Imâmîs, but lieutenants (khâlîfîs) of the absent 'Imâm pending his return as the Mahdî. Against this, Fâtimid Ismâ'îlî tradition maintained that the name Maymûn had been used in the missionary activity for the Imâm to conceal his identity and that the ancestors of the Fâtûmids, though claiming merely the rank of hâdîthîs, were in fact the Imâmîs.

Bibliography: In addition to the works quoted in the article on 'Abî Allah b. Maymûn, see now S. M. Stern, Heterodox Ismâ'îlism at the time of al-Mu'izzî, in SBSA, xvii (1955), 10-33; H. F. al-Hamdani, On the genealogy of the Fatimid Caliphs, Cairo 1958; W. Madelung, Das Imamiat in der frühen islamischen Literatur, in ILS, xxxii (1961), esp. 73-80; A. Hamdani and F. de Blois, A re-examination of al-Mahdi's letter to the Yemenites on the genealogy of the Fatimid Caliphs, in JRAf (1983), 173-207.

MAYMûN-DIZ, a castle of the Ismâ'îlîs [see ISMâ'îLÎYYA] in the Alburz Mountains in northwestern Iran, the mediaval city of Daylam [q.v.].
Rahjîd al-Dîn states that it was built in 490/1097 by the Grand Master of the Assassins Hasan-i Sâbbâb or by his successor Kîyâ Buzurg-Ummîd in the early 6th/12th century. Dhûwaynî, tr. Boyle, II, 621-36, cf. M. G. S. Hodgson, The order of the Assassins, The Hague 1955, 255 ff., has a detailed account of the fortress's reduction by the Ikhwân al-Hülegî in Shawkîâ 654/November 1256. The Mongols besieged it briefly till it was surrendered by the last Grand Master Rûkîn al-Dîn Khârî-Shâh, who had latterly resided there with his treasury instead of at Alamût [q. v.]: they then went on to capture the latter fortress.

In 1539-41, Willey identified the site as an easily-defensible plateau some 1,500 ft. 457.2 m., with extensive caverns and standing buildings, just north of the village of Shams-Kîlîyâ in the valley of a right-bank affluent of the Alamût-Rûd, itself running into the Shâh-Rûd-Sâfîd-Rûd river system (contra Ivanow's tentative identification of Maymûn-Dîz with the modern place Nawizar-Shâh).


MAXMUNA BINT AL-KHALIL, the last wife that Muhammad married. She stemmed from the Hâwâzîn tribe of ʿAbî Ṣâma and was a sister-in-law of al-ʿAbbâs. After she had divorced her first husband, a Thâkâfi, and the second, the Kurâshî Abî Rukm, had died, she lived as a widow in Mecca till it was surrendered by the last Grand Master Rûkîn al-Dîn Khârî-Shâh, who had latterly resided there with his treasury instead of at Alamût [q. v.]: they then went on to capture the latter fortress. In 1539-41, Willey identified the site as an easily-defensible plateau some 1,500 ft. 457.2 m., with extensive caverns and standing buildings, just north of the village of Shams-Kîlîyâ in the valley of a right-bank affluent of the Alamût-Rûd, itself running into the Shâh-Rûd-Sâfîd-Rûd river system (contra Ivanow's tentative identification of Maymûn-Dîz with the modern place Nawizar-Shâh).


MAYSALUN, the kingdom of the branch of the Tigris along the lower Tigris River in southeastern al-ʿIrâk. This region is called Mâṣûn by Strabo, Mâṣûn in the Babylonian Talmud, Maysan in Syriac, Mâṣûn in Middle Persian, Mâṣûn in Armenian, Maysân in Arabic, and Mâςûn in the Han sources. The earliest references from the first century A.D. indicate that Mâṣûn was an ethnic toponym, the land of the Mâṣûni people. These people lived along the Arabian side of the coast at the head of the Persian Gulf (Maṣûnîs kôlûs in Ptolemy). Whether or not these people were Arabian themselves, some of them lived at Ghrâa, and their land was regarded as lying along the ethnic border with Arabs. Arabic has the nîbas Mâṣûn, and Maysân, the latter from the Persian plural for people.

Ancient Mesene lay between two branches of the lower Tigris, but its exact extent was subject to change and is therefore difficult to determine. Pliny explicitly states that Mesene extended 125 miles up the Tigris to where overflow water from the Euphrates reached the Tigris. Whether or not these people were Arabian themselves, some of them lived at Ghrâa, and their land was regarded as lying along the ethnic border with Arabs. Arabic has the nîbas Mâṣûn, and Maysân, the latter from the Persian plural for people.

The region is called Mâṣûn by Strabo, Mâṣûn in the Babylonian Talmud, Maysan in Syriac, Mâṣûn in Middle Persian, Mâṣûn in Armenian, Maysân in Arabic, and Mâςûn in the Han sources. The earliest references from the first century A.D. indicate that Mâṣûn was an ethnic toponym, the land of the Mâṣûni people. These people lived along the Arabian side of the coast at the head of the Persian Gulf (Maṣûnîs kôlûs in Ptolemy). Whether or not these people were Arabian themselves, some of them lived at Ghrâa, and their land was regarded as lying along the ethnic border with Arabs. Arabic has the nîbas Mâṣûn, and Maysân, the latter from the Persian plural for people.

The region is called Mâṣûn by Strabo, Mâṣûn in the Babylonian Talmud, Maysan in Syriac, Mâṣûn in Middle Persian, Mâṣûn in Armenian, Maysân in Arabic, and Mâςûn in the Han sources. The earliest references from the first century A.D. indicate that Mâṣûn was an ethnic toponym, the land of the Mâṣûni people. These people lived along the Arabian side of the coast at the head of the Persian Gulf (Maṣûnîs kôlûs in Ptolemy). Whether or not these people were Arabian themselves, some of them lived at Ghrâa, and their land was regarded as lying along the ethnic border with Arabs. Arabic has the nîbas Mâṣûn, and Maysân, the latter from the Persian plural for people.

The region is called Mâṣûn by Strabo, Mâṣûn in the Babylonian Talmud, Maysan in Syriac, Mâṣûn in Middle Persian, Mâṣûn in Armenian, Maysân in Arabic, and Mâςûn in the Han sources. The earliest references from the first century A.D. indicate that Mâṣûn was an ethnic toponym, the land of the Mâṣûni people. These people lived along the Arabian side of the coast at the head of the Persian Gulf (Maṣûnîs kôlûs in Ptolemy). Whether or not these people were Arabian themselves, some of them lived at Ghrâa, and their land was regarded as lying along the ethnic border with Arabs. Arabic has the nîbas Mâṣûn, and Maysân, the latter from the Persian plural for people.
of a more extensive Maysan survive in the Arabic-writing geographers. Ibn Rustah calls Djabal, at the Tigris end of two large canals coming from Sûrû, one of the cities of Maysan. Yâkût describes the district of Kaskar [q.v.] as overlapping Maysan and extending from the lower end of the Nahrawân canal to the sea. To the extent that ancient Mesene was identified with Chaldea, it bordered on Babylonia in the west and the Chaldaean Lakes in the southwest. To the north it overlapped Djukhu [q.v.], which normally lay along the left bank of the Tigris, probably as a result of changes in the course of the river. It extended to Elymaïa [Khzoektûzîn] [q.v.] in the east, but this border was also subject to change. The town of Huwayza (modern Hawîza [q.v.]) was once part of Maysan, but by the 8th/14th century belonged to Khuzistan.

Politically, ancient Mesene was identical with the Hellenistic kingdom of Characene (ca. 129 B.C.—ca. 224 A.D.). The region between Babylonia and the Gulf coast had formed an administrative division (but not an eparchy) of the Seleucid state in the 3rd century B.C. called the territory of the Erythraean Sea. Alexander the Great had settled Macedonian veterans at a city called Alexandria which he founded above the confluence of a former course of the lower Karkeh River with the Tigris, 1¼ miles from the coast. After this city was destroyed by fires, Antiochus IV (175-164 B.C.) restored it by 166-165 B.C., called it Antiochia, and put Hyspaodanucus, son of Sagadonanus, king of the neighbouring Arabs, in charge of it and its territory. The latter became independent between 141 and 139 B.C., and in 129 B.C. built new embankments to protect the flood-damaged city, renaming it Charax Spasionoû (“the palmisde of Hyspaosines”) as the capital of Characene. In 127 B.C. he defeated the Arsacid governor of Babylon and occupied Babylon and Seleucia briefly, but was defeated by Mithradates II in 121 B.C., after which he and his successors continued as rulers of Characene subject to the Parthians.

Charax is transcribed as Karak Aspasinâh (KRR 3SPSN) and identified as Kârkâ dê Mêşêhan (KRRK DY MYSN) in Palmyrene inscriptions of the 1st and 2nd centuries. It was called Karak âhê Mayshân in Syrian and Karsh Maysan in Arabic. Its site, formerly sought in the vicinity of Muhammara, has been convincingly identified by Hansman with modern Djabal Khayâbij near the left bank of the Shâtât al-Ârab. By Pliny’s time, Charax was 193 km. from the coast although the tide went upstream far beyond it. The left bank of the lower Tigris was inhabited by Chaldeans, the right bank by Arabian brigands called Attali beyond whom were nomadic Scenitae. T’iao-Tche is described in Han sources as a hot, low, densely populated, rice-growing region with lions, rhinocerous, zebu, peacocks, ostriches, and clever jugglers. Strabo adds the production of barley, sesame oil, and dates. By the 1st century B.C., Charax was a major commercial centre where Indian ships met caravans from Petra and Palmyra. In the 1st century A.D., caravans from Petra arrived at the town of Forat 11 or 12 miles downstream from Charax. Its site was either near the modern town of al-Tamûma on the left bank of the Shâtât al-Ârab, or, according to Hansman, at Maghlûb, 17.4 km. (10.8 miles) southeast of Djabal Khayâbij. Apologists (al-Ubulla) also appears as an emporium on the right bank of the Shâtât al-Ârab opposite Forat at âÂshâr, the modern port of al-Basra, in the 1st century. Copper, sandalwood, teak, ebony, spices and gems were imported from Barygaza in Gudjarat through Apologists, while Characene merchants exported pearls, clothing, wine, purple, dates, gold and slaves. In the winter of 115-16, Trajan occupied Characene briefly, collecting tribute from Antemboolus V, after which he returned to Arachosia and Maysan.

In ca. 224 Charax fell to Ardashir I (ca. 226-41), the founder of the Sasanid dynasty, who killed the king of Characene and made his own son, Mihrâhsh, ruler of Maysan. Although it is claimed in Arabic literature that Ardashir refounded Karêh Maysan as Astarâbâdhar Ardashîr, this name has not been found in Sasanid inscriptions. Under Shapur I (ca. 241-73), his eldest son, Shapur, and the latter’s wife, Dahrâdsh, were king and queen of Mihrâhsh. A certain Atrofar-nabag is called Mîshân Shâh in Narseh’s inscription at Paikuli, and the Babylonian Talmud mentions a governor (qandârîn) of Mihrâhsh. However, Shapur I is said to have formed a separate district called Shâdsh Sâbûr in northwestern Maysân around the city of Kaskar which had its own qandârîn.

By the 3rd century, the formerly pagan population of Maysan was mixed with Jews, Magians, gnostics and possibly Christians. The priest Khosrâv claimed to have established Magians and sacred fires there, and the title of magopat of Mîshân inscribed on a gem indicates the establishment of the priestly hierarchy. Jews of mixed descent were scattered throughout Maysân, and the gnostic, baptist sect called al-Mughithasîla located there was joined by Marie’s father, Marie [see Marie b. Khosrâv] grew up in this sect, and Mihrâhsh, the governor, was one of his earliest converts and supporters. Whether or not Christianity was carried to Maysân in the 1st century by the apostle Marie, as legend claims, by the year 310 Prâgh di Mayshân (al-Parât) was the sec of the metropolitan bishop of Mayshan. By 410 there were suffragan bishops at Karakh dîh Mayshân, Rimâ and Nahârgir.

Ammonius Marcellinus describes huge groves of date palms extending from Babylon to Mesene and in the sea in the 4th century, and reports that Mesene was included in the province of “Assyria” that embraced all of lower Mesopotamia in the middle Sasanid period. In the 3rd and 4th centuries, Mêsân remained a centre for the import of spices, drugs and textiles. In this sector, in addition to silk and cotton cloth and steel, Kushân coins found in Mîshân also testify to trade with northern India.

Conditions in Maysan were transformed when the lower Tigris began to shift from its former course below Fam al-Âsilh, which had gone via Bâdhshin and Abdasî to al-Madhar. During floods in the reigns of Bahram V Gür (420-30), Kubâsh b. Fîrûz (480-96, 498-9/531), and under Khosraw II in 7/628, the lower Tigris burst its banks and changed its main course to the Dudjâval/Shatât al-Akkhâdh sh (aka the Nahr Gharra/Shatât al-Hayy as formerly thought) which went via Kaskar into the swamps (al-Âlqadh [q.v.]). Western Maysan was turned into swamps, northern Maysân and south-eastern Dzhukhâ into desert, and Maysan was reduced to the territory along the former course of the Tigris below al-Madhar called the Blind or One-Eyed Tigris (Djilât al-Àwrâ). What remained of Maysân formed the district of Shêtsh Bahamsh and was put in the Quarter of the South when the Sassanid empire was reorganised in the 6th century. Al-Parât, said to have been refounded as Babylon Ardashîr I, may have become the capital. By extension, Yûkût identifies Babylon Ardashîr, Arabised as Bahmânghir, also called Furât al-Parât, as the entire region ( racist). The Tigris estuary from al-Maifa and al-Ubulla to Abkhâdsh was also called Bahmânghir by the Persians, accord-
ing to al-Maysan, similar to Bamishir for a branch of the lower Karun [q.v.]. Vahman Ardashir is first attested in 544 as the successor of the Nestorian patriarch of Maysan. The biographies of Abul-Rasul of Rmā and Karkhādīh in Maysan are last attested in 605. N'hargūr (as N'hargūr) in ca. 23/644-6, although Fiey has argued for the survival of the latter two names. None of the late Sassanid mint-marks ascribed to al-Furat, Karkhādīh or Maysan is conclusive. The subdivisions of this district at the time of the Muslim conquest were Bahman Ardashir around al-Furat, Maysan, Dasṭ-i Maysan and Abarkubābūd. In Saʿfar 12/653, Khālid b. al-Walid took al-Ubulla, invaded Maysan and defeated Persian forces at al-Mādhār. After his victory at Buwayb about two years later, al-Muḥarramā b. Ḥāritā also sent forces to Maysan and Dasṭ-i Maysan. The actual conquest was undertaken by Uṭba b. Ghazwān in 14/635 and the spring of 15/636. Uṭba defeated and captured the ruler (shāh) of al-Furat, took al-Ubulla and al-Furat, conquered Maysan, defeating and killing the marzubān [q.v.] at al-Mādhār; Abarkubābūd; and Dasṭ-i Maysan, defeating its marzubān. After Uṭba withdrew to al-.Busra, the Mughābīr b. Shūbā [q.v.] pacified Maysan and Abarkubābūd again, killing the marzubān or dhīhān. The captives taken in Maysan included Ḣāsār, the father of al-Hāsan al-ʿUṯba b. Ghazwān, who was taken to the high place, and Artabān, the grandfather of Abd Allāh b. Awān b. Ḥāṭabān, who lived at al-Busra. Some captives from Maysan were released at Ṣumār's order. In 18/639 the Ḥurrūzān raided Dasṭ-i Maysan and Maysan from Khūzistān, taking captive Abraham, Nestorian bishop of Purāḏ, but was driven out by Abū Mūsā al-Aḫsāʿī, the governor of al-Busra. Abū Mūsā is also credited with establishing the Tigris districts (Kuwar or Kāna Dīlijī) along the Dījīlat, which may stand for Dasht-i Maysan. Post-reform dirhams were struck at al-Furat from 81/700-1 to 97/715-6, in Maysan from 79/698-9 to 97/715-6, Abarkubābūd in 93/702 and 96/714-5 and in Dasṭ-i Maysan in 80/699-700, followed by Manādhir from 81/700 until 96/714-5. By the 3rd/9th century, al-Ubulla was the administrative centre for the Kūra Dīlij, which may be why Ibn Khūzistānī al-Mubāyṣirī and Yūsuf Ibn Maysan with al-Ubulla. The Nestorian metropolitanate of Purāḏ & Maysan survived well into the Islamic period, and is first identified as the metropolitanate of al-Busra in 17/749/70. The bishopric of Abdāsī, attested in 17/749 and ca. 215/830, however, was in the patriarchal see of Baḥgādī. Some natives of Maysan, such as Anbasa b. Maʿḏūr, who settled at al-Busra shortly after its foundation. They were generally called Banū ʿĀmm and settled with the Banū Tamīm. Maysān origin (accurate only in the broadest sense) was attributed to the family of Ziyād b. Abīhi [q.v.] in a derogatory way by the poets al-Farazādāk and Ibn Mufarrigh. Al-Akhtar used attribution to Azkubābūd as an insult. However, Sahil b. Hārūn [q.v.], a native of Maysan who settled at al-Busra and was appointed governor of Maʿmūn (197-218/813-33), praised the people of Maysan in a kind of feeling of regional shuʿayba [q.v.]. The Muslim belief that God exiled Iblīs to Maysan after the temptation of Adam and Hawwāʾ (Eve) may have been related to these attitudes. Early Islamic land reclamation and development around al-Busra extended into Maysan. Ziyād granted an estate on the Gulf coast north of the estuary to Humrān b. Abān, who subsequently gave the western part of it to Abībād b. Husayn al-Habībī, after whom the entire estate and the town that grew there came to be called Abābdān, considered as the southernmost limit of Maysan. Under Sulaymān (98- 8/715-17), Yāzīd b. al-Muhallāb reclaimed land from the Bāṭāʿī in Kaskar and the Kūra Dīlij with imported Indian labour (Zutt [q.v.]) and at least 4,000 water buffaloes (qūššāmī). Under al-Raṣīd (176- 93/786-908), the villagers of al-Shuʿaybiyā in the subdistrict of al-Furat turned their property, which then became the property of the caliph’s son ‘Alī, and became sharecroppers paying a lower rent than before. A slave of al-Raṣīd called Ghālsīb is also said to have built a fort (bīn) just west of Abābdān at Bīrīm (modern Bīrīm Abābdān or Abābdān al-Ḥaḍījī). East African slaves (Zanj [q.v.]) were also imported by the Forūd b. Ḥarkīr. In 70/689-90 and 75/695 they gathered at al-Furat, and, joined by people from the river harbour, devastated
the countryside. During the great Zandj revolt in the 3rd/9th century, they were again supported or joined by the people of al-Perfūt and the villages of Djbba and Dja'fariyya. In 254/668 the Zandj invaded Maysan, then al-Khūzistān, took Dja'fariyya and Karyat al-Yahūd, and attacked al-Madhār unsuccessfully before turning south-east to ʿAḥbābān. In 267/880-1 al-Muwaṭṭak, the brother of the caliph al-Muẓaffar, took Dja'fariyya and was supported or joined by the people of al-Madhār, was again ravaged the subdistricts of Maysan.

In spite of such conflicts, in the 4th/10th century ʿAbdābān and al-Madhār were small cities and palm groves extended continuously for over 20 farāshu (241 km.) from ʿAbdābān to ʿAbadasi. A low-grade silk trade was produced in Maysan; dyed cloth and cushions were exported, and Maysanī clothing was produced at Djaḥbul. After flowing into the Baṭtah, Tigris water emptied into the Didjlat al-Awrāʾ via branching channels such as the Nahr Abī ʿl-ʿAsad, the Nahr al-Maʿā (possibly the Baṭtih Šīrīn) in the vicinity of al-Madhār, and the Nahr al-Yahūd. The tide came upstream as far as al-Madhār. Nahī Ḏīr lay on the old course of the Tigris between ʿAbadasi and Darmākān and may have extended eastwards towards Khūzistān. The Muḥtasila (now called Šabāt al-Baṭṭābī) were still numerous in the swamps and may have been the same as the Ṣāḥibān sect [q. v.] called al-Kimārīyyūn that al-Muḥaffal says lived in or near the swamps between Wāṣīt and al-Ḍaḥra. The Maḥrānī sect, reputedly formed in Maysan in late Sāsānian or early Islamic times, grew out of this milieu.

Al-Madhār remained locally important. In 329/941 the ʿamīr Baḍīqam [q. v.] sent Tūzān there with an army, where he defeated the forces of Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Barīd, while Baḍīqam himself drove the Kūds (Armenian christians) [q. v.] and seized Khadhkhādī against the Barīdiyya there. In 409/1018 the Būdīn Sūlān al-Dawla set out from there in pursuit of al-Ḥasan b. Dhiby al-Asādī, and when Djaḥl at-Dawla’s army defeated his rival, Abū Kāḥdīr [q. v.], there in 421/1030, his partisans took over the town. In about 443/1051, Nāṣir-i Khusraw states that at-Muḥaffal says lived in or near the swamps between Wāṣīt and al-Ḍaḥra. The Maḥrānī sect, reputedly formed in Maysan in late Sāsānian or early Islamic times, grew out of this milieu.

Al-Madhār remained locally important. In 329/941 the ʿamīr Baḍīqam [q. v.] sent Tūzān there with an army, where he defeated the forces of Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Barīd, while Baḍīqam himself drove the Kūds (Armenian christians) [q. v.] and seized Khadhkhādī against the Barīdiyya there. In 409/1018 the Būdīn Sūlān al-Dawla set out from there in pursuit of al-Ḥasan b. Dhiby al-Asādī, and when Djaḥl at-Dawla’s army defeated his rival, Abū Kāḥdīr [q. v.], there in 421/1030, his partisans took over the town. In about 443/1051, Nāṣir-i Khusraw [q. v.] noted that ʿAṭr Maysān (possibly Karīẖ Maysān) and Maḥgān were subdistricts of al-Ḍaḥra. Maḥgān was just above al-Bāzra and was also known as the birthplace, in 446/1054, of the author of the ʿAṣār in al-Ḍaḥra. The Maḥrānī sect, reputedly formed in Maysan in late Sāsānian or early Islamic times, grew out of this milieu.

According to Yākūṭ, in the 7th/13th century, the Tigris divided into five main channels below Wāṣīt: the Nahī Śāsī (possibly an orthogonal error for Basāmī), Nahr Ghārāf, Nahr Djaʿfar, Nahr Dakaī and Nahr Maysān (possibly the Nahī Tūlīyāthā according to ElʿAṭī). They reunited near the village of Matūra, one day’s journey from al-Baṣrā, where the Euphrates joined them. Yākūṭ defined the Didjlat al-Awrāʾ as the combined stream from Matūra to the Gulf. He describes Maysān as “an extensive district with numerous villages and palm groves between al-Ḍaḥra and Wāṣīt.” Its main town (madīna) was Maysān, and its capital (baṭla) was al-Madhār, four days’ journey from al-Ḍaḥra. Al-Ḥarrāt, across the river from al-Madhār, was a well-watered village on solid ground with many date palms, fruit trees, and chickens. Below al-Madhār, on the Nahr Maysān, was the small town (bulāyda) of al-Bazzāz; al-Ḍaḥra lay in ruins. The people of al-Madhār were all Shīʿīs, and a splendid shrine (maqdaḥa) there, where Abū Allāh b. Abī b. Abī Tallīb was buried, was the object of endowments (mukāfāt) and votive gifts (nughūr). This shrine is located on a slight rise east of the Tigris, within a river bend, just below modern Kaʿf al-Ṣāliḥ near the ruins of al-Madhār about 48 km. directly north of modern Kurna. In March 1927 Streek found a domed tomb there, visible at a great distance, standing in the eastern end of an oblong courtyard that was entered through a door in the north wall. A descendant of the Imam Mūsā al-Kāẓīm [q. v.] is also said to be buried at Abī al-Qāhirī, on the west bank of the Tigris 100 km. above al-ʿAmāra, and a descendant of the Huṣayn b. Abī at-ʿAlī al-Shārīk, about 38 km. away on the east bank. At an undetermined time, most of the people of ʿAḥbābān, having been ʿShīʿī, became ʿShīʿīs. According to al-Kazwīnī, the people of Maysān district were fanatical (ṭabāqah ʿShīʿī). Yākūṭ also describes the tomb of Ezzah (al-ʿUzayr) which he visited at the village of Nahī Šāmura (popularly called Simmara) in ard Maysān as tended by Jews and as the object of endowments and votive gifts. Modern al-ʿUzayr is a large village on the west bank of the Tigris about 33 km. south of Kaʿf al-Ṣāliḥ.

Abū ʿl-Fidāʾ calls Maysān a small town (bulāyda) in the lower part of ard al-Ḍaḥra, but after the 8th/14th century this name passed out of use. Al-ʿAmāra [q. v.] was founded in 1277/1860 at a place called al-Awrādī from the 10th/16th century onwards. Kanūn no. 48, in 1969, changed the name of the ʿAmāra Liwaʾ to Maysān.
MAYSARAY AL-MAYSIR

Arkeoloji Miizeleri, viii (1958), 44-5; Halm, 110. For the Karamita, see Ibn al-Athlr, vii, 500. ... part ( = 1/28).

(2) al-Taw'am, "the twin (arrow)", bearing two notches and winning or losing two parts ( = 2/28).

Ukba b. al-...c...la b. Hudayd dj... Tangier, where Maysara left...sent, crossed the straits himself; he massacred the Berbers of the region, but was unable to retake Damascus. The general Habib having been sent from Damascus. The general Habib having been sent from taking the fairest of their women to send as slaves to... advances on Tangier and seized it, killing the gover-...an...The general Habib having been sent from...account of the large number of veins which they con-...slaughtering of numerous beasts, generally camels...being the thighs and shins of both fore and rear legs,...is inexplicable. The winning arrows were named:

Seven winning arrows

(1) One winning arrow (fard), each bearing a name and with notches (fard or badd), by which they were identified; and

(2) Three or four white arrows (ghub, aghfd), neither winning nor losing.

The winning arrows were named:

(1) al-Fadlul, "the single (arrow)", bearing one notch and winning or losing a single piece ( = 1/28), or losing ( = 1/28).

(2) al-Taw'am, "the twin (arrow)", bearing two notches and winning or losing two parts ( = 2/28).

Bibliography:

Ibn al-Kutllya, Tarikh Ifnkiya al-Andalus, Madrid 1926, 14-15, text, 10-11; Ibn Idh...ri, al-Ifnki and went on to seize the Sus, whose governor Isma... has grave reper-...The process of the game often required the...slaughtered of numerous beasts, generally camels...accounts of the large number of veins which they con-

The game consisted of dividing a slaughtered beast into ten parts, for which the game was played: these being the thighs and shins of both fore and rear legs, plus two shoulders. The head and the feet were given back to the butcher and the remaining inferior pieces were added proportionally to the ten parts. The best pieces were called `... and Akkadian (cf. Hebrew ...decide, fix, determine"), the equivalent of the...sahid). The winning arrows were named:

Seven winning arrows

(1) One winning arrow (fard), each bearing a name and with notches (fard or badd), by which they were identified; and

(2) Three or four white arrows (ghub, aghfd), neither winning nor losing.

The winning arrows were named:

(1) al-Fadlul, "the single (arrow)", bearing one notch and winning or losing a single piece ( = 1/28), or losing ( = 1/28).

(2) al-Taw'am, "the twin (arrow)", bearing two notches and winning or losing two parts ( = 2/28).
(3) al-Rakib, also called al-Darīh, “the (arrow of the) supervisor” of the game or of the “thrower” of the lots, bearing three notches and winning or losing three parts (= 3/28).

(4) al-Hlis or al-Halīs, “the dressed” or “equipped” or even “strong (arrow)” (cf. Hebrew b-t-s and hemes), bearing four notches and winning or losing four parts (= 4/28).

(5) al-Nafs, “the precious” or “coveted (arrow)” (name sometimes given to the fourth arrow), bearing five notches and winning or losing five parts (= 5/28).

(6) al-Muṣābah, “the long and flat (arrow)”, also called al-Mudīrī, “the elongated (arrow)”, bearing six notches and winning or losing six parts (= 6/28).

(7) al-Muṣāllāh, “the superior (arrow)”, also called al-Mīghlīkh, “the (arrow that) closes”, a name also given to every winning arrow, bearing seven notches and winning or losing seven parts.

The white arrows bore no notches and their purpose consisted in slowing (nakhkhil) the game and making it more difficult. They are, in fact, “rivets”; every time that one of them was drawn, it was immediately replaced in the quiver; thus chances for the successive drawing of notched arrows steadily diminished. These were three in number, called:

(1) al-Saffi, “the profitless (arrow)” (name given to the fourth by al-Lībīyānī, who puts al-Muḥaddar in the first place). Considering the root, it seems that the shooter would receive the blood of the victim.

(2) al-Manbīz, “the generous (arrow)”, considered to be of good omen; its repeated return to the quiver was a portent of success. The shooter could receive the hide of the victim (cf. TA, ii, 234, 11. 21 f.).

(3) al-Waqīdh, “the sounder” or “(arrow of) the miser”, particularly he who does not take part in the game, afraid of losing; it has the synonym al-Baram.

(4) Some place a fourth arrow after the first (TA) or alter the second (al-Lībīyānī, al-Nuwayrī), called al-Mudīṣaf of “the double (arrow).”

The players could not be more than seven in number; when they were fewer than seven, they needed to buy the remaining parts in order for the game to take place. The player who bought these parts was called al-Tamīmī “he who completes”. When he won twice in succession he was called mutammīm, generously donating his winnings to his entourage, whence the laudatory title of muḥannā ‘l-ayyidī applied to him, as well as to the one who purchased the parts which had not been won to give them to the poor. It is to this charitable act that certain commentators attribute the term manāfī “advantages”, which the Kurān uses in speaking of mayṣir and of wine (II, 219).

The players of mayṣir were called al-ayyār (sing. yasar), and those who presided over the division of the parts al-yāṣrān. The archer, called al-hūdā, had his right hand wrapped in a piece of leather or fabric in order to prevent him identifying the arrows by touch. A piece of white fabric, called al-muḍjāwāl, was held above his hands and a rakīb or “supervisor” stood close beside him, passing him the quiver containing the arrows when the face of the hūdā was averted. Having taken it, the latter inserted his left hand (al-yāsri) under the muḍjāwāl, shook (yukkārīt) the arrows, revealed them to view (nahadha) one after the other and handed them to the rakīb (for references, see Būtī).

This is the essence of what is known concerning the practice of mayṣir, the details of which had been forgotten by the Bedouins questioned in the first half of the 3rd/9th century by Abū 'Ubayd al-Kāsim b. Sallām al-Ḥarawī (d. 223/837) (cf. T. Fahd, Deinaten, 208, n. 2). The reason for this forgetting lies in the prohibi-

tion by the Kurān, which, in two instances (II, 219 and V, 90) forbids it together with wine, while acknowledging in both certain “advantages” (manāfī). They are seen, primarily, as a diversion from prayer and, subsequently, a factor of divisiveness and animosity among the faithful (v. 91). But, being condemned along with anṣāb (idoles) and azāmā (divining arrows), they are considered “impure” practices (riḍsī) belonging to pagan cults (v, 90), and thus it may be supposed that the victims divided up for drawing by lot were originally blood-sacrifices offered to deities.

Bibliography: The present article is an abbreviated form of the analysis of mayṣir presented in T. Fahd, La divination arabe. Études religieuses, sociologiques et folkloriques sur le milieu natif de l'islam, Leiden 1966, 204-13, where the reader will find complete references to the numerous sources and studies used, among which the following are especially worthy of mention: Ibn Kutayba, K. al-mayṣir wa l-kiddād, ed. Muṣlib al-Dīn al-Khātībī, Cairo 1342/1923; Nuwayrī, Nihāyāt al-arak, iii, 114-15 (German tr. and comm. by A. Huber, Über das „Mayṣir“ genannte Spiel der heidnischen Araber, Arab. text with Latin translation by Rasmussen, Additamentum, 67/61). Zabīdī (author of TA), Ṣawṣawū al-rittāyāt fi bayān ḥalqat al-mayṣir wa l-kiddād, ed. Landberg, in Primores arabes, i, 29-38; see also Divination, 212, n. 6; Freitag, Einleitung in das Studium der arabischen Sprache, Bonn 1861, 170-83; G. Jacob, Ramādān, Greifswald 1895, 110-15. (T. FAHD)

MAYSŪN, daughter of the Kalb chief Babdāl b. Unayf q. āj., mother of the caliph Yazīd I. We do not know if after her marriage with Muṣwā’īya she retained the Christian religion which had been that of her family and of her tribe. A few verses are attributed to her in which she sighs for the desert and shows very slight attachment for her husband (see Noldeke, Delectus, 25). But the attribution to Maysūn of this fragment of poetry, which is in any case old, has been rightly disputed. She took a great interest in the education of her son Yazīd and accompanied him to the desert of the Kalb where the prince passed a part of his youth; this temporary separation from his wife gave rise to the legend of her repudiation by Muṣwā’īya. She must have died before Yazīd became caliph.

Bibliography: Given in Lammens. Études sur le règne du calife omeyyade Mustawwīa I, in MFPOR, iii (1906-8), 286-7, 305, 312-14. (H. Lammens)

MAYSÌR [see MAHÆSÛR]

MAYTA (λ.), feminine of mayt, dead (used of irra-

tional beings); as a substantive it means an animal that has died in any way other than by slaughter. In later terminology, the word means firstly an animal that has not been slain in the ritualistically prescribed fashion, the flesh of which therefore cannot be eaten, and secondly all parts of animals whose flesh cannot be eaten, whether because not properly slaughtered or as a result of a general prohibition against eating them.

In addition to sūra XXXVI, 33, where mayta appears as an adjective, the word occurs in the following passages in the Kurān in the first of these meanings: XXI, 116: “He has forbidden you mayt, blood, pork and that over which another than Allāh has been invoked; if however anyone is forced [to eat these] without wishing to transgress or sin, Allāh is merciful and indulgent” (from the third Meccan period, since VI, 119 may refer to this context and the appearance of the same exception for cases of coercion in VI, 146
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(cf. below) is then only easily explained in view of the whole trend of the passage, if there were an earlier passage, namely XVI, 116, in which it was given full justification; cf. Nöldeke-Schwally, Geschichte des Qorāns, i, 146-7; Grimm, Muḥammad, ii, 26, transfers the whole sūra to the later Mekkan period; VI, 140: 146: "They have said: 'What is in the womb of this cattle belongs to the males, and is forbidden to our females'; but if it is mayta (stillborn), all have a share in it ...

Say: I find in what is revealed to me nothing forbidden, which must not be eaten, except it be mayta or congealed blood or pork—for this is filth—or a slaughter at which another than Allah is invoked, and that which has been strangled, killed by a blow or a fall, or by the horns [of another beast], that which has been eaten by wild beasts—with the exception of what is made pure—and that which has been sacrificed to idols ...

But if anyone is forced to eat it without wishing to commit a transgression or sin, thy heart is merciful and indulgent" (of the third Meccan period; cf. Nöldeke-Schwally, i, 161; Grimm, ii, 26); II, 168: "He has forbidden you mayta, blood, pork and that over which another than Allāh is invoked but if anyone is forced to eat it without wishing to commit a sin or transgression, it is not reckoned as a sin against him; Allāh is merciful and indulgent." (from the year 2 of the hijra, before the battle of Badr; cf. Nöldeke-Schwally, i, 178; Grimm, ii, 27): vv. 4-5: "Forbidden to you is mayta, blood, pork, that over which another than Allāh is invoked, and that which has been strangled, killed by a blow or a fall, or by the horns [of another beast], that which has been eaten by wild beasts—with the exception of what is made pure—and that which has been sacrificed to idols ...

... But if anyone in [his] hunger is forced to eat of them without wishing to commit a sin, Allāh is merciful and indulgent" (in all probability revealed after the valedictory pilgrimage of the year 10; cf. Nöldeke-Schwally, i, 227-8; Grimm, ii, 28, dates the sūra to the year 7).

It is quite evident from sūra, XI, 140, that the mayta was of some significance for the Mekcans in the many laws about food with which Arab paganism was acquainted (cf. Wellhausen, Reste arabischen Heidentums, 168 ff.). Although it is no longer possible to define exactly the part it played (even the statements recorded by al-Tabarī from the earliest interpreters of this passage, which moreover only refers to a detail, reveal the complete disappearance of any significance it may have had), it is not misgiving that the Kurʾānic prohibition contained a corresponding pre-Islamic prohibition, although it perhaps modified it. Both go back to the religious reluctance to consume the blood of animals, and indeed in all the Kurʾān passages quoted, blood is mentioned alongside of mayta. It is unnecessary to assume that Muhammad was influenced by Judaism on this point, and the suggestion may be rejected especially as the prohibition in its stereotyped form occurs again in sūra II, 168, just at the time of vigorous reaction against Judaism, and in sūra VI, 147 (Medinan, a late insertion) which contrasts the prohibition of mayta, etc., with the Jewish laws relating to food. The meaning of mayta is explained in the latest passage dealing with it, v. 4: in the second half of the verse the principal kinds of mayta are given (with the exception of the animal that dies of disease), which had already been mentioned in general terms; the commentators were thus able to interpret the single cases given as examples wrongly as being different from the mayta proper. The purification (in the Kurʾān only mentioned in this passage) must mean ritual slaughter, by which, even if done at the last moment, the animal does not become mayta but can be eaten.

These prescriptions of the Kurʾān are further developed in the traditions. According to the latter, it is forbidden to trade in mayta or, more accurately, its edible parts; some traditions (mainly on the authority of Ahmad b. Hanbal) even forbid any use being made of all that comes from mayta; others again expressly permit the use of hides of mayta. An exception from the prohibition of mayta is made in the cases of fish and locusts; these are in general considered as the two kinds of mayta that are permitted, i.e. no ritual slaughter is demanded in their case (because they have no "blood", cf. above). While some traditions, extending this permission by the earliest kūfiyy, say that all creatures of the sea, not only fishes, can be eaten without ritual slaughter, including even seafood (in this case it is said that "the sea has performed the ritual slaughter"); others limit the permission to those animals and fishes which the sea casts up on the land or the tide leaves behind, in contrast to those which swim about on the water. But there is also quoted a saying of Abū Bakr expressly declaring what swims on the surface to be permitted. In this connection, we have the story of a monster cast up by the sea (sometimes described as a fish) which fed a Muslim army under the leadership of Abū ʿUbayda when they were in dire straits; but in this tradition and in the interpretation that has been given it (that they only ate of it out of hunger i.e. took advantage of the Kurʾānic permission for cases of need) is clearly reflected the uncertainty that prevailed about such questions which were on the border line. In the traditions, we find it first laid down that portions cut out of living animals are also considered mayta. The way is at least paved for the declaration that all forbidden animal-dishes are mayta. The regulations found in the Kurʾān appear again here, e.g. the permission to eat mayta in case of need and to slay properly dying animals at the moment to prevent them becoming mayta.

Some traditions handed down through Ḥammād from Ibrāhīm al-Nakhrāʾi bring us to a somewhat later period (in the Kitāb al-ʾAlḥāʾ: one says that of the creatures of the sea, only fishes can be eaten; another, which is found in two versions, limits the permission to what is thrown up by the sea or left behind by the tide; ritual slaughter is not demanded in this case. The question whether the embryo of a slaughtered dam remains a "sacred purification", i.e. is ritually polluted, is raised in one tradition and decided in the affirmative. The most important regulations of Muslim law about mayta, which express the last stage of development, are as follows. It is unanimously agreed that mayta in the legal sense is impure and "forbidden" (ḥaram), i.e. cannot be eaten, and also that fish are exceptions to this; the Mālikis and Ḥanbalis also except the majority of creatures of the sea, and according to the more correct Shāfiʿi view, this applies to all marine creatures (the Ḥanbalis here hold the opinion of Ibrāhīm al-Nakhrāʾi, except that the two ideas of "thrown up" and "swimming on the surface" are later overlaid and destroyed by the to some extent synonymous phrase "slain by another cause", "died of itself"). The edible parts of mayta are also mayta, as are the bones, hair etc. among the Shāfiʿis, but not the Ḥanafis, and among the Mālikis only the bones; the hide, when tanned, is considered pure and may be used. Emergency slaughter (dhikātāt or taḍkīyāt; ritual slaughter in general is ḍhāibh or nahr) is, according to the Ḥanafis and the better-known view of the Shāfiʿis (also according to al-Zuhri), permitted, even if the animal will certainly die, provided it still shows signs of life at the moment of slaughter. According to the view predominant among the Mālikis, such slaughter is not valid and the animal becomes mayta (in contrast to Mālik's own view). The question of the
embryo (cf. above) is answered in the affirmative by
the Hanafis, following Ibrahim al-Nakhaci and... from
the 5th to the 7th/11th-13th centuries, an intensive
cultural activity (D. Urvoy, La vie intellectuelle et
aux écoles de droit de l’occident musulman de l’0/1 e à
16/25e siècles, 1991) until the end of the 7th/13th century,
made it a condition that the embryo should be fully
developed (Mālik himself also demanded its slaughter
"to draw the blood from it") in the case where the
embryo had been dropped). That anyone who is
forced to eat mayta may do so, is the unanimous opin-
ion; but on the questions whether one is bound to eat
mayta to save his life, whether he should satisfy his
hunger completely, or only eat the minimum to keep
life alive, etc., is there a difference of opinion. The
Shafi’is and Hanbalis further demand that one should
destroy these straits through illegal
action (a different interpretation of the Qur’anic
regulations).

Bibliography: Lane, Lezôn, s.v.; the books
of hadīth and fiqh; Wensinck, Handbook of early
Muhammadan tradition, s.v.; Juybould, Handleding
læ s kennis vand de Mohammedaenske Wel., 169-70; E.
Gräf, Schlagttert and Jagdbeute im islamischen Recht,
Bonn 1959; J. Schacht, An introduction to Islamic law,
Oxford 1964, 134. (J. Schacht)

MAYURA, MAJORCA OR MALLORCA, name of the
largest (umma) of the Balearic Islands (or
eastern islands of Mallorca: al-diqar’al-sharkiya),
the others being Minúrica (Minorca or Menorca)
and Yabisa (Ibiza). Its name figures as early as the Crónica
del Maro Rasis, ed. D. Catalán, 13. At approximately
the same distance from Ibiza to the west and from
Minorca to the east, it is situated four days’
sailing time from Sardina (Saragossa) according to al-
Himyarî (Maghrībi, text 214, tr. 266) and lasts until Bougie
(al-Himyarî, al-Raouf al-miṣr, text 188-91, tr. 228-
31). Al-Himyarî, Ibn Sa’id (Maghrībi, ii, 466) and al-
Zuhri (K. al-Dja’farîya, 177-9) differ as to the terrain of
the island. According to the testimony of this last-
named author in particular, and according to the data
supplied by Christian sources following the Catalan-
Aragonese conquest of the 13th century, the island,
which enjoyed a fine climate, was fertile and possessed
abundant resources, especially cereals, fruits, trees,
pack-animals, sheep and cattle, horses and mules, a
few goats, and also, for hunting, hares, rabbits and
foxes. Cotton and flax were cultivated there, but silk
was an imported commodity (Ibn Sa’id, in E. Fagnan,
ExtraitS inédits, 23, 24). Curiously there is no
mention of the olive and the raisin, but their existence
cannot be denied, nor that of the fig; cultivation of
these products, of little significance during the Islamic
occupation, was developed subsequently. A Flemish
document of the 13th century mentions rice as one of
the principal commodities exported from Majorca to
Flanders, but there is no evidence for the cultivation
of this product in the Islamic period. From the work
of al-Zuhri (178) and from other sources, it appears
that the town and the island were endowed with
a good defensive system and substantial buildings.

Nothing is known of the situation of Majorca and
its dependencies at the time of the first Arab incursions
into the western Mediterranean. It may reasonably be
assumed that it comprised a population which
was at first Romanised, later Christianised, of
Hispanic-Roman descent, and possibly some Jews.
In the K al-imāma wa-l-siyāsa (ed. T. M. al-Zāratī, n. p.,
n.d., i, 73), in the Annales of Ibn al-Aṣḥīr (33), the
Mughrīb of Ibn Sa’id (ii, 466) and the Anaelotes of
al-Makkāri (i, 177), there is mention of a first incursion
conducted in 89/707-8, from the direction of Hīrīya,
by the son of Mūsā b. Nuṣayr, 'Abd Allāh, who—
according to one of these sources—was the fā’īl
Majorçâ, who took possession of a rich store of booty.

Other sources, including Ibn 'Idhārī (Bagan, ii, text 89, tr. 145),
who speaks of a state of revolt and of a refusal to pay the
levies due for the years 234 and 235/846-50, give
the impression that, subjected to a treaty and required to
pay the dhizya and possibly other contributions, the
Majorcan refused on more than one occasion to live
for a considerable period of time in a state of
permanent or less nominal independence until the conquest
of the island in the time of the amir Muḥammad I (al-
Zuhri, 178) or until the arrival, in 290/902-3, of ʿljām
al-Khāwālīnī who contributed to the Islamisation of
the island by constructing hostleries, baths and mos-
ques (Ibn Khalīdūn, ʿIbr, iv, 164), all this after the
island had suffered, in 255/869, the devastating effects
of a Norman invasion. Majorca was a constant source of
difficulties for the Cordovan administration, to
such an extent that in 336/947-8 al-Nāṣir was obliged
to send his kātb ʿalīyar b. ʿUthmān al-Muḥṣafī
to restore order there (Bayān, ii, text 215, tr. 356). In
the 5th/11th century, there begins a new period in the
history of Majorca. Annexed to the kingdom of
Muḥjāhid (s.v.) of Denia (see Clelia Sarnelli Cerqua,
Muḥjāhid al-Ma’rīn kātib al-ʿarabī, 1977), the island was
inhabited by the Banū Ṣalāh (s.v.) and possibly other
contributions, the Almohads (see Clelia Sarnelli Cerqua,
Muḥjāhid al-Ma’rīn kātib al-ʿarabī, 1977) which was at first Romanised, later Christianised, of
the island by constructing hostelries, baths and mos-
ques (Ibn Khalīdūn, ʿIbr, iv, 164), all this after the
island had suffered, in 255/869, the devastating effects
of a Norman invasion. Majorca was a constant source of
difficulties for the Cordovan administration, to
such an extent that in 336/947-8 al-Nāṣir was obliged
to send his kātb ʿalīyar b. ʿUthmān al-Muḥṣafī
to restore order there (Bayān, ii, text 215, tr. 356). In
the 5th/11th century, there begins a new period in the
history of Majorca. Annexed to the kingdom of
Muḥjāhid (s.v.) of Denia (see Clelia Sarnelli Cerqua,
Muḥjāhid al-Ma’rīn kātib al-ʿarabī, 1977), the island became the cen-
tre of intense piratical activity. After the disappear-
ance of Ali b. Muḥjāhid and the incorporation of
Denia, in 468/1076, into the kingdom of the Banū
Ḥūd (s.v.) of Saragossa (Aflī Turk, El reino de Zaragoza
en el siglo XI de Cristo (V de la Hegír), Madrid 1978,
109-14), there followed, from 480 to 508/1087-1115,
some obscure years of independence during which the
islands, having undergone a devastating attack on the
part of the Pisans and the Catalans, were occupied by
the Almohavids. The rule of the latter, continued,
after their collapse and their disappearance from the
Iberian peninsula and North Africa, with the dynasty of
the Banū Qānīnaya (s.v.) until the occupation of the island by the Almohads in 599/1202-3 (see especially
al-Himyarî, al-Raouf al-miṣr, text 189-91, tr. 228-
31). The reign of the Almohads represents a period of
obscurity which lasted until the year 627/1229 when
James I of Aragon put an end to Islamic domination;
the last centre of resistance were crushed in Rabī’
I 628/January-February 1231.

Majorca was Islamised and Arabised from the 4th
to the 6th century/10th to the 12th, and under the
Almoravids and the Almohads its ethnic composition
became increasingly Berberised, a factor which has
left visible traces in the toponymy of the Balearic
M. Barcelo, De toponimia tribal i clàctica berber a les illes orien-
tals d’al-Andalus, Societat Onomàstica, Buttleti
interior, vii Colloqui Mallorca, April 1982, 426; A.
Poveda Sánchez, Introducción al estudio de la toponimia
árabe-musulmana de Mallorca, según la documentación de los
archivos de la ciudad de Mallorca (1232-1276), in Aesropa,
tii (1980), 76-100. Majorca displayed, especially in
the 7th to the 11th/13th centuries, an intense
cultural activity (D. Urvoy, La vie intellectuelle et
spirituelle dans les Baléares musulmanes, in And., xxxvii (1972), 87-132). The other islands were also conquered by the Catalan-Aragonese: Ibiza in 632/1235 and Minorca in 686/1287. 

Bibliography: Besides the works mentioned, see Guillaume Roselli Bordoy, L'Islanda e le Isole Baleari, Palma, Majorca 1968, which contains full references to the Arabic sources and puts into context the information supplied by the classic work of Alvaro Campaner y Fuertes, Bosquejo historico de la dominación islámica en las Islas Baléares, Palma 1888. Also see the works of Miquel Barcelo (extensive bibliography), A. Poveda Sánchez and Richard Soto, author inter alio of Quan Mallorca era Mayurka, in L'Avenc, xvi (May 1975), 25-33 and of Moscuitas urbanes e mesquites rurales a Mayurqa, in Bulletí de la Soc. arqueológica Lusiana, any xv (1979), no. xxxvii, 114-35. On the subject of Majorca, E. Molina López, El gobierno independiente de Menorca y sus relaciones con al-Andalus e Iftaniya, in Revista de Menorca, Mahón 1982, 5-88. Also recommended is M. de Episla, Orígenes de la invasión cordobesa de Mallorca en 902, in Estudios de Prehistoria, d'Historia de Mayurqa i d'Història de Mallorca dedicats a Guillem Rosello i Bordoy, Majorca 1982, 113-129 (these Estudis also contain other interesting articles).

(J. Bosch Vila) AL-MAYURKI, the nisba of several persons originally from Majorca (Mayurka [q.v.]) or residents of the island. In his Mudad al-baladání, iv, 720-3, s.v. Mayurka, Yákút mentions a certain number. 

In addition to al-Íhumaydi [q.v.], the best-known person with this last nisba, one should mention the name of Abu 1-Hasan‘Ali b. Ahmad b. ‘Abd al-Áziz b. Tunayz, who seems to have led quite a lively existence. According to Yákút, iv, 722-3, he was a good grammarian (cf. al-Suyútí, Bugháni, 327) who was also concerned with the Kur‘án readings; he naturally collected hadiths at Damascus, Basra and elsewhere. He is said to have gone to ‘Umán and the land of the Zanj, where he stayed for some time before returning to die at ‘Askímayn, near Baghdád (rather than at Basra, in Yákút’s second version) in ca. 475/1082. Two verses by him are cited by Yákút and al-Suyútí, but others are preserved in the Escorial ms. 467/2 (Derenbourg). See Brockelmann, S I, 479. Another Mayurkí worthy of notice is a Christian convert to Islam, Fray Anselm Turmeda, better known under the name of ‘Abd Alláh al-Tárdjumán [see al-Tárdjumáni].

(MAYY ZIYÁDA, pen name of MÁRÌ İLYÁS ZIYÁDA, pioneer writer of poetry in prose, essayist, orator and journalist in Arabic, French and English; translator from several European languages; and a zealous feminist who defended the case of Arab women’s education and freedom. 

Born in Nazareth on 11 February 1886 to a Lebanese Christian father who worked as a teacher and journalist, and a Galilee mother from a village near Nazareth, Mayy received a French education at St. Joseph’s School in Nazareth (1892-9), in ‘Ayníyurá in Lebanon (1900-4), and at the Lazarist Nuns in Beirut (1904-8). In 1908 her parents emigrated to Cairo, where her father was appointed as the editor of the journal al-Mahrusa. Her first literary work was a booklet of a collection of romantic poems and poems in prose in French, influenced by Lamartine and dedicated to him, entitled Fleurs de rône (Cairo 1911). It was published under the pseudonym of Isis Coppia. Djammal Djibr transformed it into Arabic as Azákhir h'lum (Beirut 1952).

In Egypt she studied various European languages and European romantic poets and writers, and became interested in European feminist activities. She also came under the influence of Arabic Islamic culture, especially through Lutfí al-Sayyid [q.v.]. She published four volumes of Mahrus novels by European writers which she translated into Arabic, and later these were published in book form. Some of these were from the French: Brada’s novel Le retour du flot, which she entitled Raudúf al-masayla (1925); a novel by Sir Arthur Conan Doyle, The Refugees, which she entitled al-Hubb fi l-‘íghab (1925) and from German the novel Deutsche Liebe by F. Max Müller under the title Dhísanát u-wa‘ílima (Cairo 1911).

In 1916 she joined the Egyptian University (al-Ídámía al-Misriyya), where she studied literature and philosophy. She also collected her social essays which were published in al-Mahrúsí and other Arabic journals under the title Sawánín fatát (Cairo 1922). She took an active part in the social and cultural life in Lebanon and Egypt by lecturing at mixed meetings of men and women in various clubs and societies such as Fatáí Misr, where she lectured on Gháyát al-hayát (Cairo 1921). She published articles in various journals—in Arabic, al-Mahrúsí, al-Muktafar, al-Hlíl, al-Ahrám, and al-Súyúsa al-‘úshá’íyya; in French, Sphynx, Le Progrès Égyptien; and in English, The Egyptian Mail—on various cultural subjects such as Arabic language and literature, Arab and Eastern women and the awakening of the Eastern nations such as the Turkish and the Japanese. She defended the “spiritualism of the East” as opposed to the materialism of the West, but condemned the poverty, illiteracy and illness which prevailed in the East. Her lectures were collected in her book Kalímát wa-ishdrat, (Cairo 1922). Her articles on French and Arab personalities she collected in her book al-Sáhadí (Cairo 1924), and on Arabic language and literature in Bayn al-dajzar wa ‘l-nadid (Cairo 1924). Her collection of romantic and lyrical poetry-in-prose (ghbír mánthár) influenced by Khalíl Djibrán [q.v.] she published in her book Zútumát wa-ashá‘íyya (Cairo 1923) in which she expressed her pantheism.

In her essays she called for brotherhood, justice, mercy and secular humanism. Yet Mayy did not believe in equality in society. She expressed her ideas on aristocracy, slavery, passive and revolutionary socialism, democracy, anarchism and nihilism in her book al-Musawáti (Cairo 1922), where she ended her discussion with a play emphasising that equality in society is impossible.

In various works, Mayy extolled the literary achievements of her contemporary Arab pioneer poetsesses and writers such as in Bdhíẖát al-Bádiyya (pseudonym of Malak Híni Násif [q.v.]) (Cairo 1920), Warda al-Ázídí (Cairo 1924), and Ídásíh el-Taymíríyya, published in serial form in al-Muktafar (1923-5) and in book form in 1956.

French literary and cultural life made a great impression on Mayy. She styled her weekly salon according to Mme de Rambouillet. Her circle, which exercised deep influence on Egyptian literary and cultural life, included eminent Egyptian and Syrian-Lebanese men and women of the pen such as Malak Híni Násif and Húdí Sha’rá’íi, the poets Ismá’il Sabrí, Ahmad Shawkí, Hájí Ibrahim, Mustafá Sádík al-Ráfíí, Walí al-Dín Yágan and Khalíl Mútárán, and writers such as Lutfí al-Sayyid, Shi'bíl Shumayyil, Mustafá ‘Abd al-Rázík, Salím Sarkí, Saláma Músá, Ya’kúb Sárruf, Táhá Húsayn and ‘Abábás Míjímíd al-‘Ákkád. In her salon, literary and cultural questions, and philosophical and scientific trends, were
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discussed and poems were read. Many writers said that some of these personalities were in love with Mayy; yet it is agreed that her great love was Djabran, whom, though she corresponded with him, she never met in person.

Mme de Sévigné was her example for literary correspondence. Beside Djabran and the attendants of her salon, she corresponded also with Salma Sâviyh and Amin al-Rîhâni. Some of these letters were collected and published by the Lebanese Djamil Djabr in his book Mayy wa-Djabr (Beirut 1950), Rasâ’il Mayy (2nd ed. Beirut 1954) and by T’hir al-Tunnâhî in Abî man haydt Mayy (Cairo 1974). A common fault among Arab writers is that they have looked at Rasâ’il Mayy (1948) by Madeleine Arkash as a collection of Mayy Ziyâda’s genuine letters while, in fact, these are imaginary letters giving advice to women on problems of life.

Mayy’s style is influenced by Christian Arabic liturgical literature and the French Romantics. She treats her subjects emotionally and metaphorically, loading them with allusions to French and Arabic history and culture.

The deaths of her father in 1930, of Djabrân in 1931 and of her mother in 1932 made her feel lonely and deserted. Her journeys to France and England in 1932 and then to Rome did not release her from her melancholy. In 1935 her relatives suspected her of neurasthenia and hysteria; they lured her back to Lebanon and she was put into a mental hospital for nine months. The Lebanese journal al-Makhibhî defended her case with the help of her friends Amin al-Rîhâni, Charles Malik and Kushtânîn Zaraq and Prince ‘Abd al-Kâdir al-Djazâîn, and she was released from hospital. Two years later she returned to Cairo, where she died on 19 October 1941. In 1975 Muqassat Nawfal in Beirut published all Mayy’s works and translations, twelve in number.


(S. Moreh)

MAYYAFARIKIN, a town in the northeast of Diyar Bakr [q.v.]. The other Islamic forms of the name are Mafarkîn, Mafarîk, Farkîn (whence the name of origin al-Fariki), etc. The town is called in Greek Martyropolis, in Syriac Maphêrê, in Armenian Nphêrê (later Mucharîn, Muchparîn). According to Yakûtî, iv, 702, the old name of the town was Madhir-sâîla (read kâla < *matur-khalakh in Armenian, “town of the martyrs”). On the identification of Tigranocerta with Mayyafarîkin, see below.

1. Topography and early history.

Geography. The town lies to the south of the little range of the Harzî which rises like the first tier of the amphitheatre of the mountains, the higher parts of which consist of the summits (Darîqî, Antok) rising to the south of Mûsh and separating the course of the eastern Euphrates (Murûd çay) from those of the Tigris and its left-bank tributaries.

Muyyafarîkin lies 25 miles north of the Tigris and 12 west of the Batmân-Sû. It is watered by a little river (now called the Fârîn-Sû) which flows into the Batmân-Sû 12 miles to the southeast, an important left-bank tributary of the Tigris which drains the wild and mountainous country south of Mûsh (the cantons of Kulp and Şasîn). The old names of the Batmân-Sû are Nicephorius (Roman period), Nymphios (Byzantine period), which go to form the Batman-Su: 1. Cabakhdjur (on the Murûd çay) — Dhu ’l-Karnayn — Lîdir — Bokhâr — Mayyafarîkin; 2. Mûsh — Kulp — Pûsûr — Mayyafarîkin; 3. Mûsh — Khoyt — Tingirt (Şasîn) — Mayyafarîkin. Routes 3 and 4 passing Şasîn are still little known. The distance between Diyarbakr and Mayyafarîkin is about 45 miles. The old road Diyarbakr — Bitlis, which used to pass through Mayyafarîkin, now runs farther south and crosses the Batmân-Sû south of Almadîn (Diyarbakr — Sinân — Zok — Weisikarîn — Bitlis).

Mayyafarîkin has thus lost the advantage of being a stage on the road between Armenia and upper Mesopotamia. Since 1260 it has no longer been a political centre around which gravitated the interests of the surrounding country. It retains only its importance as a market for the produce of the mountainous and pastoral country drained by the Batmân-Sû.

Ancient history. The mountains to the north of Mayyafarîkin have long sheltered the remains of ancient aboriginal peoples. About 600 A.D., Georgius Cyprius (ed. Gdtzer, 48), mentions the Xbûsâc and Sasûnawtau there who gave their names to the districts of Khût and Sasun. Marquart (1916) supposes there are elements of the aboriginal language in names like *M-îpher-kêl and *Ma-mushêl(i) which are, he says, formed with Caucasian (“sîdka-kassîch”) prefixes. According to tradition (Yâkûtî, iv, 703), the founder of Martyropolis, Marúthâ b. Layûa, was the son of a woman on the mountains, and Marquart sees in Layûa a mutilated form of the name of the people Urta(n) < Urtûa (Handes Amuruya [1915], 96; [1916], 126). The Marwanîd Abû Nasr (see section 2. below) was married to the daughter of Šankarbîr, lord of the Sanasûna; cf. Amedroz, in FNAS (1903).

Lehmann-Haupt thought that he could recognise at Mayyafarîkin traces of an ancient Assyrian settlement, "eine von Haus aus assyrische Anlage" (Armenia, i, 396, 396). Tigranocerta = Mayyafarîkin (?). As early as 1838, von Moltke had suggested that Mayyafarîkin was the ancient Tigranocerta, i.e. the new capital founded by Tigranes II about 80 B.C. which was taken by Lucullus after the victory won on the banks of the Nicopolis (6 Oct. 69 B.C.) and again in the reign of Nero by the legate Corbulo (ca. 63 A.D.); it is regularly mentioned down to the middle of the 4th century. Other scholars had sought Tigranocerta at Sirîn (d’Anville), Arzan (H. Kr., 61), and Kef-Djioz (Kiepert 1875), at Tell-Arman west of
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Nišibin (E. Sachau; cf. dunavšēr), etc. Late Armenian tradition gives the name Tigranocerta to Diyarbakr. Moltke’s idea was taken up vigorously by Lehmann-Haupt and W. Belck after their expedition to Armenia in 1899-90.

On the north wall of Mayyāfārīkīn is a mutilated Greek inscription. It was deciphered and published by Lehmann-Haupt, who attributes it to the Armenian King Pap (369-74), which is quite in keeping with the known facts of the reign of this monarch. In spite of his criticism of the details of Lehmann-Haupt’s hypothesis, Marquart (1916) has rather corroborated him by bringing forward new considerations.

In view of the many contradictions found in the classical sources regarding Tigranocerta, the question comes to be, if Mayyāfārīkīn is not Tigranocerta, what other unknown town existed here in the time of Pap, unless the stones on which the inscription is engraved and which are now hopelessly disarranged (“in heilloser Verwürrung”) were brought from another place when Martyropolis was being built?

The main objection to the identification of Tigranocerta with Mayyāfārīkīn is that, according to Eutropius, vi, 9, 1 and Faustus, v, 24, Tigranocerta was in Arzanēnē (Aldznikh); on the other hand, the river Mamushel seems to have formed in the 4th century the western frontier of this latter province. From this fact (Hübschmann, Die alarmen. Ortsnamen, Indogerm. Forsch., Leipzig 1904, 473-5), it seems that Tigranocerta ought to be placed east of the Baştān-Şū if this river is identical with the Mamushel. This last name was connected by Marquart with the name al-Musuliyyāt, which al-Muḳaddasaš, 144, gives to one of the tributaries of the Tigris (on the left bank) and apparently corresponding to the Baştān-Şū. (A district of Musuliyya (?) still exists farther east on the upper course of the Biḏlūs ʿayān, in the area of the ancient possessions of the Baştāk Mushālī.)

To reconcile the statements of Faustus, iv, 24, 27, with the position of Mayyāfārīkīn (12 miles west of the Baştān-Şū), Marquart proposes to identify the Mamushel = Nicephorius with the Farkīn-Şū, while the Musuliyyāt would be applied to the whole system of the tributaries of the Tigris (Neyzyūz, Sāvādāmā, etc.). The insignificance of the Farkīn-Şū, which rises in the hills about 3 miles north of Mayyāfārīkīn (Ibn al-Azraq calls its source Raʾs al-ʿAyn; the Diḥīḥan-numā, 437, ʿAyn al-Hawd) and does not suit the description of the hermitage of Mambēr, which, according to Faustus, must have been on the right bank, makes Marquart’s hypothesis less attractive. If finally we consider the position of Mayyāfārīkīn from the point of view of the interests of Tigranocērta, one is forced to admit that against an enemy coming from the west (Lucullus!) Tigranocerta ≠ Mayyāfārīkīn was devoid of natural defences, while in the event of an enemy coming from the east it ran the risk of being easily cut off from Armenia on the main road from Biḏlīs (the ancient Kāstōra ʿAqalaṭūn, cf. Tomaschek, Susan in SBAW Hēr [Vienna 1895], 6). On the other hand, Mayyāfārīkīn from its position later played an important part in the defensive system of the Byzantine empire.

In these circumstances and before a more detailed study has been made on the spot, it is a mistake to think that all the difficulties in the identification of Tigranocerta have been cleared up.

Mayyāfārīkīn = Martyropolis. The identity of these two towns is quite certain. The Christian sources (Syriac, Armenian and Greek) referring to the foundation of Martyropolis are numerous. A Syriac "history" (taḥīṭa) kept in the Jacobite church of Mayyāfārīkīn was translated for the historian of the town Ibn al-Azraq and is given in a synopsis in Yākūt, iv, 703-7 and al-Kazwīnī, ii, 379-90 (tr. with notes by Marquart, in Handels Amoury [1916], 123-35).

The town is said to have been founded on the site of a "little village" (karya ʿażima) by the bishop Marūḥā (Mār Marūḥā) who had obtained the authority of Yazdigird I of Persia to do so. This ecclesiastical flourished between ca. 383 and 420 (on the sources for his biography, cf. Marquart, op. cit., 91-2, 125). The town of Martyropolis to which Marūḥā brought the remains of the Christian martyrs of Persia is mentioned for the first time in 410. The etymology of the Syriac name Mīphērkēt is uncertain (cf. above).

In Armenian, the town is mentioned for the first time in the Geography of the 7th century as Nphhrēt (once Nphret).

By the peace of 297 with Diocletian, the province of Sophanēnē, within which Martyropolis lay, had become part of the Roman empire. Even after the disastrous peace made by Jovian in 363, Sophanēnē remained to the Emperor. Under Theodosius II (401-50), the new town, situated quite near the frontier, acquired considerable importance and became the capital of Sophanēnē (= Great Tsoḵāk). The town was still insufficiently fortified, and in 502 the Sāsānian Kawaḵṯ b. Pērōz seized it and carried the inhabitants off to Khusraw, where he founded for them the town of Abaḵ-Ḵubāḏ (Yākūt, iv, 707) Weh-Amīḏ-Kawāḏ = Arradjan; cf. Marquart, Erānīshār, 41, 307). Anastasius began the fortification of Martyropolis but Justinian, after his accession in 527, was the first to completely reorganise the eastern frontier between Dārā and Trebizond. Martyropolis, the headquarters of a commander under the strategy of Theodosiopolis (Erzerūm), became one of the most important military centres. Procopius, De aedificiis, iii, gives a complete description of the walls of the town, the height and thickness of which were doubled and a full account of the system of defences (outer walls, advanced forts etc.); cf. Adontz, op. cit., 10-12, 140-2. In 589 the town fell into the hands of the Sāsānids, but in 591 came back to the Byzantines in return for the support given by the Emperor Maurice to Khusraw II. Heraclius held it still the year 18/639 (Yākūt, loc. cit.). (The date is not given in Muralt, Chronogr. byz. , i.).

The vicissitudes of Martyropolis probably explain the fact that in the Armenian Geography of the 7th century (ed. Pātkanov, tr. 45; Marquart, Erānīshār, 18, 161) the Persian province of Aldznikh (Arzanēnē) is separated from Tsoḵāk (Sophanēnē) by the line of the Khālīr (= Baştān-Şū) while in the description of parts of Armenia Nphret (= Nphṛjet) figures as one of the 10 cantons of Arzanēnē.

Christian legend as preserved by Ibn al-Azraq and Yākūt gives very full details of the building of the town in the time of Mār Mārūḥā: the arches (tīḵān) of the walls in which the remains of the martyrs were placed, the eight gates of the town, the names of which are carefully recorded, the convent of SS. Peter and Paul, the buildings erected by the three ministers of the Byzantine emperor, each of whom built a tower and a church. There is still to be seen in Mayyāfārīkīn the ruins of a magnificent basilica and of the Church of the Virgin (al-ʿAḏhrā). Gertrude Bell dated the basilica “not much later than the beginning of the fifth century”, and suggested that the Church of the Virgin was one of the two built by Khuṣrāw II in recognition of the assistance lent by Maurice; cf. Abu ʿI-Farajī, Mukhtasār, ed. Pococke, 98.

(V. Minorsky)
2. The Islamic period.

The conquest and caliphal rule. In the wake of the conquest of the Djazira by 'Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb had made him governor of the Djazira in 18/639 (al-Baladhuri, Fatīḥa, 170). From that time until the early 'Abbāsid period, the city was ruled as part of the Djazira, sometimes jointly with al-Šāhm and on other occasions with Armenia and Adharbāyjān. The names of individual governors of Mayyāfārīkīn for this period are listed by the town chronicler Ibn al-Azraq al-Fārīkī and copied by 'Īzz al-Dīn Ibn Shaddādīd, the 7th/13th century geographer of the city. During the reign of the 'Abbāsid caliph al-Muḥtaḍī (255/669-70), Mayyāfārīkīn and Amīdīd were seized by the Ṣayḥānīdīs 'Īsā b. al-Šaykhīdī (Ibn Shaddādīd, ms. Oxford, Marsh 333, fol. 10a). The Ṣayḥānīdīs continued to govern the area until its reconquest by the caliph al-Muḥtaḍī in 286/899. The grandson of 'Īsā b. al-Šaykhīdī, Muḥammad, built the minaret of the Friday mosque in Mayyāfārīkīn in 270/883-4 or 273/886-7. His name was inscribed on it (ibid., fol. 69a).

Hamdānīd and Buyid involvement in Mayyāfārīkīn. Mayyāfārīkīn fell under the sway of the Taghlībī Arab family, the Hamdānīsld, after the appointment of Nāṣīr al-Dawla al-Ḥasan as governor of Mawsīl in 324/935. His brother, Sayf al-Dawla al-Salīlīd (d. 356/967), ruled Aleppo and Diyar Bākr and showed a particular liking for Mayyāfārīkīn. Sayf al-Dawla repaired its walls and rebuilt the old citadel, where he stayed when visiting the city. He also provided Mayyāfārīkīn with a proper water supply. The entourage of Sayf al-Dawla at Mayyāfārīkīn included the famous preacher Ibn Nubatā (Ibn Shaddādīd, fol. 77a-78a).

During the rule of Sayf al-Dawla, the Djazira was under frequent attack from the Byzantines, whose territorial possessions extended at times almost as far as Amīdīd. The future Byzantine emperor John Tzimīscēs witnessed another cultural flowering in Islamic Mayyāfārīkīn. The second Marwānid sultan, Mumāhidīd al-Dawlaī, repaired the city walls and inscribed his name on them in many places (ibid., 86, 163; Ibn Shaddādīd, fol. 70a). An inscription of his is illustrated by Lehmann-Haupt (Armenien, 424).

The greatest of the Marwānid rulers, Nāṣīr al-Dawlaī, ruled 401/1011-61, was responsible for much building activity in the city, including a new citadel with gilded walls and ceilings which was completed in Ḏub 'l-Hijdādīd 403/June-July 1013 and which stood on a hill, the site of the Church of the Virgin. The Christian relics were transferred to the Melkite church (Ibn al-Azraqīd, ed. ʿAwād, 107-8).

Nāṣīr al-Dawlaī also restored the old observatory (manṣūra), put a clock (bānām) in the Friday mosque, constructed and endowed a hospital (bimarstān), planted the citadel garden and built bridges, public baths and a mosque in the suburb of al-Muḥaddathīd (ibid., 123, 138, 141, 143, 145, 163-4, 168). The Marwānid capital attracted prominent religious and literary figures (ibid., 82, 144, 166); from it, for example, ʿAbd Allāh al-Kāzārīdīd put the Shāfiʿī madhhabī in Diyar Bākr (Ibn al-Athīrīd, ix, 52). ʿAbbās Abū Nāṣīr al-Malānī, a high official at the time of Nāṣīr al-Dawlaī, collected books and established waqfs for libraries in the mosques of Mayyāfārīkīn and Amīdīd (Ibn al-Azraqīd, ed. ʿAwād, 131). Nāṣīr al-Dawlaī died in 453/1061 and was buried in the turba of the Banū Marwān at Mayyāfārīkīn (ibid., 177).

After this, the Marwānid sultans held on to Mayyāfārīkīn until the town and the rest of Diyar Bākr were taken by the Seljūqs in 478/1085 during the campaign conducted by Ibn Djāhirī (Ibn Shaddādīd, fols. 77a-78a), the erstwhile vizier of the Marwānīdīs. Ibn Djāhirī had persuaded the Seljūq sultan Malik-Shāhīd (Ibn Shaddādīd, fol. 78b) to authorize him to besiege Mayyāfārīkīn, and the vizier was able to carry off vast treasures belonging to the Marwānīdīs (Ibn al-Athīrīd, x, 86-8, 93-4; Ibn al-Azraqīd, ed. ʿAwād, 208-12).

In the brief quarter-century following the death of Nasr al-Dawla, Malik-Shahīd and his sons fought many battles, and the city was ruled by Seljūq princes and other local rulers, including Tutūsh, Dukakī, Kūllīdī Arslān and Sukmān al-Kutbī al-Khūṭātīd. The Artūkīds. After the death of the Seljūq sultan Muḥammadīd b. Malik-Shāhīd (Ibn Shaddādīd, fols. 81b-82a) in 512/1118-19, Mayyāfārīkīn fell under the sway of the Turcoman Artūkīdsīd. According to its chronicler Ibn al-Azraqīd, the town was seized in 512/1118-19 by the Artūkīd Nadīm al-Dīn Il-Ghāzīī, who had already taken Mārīn around 502/1018-9 (ms. B.L., Or. 5803, fol. 161a). Ibn al-Athīrīd puts the Artūkīd capture of Mayyāfārīkīn three years later, in 515/1121-2 (x, 418), but this is one instance where the dating of the local historian is more likely to be accurate. After Il-Ghāzīīs death in 516/1122, his son Temūr-taḡī was able to hold on to Mārīn and Mayyāfārīkīn for thirty years and to withstand Zangūs attempts to extend his sphere of influence in Diyar Bākr (Ibn al-Azraqīd, Or. 5803, fol. 160a, 171a; Ibn al-ʿAdīmīd, 271; Ibn al-Athīrīd, Atabegīd, 79). Temūrtaḡīs most ambitious project was the building of the Kāramān bridge over the Satīdāmī river (the Batmānī-Sū) five miles east of Mayyāfārīkīn. The work was begun in 541/1146-7 and was completed by his son Nadīm al-Dīn Alīīd in 548/1153-4. The stone arch of the bridge.
measured more than sixty spans and was "one of the marvels of the age" (Ibn al-Azrak, Or. 5803, fols. 171b, 179b). The bridge is described fully by Gabriel (Voyages, 236), who notes that Sauvaget read the name Temurtasha and the year 542/1147-8 on the bridge (ibid., 345). A copper mine was discovered in the time of Temurtasha in the area north of Mayyafarikin (Ibn al-Athir, x, 215) and it is noteworthy that Temurtasha is known to have minted copper coins (Ibn al-Azrak, ibid.).

Temurtasha and the year 542/1147-8 on the bridge (Voyages, 236), who notes that Sauvaget read the name Temurtasha and the year 542/1147-8 on the bridge (Voyages, 236). There is an inscription in the name of Nadjm al-Din Alpi at the base of the dome (Gabriel, Voyages, 227). The description of Mayyafarikin after the conquest by Salâh al-Din. After its conquest by Salâh al-Din in 581/1185, the city walls were decorated with a fine commemorative inscription. This was discovered by Gertrude Bell and analysed by Van Berchem (in Diez, Baudenknäpler, 108) and by Flury (Schriftbänder, 44-8). It is apparently the only Kufic inscription in the name of Salâh al-Din. Minorosky (EI1, art. Mayyafarîkîn) stated on the authority of Gertrude Bell that this ruler built a mosque at Mayyafarîkîn for which the columns of the Byzantine basilica were used. There would appear to be no evidence in the sources for this. Possibly the mosque in question was the one outside the walls, of which only the Ayyubid minaret remains (Gabriel, Voyages, 210, 228).

Salâh al-Din entrusted Mayyafarikîn to his brother Sayyid Ahmad Beg Ruzak, who by the city wall of the Ayyubid branch of the Ayyubid family until the Mongols conquered the city in 658/1260. In addition to the literary record, there is architectural, epigraphic and numismatic evidence of this short-lived Ayyubid dynasty at Mayyafarîkîn. Awdad Najm al-Din Ayyûb (596-607/1200-10) left an inscription dated Ramadan 599/May-June 1203 on a tower of the eastern inner wall (illustrated and described by Lehmann-Haupt, Armenien, 425-6) and the name of his successor, Ağraf Mûsâ (607-12/1210-20), is inscribed on a tower to the north (ibid.). Mûsâ's brother, Mu'azzar Shihâb al-Din Ghazi (617-42/1220-44) built a fine mosque of red baked brick with an inscription dated 624/1227 which was seen and analysed by Taylor (ibid., 428). The inscription on the mihrab is given by Gabriel (Voyages, inscription no. 124). The coins struck by the Ayyubids of Mayyafarîkîn have aroused a certain interest amongst scholars (Grabar, 167-78; Lane-Poole, iv, 122-30; Lowick, 164-5). A series of them minted between 582/1186-7 and 612/1215-6 represent crowned human figures. Some have long locks of hair; others are wearing caps with tassels; sometimes these figures are enthroned (ibid.).

The Mongols devastated the area around Mayyafarîkîn as early as 628-9/1231. In 638/1240-1 a Mongol embassy reached the town and demanded that it should surrender and that its fortifications be destroyed. On this occasion, Mu'azzar Shihâb al-Din Ghazi succeeded in deflecting the attentions of the embassy elsewhere. His son, Kâmil Muhammad (642-58/1240-64) defended the Mongols in a brave stand at Mayyafarîkîn, but the city fell in 658/1260 to the Mongol army of Hûlegü under the command of Yağmûr and it was then that this last Ayyubid ruler was killed (Rashid al-Din, 77-81; Ibn Shaddad, fol. 120a).

Descriptions of Mayyafarîkîn in the Muslim geographers. There is some disagreement in the classical Muslim geographical works on the placing of Mayyafarîkîn. Al-Mukaddasî (137) puts it in Diyar Bakr, al-Îstakhri (188) considers it to be part of Armaniyâ, whilst Ibn al-Fâkhi (133) places it in Diyar Râba'a. Ibn Shaddad lists Mayyafarîkîn as one of the four aamiar of Diyar Bakr, the other three being Amid, Arzan and Mârdin (fol. 63a).

Al-Îstakhri (76, n. k) describes Mayyafarîkîn as having an encircling wall and an abundant water supply, but he comments on the town's unhealthy climate. Al-Mukaddasî (140) mentions the fortifications, including battlements, an encircling wall and ditch; he also notes that the water there is muddy in winter. According to Kudâma (246), the combined revenue of Arzan and Mayyafarîkîn in 4Âbâdîs times was 4,100,000 dirhams. Nâsirî Khûrâvî visited the town in the 6th/12th century. He was aware of the excellent condition of its walls, which seemed as if they had only just been completed (tr. Schefer, 24-5).

Yâkût (d. 626/1229) praised the city, especially its surrounding wall of white stone and its prosperous suburb (rabad) (Mu'âjam, iv, 703-7). When Ibn Shaddad visited Mayyafarîkîn in the 7th/13th century, he found thriving bâns and markets, as well as two madrasas, one Hanbali, the other Shâfi'i (fol. 71a). Both Ibn Shaddad and Yâkût mention eight city gates at Mayyafarîkîn, seven of which probably corresponded to those of Byzantine Martyropolis (Gabriel, Voyages, 218).

The 8th-9th/14th-15th centuries. In the Ilkhanid period (654-754/1256-1353), Mayyafarîkîn shared the fate of the rest of Diyar Bakr and was ruled by Mongol emirs. After the collapse of the Ilkhanid state, after 736/1336, Diyar Bakr fell into disarray and became the arena for power struggles between rival Turcoman (the Ak Koyunlu and Kara Koyunlu confederations), Kurdish and Arab groups, before falling victim to the depredations of Timûr who attacked the area (but not, apparently, Mayyafarîkîn) in 796/1394 and 803/1400-1 (Ibn 'Arabişhâh, 65-6, 164-5). Thereafter, Mayyafarîkîn was in the hands of one branch of the mostly nomadic Sulaymanî Kurds [see KURDS] until it was taken in 827/1427 by the Ak Koyunlu leader Kara U'tmânî (d. 839/1435), who appointed his son Bàyazid governor of the town and other citadels in the area (Tîrânî, 95).

The Şafawîd and Ottoman periods. The Şafawîd Şâh Ismâîl I occupied the whole of Diyar Bakr in his campaign against the last Ak Koyunlu ruler Murâd in 913/1507-8. He then allotted Diyar Bakr to Şânî Muhammad Ustaşîlî (Iskandar Ben Munshi, Âlâm-arâ, i, 32-3). After Ismâîl's defeat at Caldirân [q.v.] in 920/1514, Mayyafarîkîn was seized by the Kurdish chief Sayîd Ahmad Beg Rûzâkî. The city fell under Ottoman control in 921/1515 after the battle of Khoş Hisâr, when the Şafawîs were forced to cede Diyar Bakr to the Ottomans. In his history of the Kurds, the 10th/16th century writer Şaraf al-Dîn Khîn Bûtûlî gives the genealogies of Mayyafarîkîn in his own time (Şaraf-nâmâ, 270-2).

Information on Mayyafarîkîn in the Ottoman...
period is scanty. The Portuguese traveller Tenreyro went there in 936-7/1529 and found it “almost deserted” (Itinerario, 406). Ewliya Celebi (d. ca. 1095/1684) visited the town (Seyihat-nama, iv, 76-b) and gave a long laudatory description of the Saray bridge. Von Molke, who passed through the city in the 19th century, while noting the well-preserved state of its walls and towers, commented on the ruined condition of the rest of the city which he said had been caused by Ottoman-Kurdish struggles in the area (Lehmann-Haupt, 394, 419). Indeed, the city was to remain de facto in Kurdish hands until the beginning of this century.

Christianity in Mayyafarikin during the Islamic period. The Arabic sources record little of the transition from Christianity to Islam within Mayyafarikin, a major centre of Oriental Christianity. Isolated references indicate, however, that Christianity continued to prosper after the Muslim conquest until recent times. This evidence is of course corroborated and expanded by surviving Christian architecture in the area. Al-Mu’kaddasi (146) records without comment that in the monastery of Thomas (djury Tmud) one farash from Mayyafarikin there was a mummified corpse; it was allegedly that of one of the disciples [of Jesus]. Ibn al-Azrak mentions the existence of a Melkite church in the Marwān period and that Christians held office in the Marwanid government (ed. A’wad, 145, 164). The Jacobites had a bishopric in Mayyafarikin by the 9th/10th century (Vryonis, 53), although this is not mentioned in the detailed chronicle of Ibn al-Azrak. Ibn Shaddad does, however, mention an incident in which a Saljuk governor, Kiwām or Kawām al-Mulk Abu ‘Ali al-Balbāk became exasperated by the nākis from a monastery in Mayyafarikin and, refusing a large sum of money offered him by the Christians if he would leave the building intact, destroyed it (fol. 70b). The same author records that in his own time (the 7th/13th century) there were monasteries on a hill to the north of Mayyafarikin (ibid.). In 936-7/1529 Tenreyro describes “beautiful monasteries and churches without roofs, containing sumptuous monuments with inscriptions in Greek letters. On the walls were pictures of apostles and other saints, painted in very fine colours and gold.” He remarks that there were only a small number of inhabitants who were Jacobite Christians and spoke Arabic (Itinerario, 376).

Mayyafarikin in recent times. In 1891 the population of the town was 7,000, divided about equally between Muslims and Christians (Cuinet, ii, 470-2). During its occupation by the Sulaymanli Turks, the name Mayyafarikin had been eclipsed by that of its minority inhabitants, who were Jacobite Christians and spoke Arabic (Itinerario, 376). The town on 3 Djumada II 1071/24 January 1662. He was the author of several commentaries, other coins of Muzaffar Ghdzi, in CAROLE HILLENBRAND

MAYYA'A
Abū ʿAbd Allāh Muḥammad b. Ahmad, Mooroccan scholar and teacher, born 15 Ramaḍān 999/7 1539 at Fāṣ, where he studied and taught law and ḥadīth until his death in the same town on 3 Dhuʾ al-Ḥijjah 1072/14 January 1662. He was the author of several commentaries,
notably on the *Tuhfa* of Ibn *Asim* [(q.v.)], of which a manuscript exists in the Bibl. Générale, Rabat (D 873), and on the theological poem called al-*Marḥīd al-muʿārin* of his master Ibn *Ašūr* (d. 1040/1631) composed 1043–4 in *masāʿif* al-muʿārin fi ṣharṭ al-Marḥīd al-muʿārin ʿdālā l-*darārīn min ʿalām al-dīn* (lit. Fās, printed Tunis 1293, Cairo 1305, 1306). In 1048, he made an abridgement of it, *Iḥtiyāṣ al-Durr al-ʾal-تَحْمَر للمؤثرَين في الشارْت المُحَرِّم* which was lithographed at Fās in 1299 and printed at Cairo in 1301, 1303, 1305 and 1348; it should be noted that in his commentary, he took account of criticisms raised concerning his lack of objectivity and its lacunae (ii, 339–41; cf. Hājji, *ʿĀṣīṭī ʿumūrīyya*, 203–5). Amongst other works of his extant, as well as the *Naṣīḥ al-talāʾī wa l-durūr* (mss. Rabat 855 and 3702 Z) which contains a *fāhrās* [(q.v.)] and consequently, autobiographical details, one might mention the *Tuhfat al-asbāb wa l-raṣaqa bi-baʾda masāʾil al-safqa* (mss. Rabat 589 D; cf. O. Pesse, *Le contrat de safqa au Maroc*, Rabat 1952, passim), and particularly, the *Naṣīḥat Ṭahā al-mustafāy al-muṣāfirin fi l-*ṭaḥlīl bayn al-Muslimīn* (mss. Bibl. Royale, Rabat 7248), composed in 1051/1641 in defence of those Muslims of Jewish ancestry who were once more, after the death of sultan al-*Maṣrūq* al-Dhahabī (1603) the victims of a certain ostracism by traders and scholars in Fās. After the publication of this book, a cabal was formed against Mayyāra, who was the object of violent attacks, but who nevertheless benefited from the protection of Muhammad al-*Taṣīb* al-Dīlāʾī, who wrote a *Takrīz Naṣīḥat al-muṣāfiʿīn* (mss. Bibl. Gén., Rabat 923 K, 125–8), and from a defence by al-*Awhī, also the author of a *Takrīz* (in the text of the *Naṣīḥa*, 126–7). Like Mayyāra’s other works, the *Naṣīḥa* contains interesting pieces of historical information which would justify its publication. On account of his Jewish ancestry, this scholar, like al-*Maṇḡūr* [(q.v.)], was not allowed to fill any official post of a religious nature, although often described as *imām*, and it is said that he had to make a living by hiring out dresses and ornaments for ladies on the occasion of marriage (see al-Īfrānī, *Ṣafwat man ṭarāṭīr, litt. Fās n.d., 140; Hājji, op. cit., 147).

The epithet of “the Elder” (al-ʾĀkhār) is sometimes appended to his name in order to distinguish him from Muhammad b. Maḥmūd b. Muhammad (or Ahmad) al-*Hāfīd* or al-*Aṣghar*, also considered as *imām* of Fās (d. 15 Maḥarram 1144/20 July 1731; see al-ʾĀḏārī, *Naṣāʾ al-maṭhānī* ii, 235; al-Katṭānī, *Ṣafwat al-anfūs*, i, 167; L. Nāṣīḥī, *Livre littéraire*, index).


MAYYŪN, volcanic island of ca. 1 km² and 400 inhabitants in the Straits of the Bāb al-Mandāb [(q.v.)], off the coast of the People’s Democratic Republic of Yemen (the former Aden Protectorate). Known in classical times as *Δυόνυς* it became known in the West as Perim, probably from the other Arabic term used for the island *baṣīt* “rope”, possibly connected with the usage of the island as a coaling place. In 1854, the British landed there in 1799, but left because of the lack of water. In 1872 the British army of “South Borneo” under Captain Laws built a fort and established a coaling station, called Brown Bay, which was abandoned however in 1936. In 1915, Turkish troops made an unsuccessful attempt to land on the island. Incorporated into the British Crown Colony of Aden in 1957, Mayyun changed from the island of Kamarān and Sooret (Sukūtrā), *MAZ' [see qanasam].

MAZĀGĀN [see al-qa'dīnā].

MAZĀLĪM (A.), a word whose sing. *mazīm* denotes an unjust or oppressive action. Closely related to *zulm*, it is an antonym to *ʿadl* [(q.v.)] and thus signifies basically something “not in its right place” (LA). At an early stage in the development of Islamic institutions of government, *mazālīm* came to denote the structure through which the temporal authorities took direct responsibility for dispensing justice.

Precedents for the institution of *mazālīm* can be found in Byzantium and, more particularly, in the Sassānid bureaucratic office which functioned as a jurisdiction parallel to the ordinary judiciary headed by the *mobadhdh-mobadhīn* [(q.v.)] (A. Chrestensen, *L’Iran sous les Sassanides*, Copenhague 1944, 301 f.). It was suggested that the ideal of open access to tribal leaders in pre-Islamic Arabia was carried over into the early Islamic experience.

The establishment in Medina of the rudiments of an Islamic polity did little to change the situation. Muhammad combined in himself the rôles both of the traditional tribal chief and of the *hakam* [(q.v.)]. The early caliphs and provincial governors inherited this position, where judicial functions were not distinguished from other functions of government. Only in relation to the *dhimmī* [(q.v.)] did caliph or governor function as an alternative judicial authority (E. Tyan, *Histoire, 87–98*).

The growth in size and complexity of the Muslim community soon obliged caliphs and governors to appoint *kāfīs* [(q.v.)] to whom their judicial functions were delegated. The development of the *shariʿa* [(q.v.)] as a distinct system of law during the 2nd/8th and 3rd/9th centuries, its identification with the office of *kāfī*, and its increasing importance as a test of Islamic legitimacy, combined to form a context in which it becomes possible to identify a discrete *mazālīm* system. Al-Mawardi’s suggestion (Abkām, 65) that the Umayyad caliph *Abd al-Malik b. Marwān* [(q.v.)] was the first to arrange for the regular hearing of *mazālīm* petitions seems to be premature.

The 'Abbasid period. More certainty surrounds reports that the caliphs al-Mahdi and al-Hadi ([q. v.] ensured the regular holding of mazālim sessions. The practice for the first several decades was usually for the wazir ([q. v.]) to take charge (Sourdel, Various, 640-8), and there are indications that the mazālim jurisdiction was regarded both by them and by the kādīs and 'ulamā' as a rival to the shari'ā jurisdiction. Although Abū Yusuf ([q. v.] suggested to Hārūn al-Rashīd ([q. v.] that the caliph should personally take charge (K. al-Kānhārī, Cairo 1352, 111 f.), this seldom happened. In the longer term, mazālim remained a disputed institution following the fall of the Fatimids, and kādīs [see BARĀMIK] became more influential in the kādīs, culminating when a series of Mu'tazalī chief kādīs also held responsibility for mazālim.

The end of Mu'tazalī influence under al-Mutawakkil ([q. v.]) returned mazālim to the control of the wazirs, where it remained, until the Buyyid amīr al-unmar ([q. v.]) downgraded the wazir and handed control of mazālim to the ʿAḥwarī Shīrī nāšīb al-ʿadl ([q. v.]) (H. Busse, Chalif und Grofsunik, Wiesbaden 1969, 286-9).

From a comparatively early date, it became usual for the wazir or kādī in charge to appoint a deputy to take responsibility for the routine management of the institution. On occasions, this official, variously known as sāhib or nāzi al-mazālim, might also be appointed directly by the caliph.

The jurisdiction of mazālim tended to be very wide. Receiving and processing petitions against official and unofficial abuse of power was an important part of its activity, but it also on occasion functioned as a court of appeal against the decisions of kādīs. Additionally, it is evident that, for an early stage, mazālim was often the office through which military and civilian officials and dignitaries applied for the allocation of ḥālsa's and through which such grants might also be confiscated and their holders fined.

Theory. Before the work of al-Māwardī ([q. v.]), little theoretical consideration of mazālim is to be found. Statements in general terms of principle were not developed in detail. Al-Fārābī's view that the head of the just city should "favour justice and the just, hate tyranny and injustice, and give them both their just deserts" (al-Mudīna al-fadila, ed. Dieterici, repr. Leiden 1964, 60), is typical.

Working in the service of the caliphs al-Kādīr and al-Kāhīm, al-Māwardī's object was to restore the authority of the caliphate in preparation for the approaching Sālqīds. His work al-ʿAhsāʾ al-sulṭanīyya therefore included an extensive chapter on the structure, procedure and jurisdiction of mazālim, which is paralleled with minor differences in Abū Ya'qūb b. al-Farraj's work of the same title (cf. Bibl.).

Supervision of mazālim is the responsibility of the caliph, his viziers and governors, or their appointed deputies, who must have personal qualities combining honesty, power and judiciousness. The mazālim session is duly constituted when the official in charge is assisted by guards, kādīs, fakhsīs, secretaries and notaries (ghāshīs). Ten classes of cases are detailed in coming within the jurisdiction of mazālim, falling into two main categories, namely abuse of official powers and enforcement of kādīs' decisions.

The major difference from the kādīs, according to al-Māwardī, lies in the area of procedure. The sāhib al-mazālim has a wide scope for active direction and participation in the proceedings, including powers of coercion, admitting evidence below the standards required by kādīs' courts, subpoena of witnesses and postponement of hearings to allow judicial investiga-

Mazarlām presents his discussion in terms of a relaxation of the rules of the sharī'ā, with the purpose of controlling powerful officials who otherwise might subvert the normal judicial process. Later writers link mazālim with the concept of shayṭān sharī'īyya. In fact, the theory of mazālim—as also later Hanbalī theory of sharī'ā sharī'īyya—actually represents an attempt to bring the current practice closer into line with the requirement of the sharī'ā.

Later theory reverts to the common pattern of giving more general statements of principle, in terms of "helping the weak against the strong", a phrase often appearing in the obituaries of sultans and governors. Expositions in detail are rare and, when they do occur, as in al-Māxrīzī (Khitat, Cairo 1270, ii, 207 f.) and al-Nuwwarī (Nihāyat al-arab, Cairo 1923-55, vi, 265-90), are based on al-Māwardī.

The mediaeval period. In the event, the hopes of al-Māwardī and his patrons did not materialise, and mazālim continued to develop with little reference to theory. The main feature during this later period is an increased bureaucratisation, a process which took place simultaneously under the Sālqīds, under the Khārazm-Shāhs in Persia and Central Asia, and under the Fātimids in Egypt. The various parts of this development came together under the Ayyūbids and continued with little change through much of the Mamlūk period.

The first step in opening a case was to present a petition (rukā or kisā) drawn up according to detailed formulae (described in al-Kalkashandi, Subh al-ʿalāqa, Cairo 1913-19, vi, 202 f.). While the ideal remained the personal presentation of the kisā in public session, the vast majority were dealt with administratively. Al-Kalkashandi (vi, 206-10) describes six different channels through which the kisā could be dealt with, and these procedures are confirmed by other sources. Several different officials are to be found taking decisions, including the sultan, his deputies and provincial governors (nuwābā), and high-ranking military officials (most commonly the atābak, dausūrgād and ḥāgūsā). Common to all channels of petition was the central role of the chancery (daw<$a_i>n al-ingha'ī), headed by the wazir or sāhib daw<$a_i>n al-ingha'. From the late 7th/13th century by the kādī al-ṣer. Oversight of the routine clerical work was handled by a secretary explicitly appointed to deal with mazālim work, called sāhib (or muwakkīlī) al-kalām al-dakhī under the Fātimids and kātib (or muwakkīlī) al-dast under the Mamlūks. From the early Fātimid period, elaborate rules also determined the form of the decree (uaqīfī or marṣūm) containing the final decision in a case (Subh, xi, 127-33). Such decrees would normally be signed by the sultan or a high officer of state, regardless of where in the administrative process the decision had been taken.

The site of the public session (mazālis) was normally the place where the presiding official conducted his general duties. A departure from this took place when Nur al-Dīn Zanjī established a house of justice (dār al-ṣalād) in Damascus soon after 549/1154, with the specific purpose of providing a setting for mazālim. Situated outside the citadel by the Bāb al-Nāṣr [see IMĀM], it became more commonly known as dār al-saʿāda when it was turned into the seat of provincial government in 634/1236. By this time, other provincial capitals in the Ayyūbīd state had also acquired a dār al-ṣalād. In Cairo, mazālim sessions were usually held in a Shāhī madrasa. Held twice a week on Mondays and Thursdays, these sessions were associated with an increased amount of official ceremonial, as the sultan and his officials went to the dār al-ṣalād in
public procession (mawkib) [see MAWAKIB]. To the mawkib and madjlis was soon added an... and Siyah-rustak (?); on the other hand, the diydr-i Kumis wa-Tabaristan included Simnan, Damghan, FTruzkuh, a town of

Towards the end of the 8th/14th century, or official posts (al-Sdlihi, likewise clarified, and in the 9th/15th century a khidma. The jurisdiction of... remained synonymous with the adl. However, remained companionship between Mazandaran and Tabaristan. In his time of Mazandaran. (1340), the 7... and moved it to the Royal... of the Saldjuk period. Mazandaran only reappears in the Saldjuk period. (Mazandaran). (Mazan" was a particular place, distinct from the part of the country known as Tapuristan. (A village of Mesedeyan (?) is marked on Shah's map 12 km. south of Firuzkuh!). In any case, the name Mazandaran seems to have no connection with "Mazāvī (or Māzā-i), the region to its west was populated by "Mazāvīan dēwās" (Bartholomaei, Wüsterbuch, col. 1189, under mazāvī dēwā). Darmesteter, Zend-Avesta, ii, 373, n. 32, thought that Mazandaran was a "comparative of direction" ("Mazana-tara", cf. Shūsh and Slüggha) but Noldeke's hypothesis is the more probable (Grundr. d. Iran. Phil., ii, 178), who thought that Mazan-bar = "the gate of Mazān" was a particular place, distinct from the part of the country known as Tapuristan. (A village of Mesedeyan (?) is marked on Shah's map 12 km. south of Firuzkuh!). In any case, the name Mazandaran seems to have no connection with "Mazāvī (or Māzā-i), the region to its west was populated by "Mazāvīan dēwās" (Bartholomaei, Wüsterbuch, col. 1189, under mazāvī dēwā).
2. Geography: The actual extent of Mazandaran is 100 miles from east to west and 46 to 70 miles from north to south. Except for the strip along the coast—broader in the east than the west—Mazandaran is a very mountainous country. The main range of the Elburz forms barriers parallel to the south of the Caspian, while the ridges running down to the sea cut the country up into a multitude of valleys open on the north only. The principal of the latter ridges is the Mazârdûb, which separates Tabaristan from Tunakabûn. The latter is bordered on the south by the chain of the Elburz in the strict sense, which separates it from the valley of the Shahrûd (formed by the waters of the Alamût and Talâkân and flowing westward into the Safîd-rûd).

To the east of Mazârdûb, a number of ranges run out of the central massif of the Elburz: 1. to the east, the chain of Nûr, which cuts through the Harâz-pây; and 2. to the south-east, the southern barrier which forms the watershed between the Caspian and the central plateau. Between the two rises in isolation the great volcanic cone of Damawand [q.v.].

To the east of Damawand, the southern barrier rejoins the continuation of the Nûr and the new line of ranges runs its course to the coast. The rivers of Mazandaran are of two kinds. A hundred short streams run straight down into the sea from the eastern ranges of Barfurush; the Tâlçin (river of Alirâbâd); the Tâlçin-Ashraf; Sârafud (to the north of Shah-kuh); G. C. Napier, Extracts from a diary of a tour in Khorasan, in JRGS, xlvi (1876), 62-171.

The rivers of Mazandaran are of two kinds. A hundred short streams run straight down into the sea from the eastern ranges of Barfurush; the Tâlçin (river of Alirâbâd); the Tâlçin-Ashraf; Sârafud (to the north of Shah-kuh); G. C. Napier, Extracts from a diary of a tour in Khorasan, in JRGS, xlvi (1876), 62-171.

...
Djibal Karin had only one town, Shahmar, a day's journey from Sariyya. The local chiefs of the Zivaya have always run near Kulbad (on the river Kirrind; in the strict sense, with Astarabad (Djurdjan) seems to be used in different periods for more or less identical (1909), part ii-iii, 125-52.

Inostrantsev, Die Kaspischen Dialecte, 3. Ethnology. N. Khanykov, Memoire sur GMS, London 1928 (itineraries on the

Amul-Astarabad-Tash-Amul; Firuzkuh-Dāmghān); E. Stack, Six months in Persia, 1913), 435-54 (Rasht-Sarl); J. de Lon-daran, MJRGS (Nov. 1921), 401-18 (Damghan - Cardih - Djahan-numa - Astara-bād); G. E. Browne, A year amongst the Persians, London 1893, 557-68 (Tehran - Mashhadisar); J. de Nogar, Missions scientifiques, Étude géographiques, i, 1894, 113-208 (numerous illustrations); A. F. Stahl, Reisen in Nord- und Zentral-Persien, in Pet. Mitt., Ergänzungshefte no. 118 (1896), 7-18 (Tehrān-Kelarestak-Nūr-Lār-Damwānd; Tehrān-Āmul; Firūzkūh-Ālābād; Āmul-Astarābād-Tāgh-Chāhrābād - Simnā) (with a detailed map); H. L. Wells, Across the Alborz mountains; in The Scottisch Geogr. Magazine, xvi (1894), 1-9 (supplement to H. L. Lovett: Afra-Varasun-Kudjur-Nawrudbar-Mulla-kala); Saaré, Reise in Mazanderan, in Z. Gesell. Erdkunde (1902), 99-111 (Damwānd-Āmul-Aghraj-Bandārāz); Stahl, Reisen in Nord- und Westpersien, in Pet. Mitt. (1907), Heft vi, 121-31 (with a map: Bārfurūsh-Firūzkūh); O. Niedermayer, Die Persien-Expedition, in Mitt. d. Goegl. Gesell. in München, viii (1915), 177-88 (Firūzkūh-Turud-Pelwār-Sārī; Ni-ka - Seiđfejde); H. L. Rabino, A journey in Mazan-derān, in JRGs (Nov. 1913), 435-54 (Rashā-Sarī); Golubiatnikov, Petrol in Northern Persia [in Russian], in Nefteyanoe i slantsysoy khozaystvo, Moscow (Sept.-Oct. 1921), 78-91; Noel, A reconnaissance in the Caspian province of Persia, in JRGs (June 1921), 401-18 (Tehrān-Āmul-Farabābād-Nūr-Kudjur-Tunak-bāz); Herzfeld, Reisechronik, in ZBdH (1926), 278-82 (Bistānī-Rudkān-Saĥmār-Dāmghān); Stahl, Die orographischen und hydrographischen Verhältnisse des Elbars-Gebirges in Persien, in Pet. Mitt. (1927), Heft 7-8, 211-15 (with a map); Rabino, Māzāndarān und Astarābād, GMS, London 1928 (itineraries on the coast, administrative divisions with lists of villages, Muslim inscriptions); cf. p. xx, complete list of previous works. G. M. Bell, Geological Notes on part of Mazanderān, in Geol. Transactions, series ii, vol. v, 577.


4. Language. Cf. Geiger, Die Kaspischen Dialekte, in Grundriss d. iran. Phil., v2, 344-80, where the literature of the subject is given (esp. Dorn's works). 5. Historical geography. This is still full of difficulties, although Vasmor's very full study has considerably reduced their number. The matter is complicated by the fact that certain well-known names are used in different periods for more or less identical districts.

The eastern frontier of Māzāndarān (Tabaristān) in the strict sense, with Astarābād (Dūrgānd) seems to have always run near Kūlbād (on the river Kirrīd; cf. Poteley's Χάνων, where there used to be a wall (dīar-i Kūlbād) which barred the narrow strip of lowland between the Gulf of Astarābād and the moun-tains; cf. Ibn Rustā, 149, who speaks of the brick wall (gān) and of the Gate of Tāmis through which the travellers had to pass (cf. Ibn al-Fakhīr, 303). To the west, the town of Sālūs (Čalūs) was situated on the frontier of Daylām (Ibn Rustā, 150: fi nahu al-ṣudaww) but later the valley of the Sārd-āb-rūd (Kalār-dāsh) seems to have been annexed to Tabaristān. Further west, the coast of Tunakābūn was governed sometimes with Māzāndarān and sometimes with Gīlān.

The Arab geographers distinguished between the plain (al-sakhliya) and the mountains (al-dījabaliyya) of Tabaristān (al-Ī斯塔fri, 211, 271). The important towns of Tabaristān were in the lowlands: Amūl, Nārīl, Shālūs (Čalūs), Kalār (Kalār), Milā, Tarādī (Tūdī, Bargī?); 4. Ayn al-Humā, Māmtime (Bār- furūsh), Sārī, Tambīša (cf. al-Ī斯塔fri, 207, cf. al-Mukaddasī, 353). The principal town (mādīnā) of Tabaristān in the time of al-Yākūbī, 276, was still Sālīya (q.v.), but in the time of al-Mas'uḏī, Tānbī, 179, Al-Ī斯塔fri, 211, and Ibn Hawkal, 271, the prin-cipal town (kasabā) and the most flourishing one in Tabaristān was Amūl (larger than Kūmīn).

The mountain area was quite distinct, and its con-nection with the plain is not very clear in the Arabic texts; cf. the confused testimony in al-Ī斯塔fri, 274, 294, Al-Tabarī, ii, 1295, under the year 224/838, distinguishes three mountains in Tabaristān: 1. the mountain of Wandā-Hūrūmz in the centre (waqūt); 2. that of his brother Wandaspandjān (ib) b. Alandāb b. Kārīn; and 3. that of Shārwin b. Surkhab b. Bāb. Now according to Ibn Rustā, 151, [the Kārinid] Wandā-Hūrūmz lived near Dūnbāwānd. On the other hand, the same writer, 149, says that during the rule of Tabaristān by Dūrī b. Yazīd, Wandā-Hūrūmz had bought 1,000 dīārīb of domain lands (sawāfī) outside the town of Sārī. These dīārīb seem to correspond to the region round the sources of the rivers Tīǧīn and Nīkā, which in Persian is called Hazār-dīārīb. Later, the lands of Wandā-Hūrūmz included the greater part of eastern Māzāndarān. *Wandaspandjān seems to have ruled over the greater part of Māzāndarān, for his capital Mūnuz was the rallying point from which expeditions set out against Daylām. Finally, the mountain of Shārwin comprised the south-eastern part of Māzāndarān, for according to Ibn al-Fakhīr, 305, it was close to Kūmīn.

In the time of al-Ī斯塔fri, the three divisions of the mountains specified are: the mountains of Rūbdjāng, of Fādušbān and of Kārīn. "They are high mountains (dījabāl) and each of them (dījabāl) has a chief". Rūbdjāng, according to Ibn Hawkal, lay between Rayv and Tabaristān. Barthold, Oerlik, 155, emends the name to *Rūyand and identifies it with Rūyān. Ibn Rustā, 149, says that Rūyān, near the lands of Rayv, did not form part of Tabaristān but formed a special kāra with the capital Kudjurī, which was the headquarters of the wāll (cf. Ka‘farvāsūk in the bulāk of Kudjur). According to this, *Rūyand = Rūyān is to be located in the south-western part of Māzāndarān (north of Tehrān). In the Mongol period, Hamd Allāh Kāzawīnī, 160, is the first to mention Rustamdār (on the Shāh-rūd). As Vasmor, op. cit., 122-5, has shown, Rustamdār later included all western Māzāndarān between Sakhāsār (Gīlān) and Āmul. Rustam-dār therefore included Rūyān, without the two terms being completely synonymous.

Dūrbāl Kārīn had only one town, Shāhmār, a day’s journey from Sārīya. The local chiefs of the
dynasty of Karín lived in the stronghold of Firnm [q. v. in Suppl.] which must have stood on the island off the
western coast of Tabaristan; it is possible, perhaps, that the
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coast of Mazandaran that the fugitive Khwarazmian ruler Ali al-Dawla Muhammad died in this same year [see ARIZM-SHAHS]. Mazandaran in the Mongol and Il-Khanid periods was frequently a corridor through which Mongol armies passed, and in the latter part of the 18th/14th and the 9th/15th centuries we hear of local princes seem largely to have been undisturbed. Also in the period of the Mongols and their successors, we know that trade was carried on across the Caspian Sea to South Russia and the lands of the Golden Horde from the port of Nilm Murdan off the Caspian Sea to South Russia and the lands of the Golden Horde from the port of Nilm Murdan off the Caspian Sea.

Mazandaran was conquered by the Mongols, presumably because of their relative inaccessibility and their uncongenial climate. Mazandaran, however, often played a rôle as the winter camping-ground [see KHAM].

Abaka, Ghazan and Öljeytu, in conjunction with Khurásan, which was favoured as a summer pasture ground for the Mongol hordes and their flocks. In the latter part of the 18th/14th and the 9th/15th centuries we hear of governors appointed over Mazandaran by the Sarmadírs and then the Timúrids, but in practice, the local princes seem largely to have been undisturbed. Also in the period of the Mongols and their successors, we know that trade was carried on across the Caspian Sea to South Russia and the lands of the Golden Horde from the port of Nilm Murdan off the coast from Astarábad (Mustawfi, Nuzha, 160, tr. 156).

After the latter's expulsion of the Afghans from Persia, and in 1744 the Kadjars of Mazandaran in fact rebelled against Nádīr Sháh Afshár after the latter's expulsion of the Afghans from Persia, and in 1744 the Kadjars of Mazandaran in fact rebelled against Nádīr Sháh Afshár.

Under the Kadjár Sháhs, Mazandaran and Gurgán continued to be of strategic importance against Turkmen incursions, and were royal governors. The local economy seems to have flourished, with its staples of rice, cotton, sugar, timber and the fisheries of the Caspian, the latter however leased in the latter part of the 19th century to Russia in return for an annual rent. Curzon noted that the revenue of Mazandaran in 1888-9 was 139,350 tuman in cash, with government expenditure on public buildings, expenses of collection, etc., amounting to a mere 4,590 tuman (Persia and the Persian question, 1, 354 ff.).

The ancient town of Sári declined in the 19th century, whilst Ámus and above all Bábfurúsh [q. v.] expanded commercially; much of the trade with Russia went from the port of Bábfurúsh at Maghad-i Sar (later Bábül-i Sar) at the mouth of the Bábül river, and there was a Russian consul for trade in the town. In the middle years of the century, this district was a centre of Bábism, one of whose leaders was Mullá Muhammad 'Alí Bábfurúsh [q. v.]. The convention of Badaqṣht took place in Mazandaran, and a fortified site near Bárifulúsh called Shakyh Tabarásí was the centre of the Bábí rising of 1848-9, barbarously suppressed by government forces [see BÁB].

The father of Mirzá Husayn 'Alí, the later Bahá' Alláh [q. v.], was a native of Núr in Mazandaran. In 1889-90 there was a pioneer attempt at railway-building in Persia when a short line was built by Belgian engineers from Ámus to the Caspian coast; a road over the Elburz Mountains from Ámus to Tehran, 120 miles/190 km. long, had already been constructed by Náṣir al-Din Sháh in 1877-8.

In the present century, with the confusion after the First World War, Mazandaran was, with Gúr-gán, involved in the Bolshevik rising of 1920-1 in the Caspian provinces under Kucák Khán [q. v.] and Amir Mu'ayyad, in the ending of which the command of the Cossack Brigade Rídál Khán, later Sháh, achieved prominence; he was himself a native of Mazandaran, having been born at Elašt in the Elburz mountains (see L. P. Elwell-Sutton, in Iran under the Pahlavis, ed. G. Lenczowski, Stanford 1978, 4-6). After he was made Sháh (December 1925), much of Mazandaran became crown land (kháílsa [q. v.]), actually in the form of personal estates (amád-k-i sháhi) of the Sháh himself; but these were returned to their original owners in 1941 and subsequently distributed to small proprietors under the land reform policy of Rídál Sháh's son Muhammad Rídál Sháh (see A. K. S. Lambton, The Persian land reform 1962-1966, Oxford 1979, 11-12, 120-2, 218-21).
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found from the time of Firuz onwards are an abbreviation for Amul, but this explanation is quite without proof. The Dā'bāyids and the earlier Arab governors of Tabaristān struck in the 2nd/8th century coins of the type of the Sāsānīd dirhams of Khusraw II; on the obverse, with the bust of the ruler, his name is given in Pahlavi characters and on the reverse is the fire-altar with its two guardians and on the right the mint Tpurustan and on the left the year in the Tabaristān era (began on 11 June 652). These silver coins average in weight 1.90 gr. = 29.3 grains and are hemidrachms. Of the Dā'bāyid rulers, Ferkhwān, Dātbardjmatān and Khūrshid are mentioned upon them. The coins of the first bear the years 60-77 (711-28), of the second 86-7 (737-8) and of the third 89-115 (740-66); these dates enable us to correct the chronology given by the historians. On some coins with the name Khūrshid, earlier students read the dates 60-3, but this is to be explained by the similarity of qāṣt and debat in the Pahlavi script and these coins are really of the years 110 and following. The assumption of a Khūrshid I, who reigned in the sixties of the Tabaristān era (Mordtmann), is thus quite unfounded. As Khūrshid died in 144 A.H. = 110 Tabaristān era, and there are coins with the names of Arab governors earlier than the year 116 Tab. era, it must be assumed that the Arab governors continued to strike coins in the name of the earlier ruler of the land for a period after the conquest of Mazandaran, just as they did after the conquest of Persia under the caliph 'Umar.
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Suse, Paris 1938; idem, Supplementary notes on the coins of Tabaristan, in Num. Soc. of India, vi (1944), 37-45; Zambur, Die Munzprägungen des Islam, zeitlich und örtlich geordnet, i, Wiesbaden 1968, 34-5 (Āmul), 136 (Sārī/Sāryān), 170 (Tabaristan), 185 (Firrūm), 321 (Mázandarán); A. H. Morton, Dinārs from western Mázandarán of some vassals of the Salţūq sultan Muhammad b. Malik-Shāh, in Iran, JBIPS, xxv (1987), 77-90.

R. Vasmier - [C. E. Bosworth]

Mázar [see sékiliyya].

Mazār-i Shāriā, a town in northern Afghānistān, situated in lat. 36° 42' N. and long. 67° 06' E., at an altitude of 1,235 feet/380 m. in the foothills of the northern outliers of the Hindu-Kush [q.v.].

The great classical and mediaeval Islamic town of Balkh [q.v.], modern Wazīrābād, lay some 14 miles/20 km. to the west of Mazār-i Shāriā, and until the Timurid period was the most important urban centre of the region. Previously to that time, the later Mazār-i Shāriā was marked by the village of Khvāy, later called Khwāy Khvāyrān. On two different occasions, in the 6th/12th century after 530/1135-6 in the time of Sultan Sandjar [q.v.], and in 885/1480-1, in the time of Sultan Sandjar [q.v.], the town's fortunes to rise, so that in recent times, it has become a centre for local government as well as continuing to fulfill its old commercial role, as well as providing a ferry-point of Pata Kesar on the Oxus [see AMU-]
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may be found in the various mss. of the *Dāmmī masāʾil al-ahkām* by al-Burzulī (d. ca. 841/1438 [q.v.]), as well as in the *Mīyār* of al-Wangārīshī (d. 914/1508 [q.v.]), lith. Fās 1314-15 (e.g. ii, 192-4, 206-7, 321, 323-4, 234-6, 241-2, 244-7, 249-51, 280; vi, 212, 214, 217, 219, 226-7, vii, 154, viii, 114-5, 130-1, 205, 220, 271, 285, ix, 52-3, 417, 421, 434, x, 245, 259, xii, 233, 243-7). His works numbered about a dozen, but only three of them have survived and not one has been published; they consist after all of commentaries which nevertheless may be regarded as holding a certain interest, since they contain a wealth of documentation and tackle various important questions. This is especially so in the case of al-Mɑṣīm bi-faṣaʿlād Kitāb al-Muṣāriʿ, which appears to be the earliest commentary on the *Ṣahih of Mūḥammad* (see the judgment of Ibn Khaldūn in the *Mukaddima*, ii, 403; tr. de Slane, ii, 475-6; tr. Rosenthal, ii, 459; on the mss. and the sequel attributed to the kādī Iyād, the Dinād al-Maṣīm, see Brockelman, S I, 263): the other works preserved are the Kitāb fālāf al-mahālīn min Barḥān al-awzīl, on the Barḥān of the *Ddjawiyyin* (d. 478/1085 [q.v.]) and the *Šahr al-Talīn* Abīd al-Wawḥāh [al Tālībī] (d. 422/1031; see Brockelman, S I, 660).


Two colleagues of this jurist, bearing the same ṭanw and the same nisba are often confused with him, especially since they are practically contemporaries:

The *first, Abū ʾAbd Allāh Muḥammad b. Abī l-Farādy al-Māzāri*, surnamed al-Zakī (d. 512/1118), who was also a native of Mazara and an Ashʿarī, residing at the Kaʿba of the Bānū Ḥamdād [q.v.], was then taught by numerous masters of Kairouan before going to settle in the East. He is the author of a work on *Kurān*ic readings, of a treatise on physical contacts effected through error, the *Kashf al-khātāt* "on lams al-khātāt," and of an appraisal of certain hadīths quoted by al-Ḥazāli (d. 930/1111 [q.v.]). In the *Ihya*, al-Kaḥf wa l-ʿibāh "al-aʾrādīdum bi l-ʾibāh.


The *second, Abū ʾAbd Allāh Muḥammad b. "L-Muṣāriʿ al-Kurāshī al-Iskandarānī* (d. 530/1135), who lived in Alexandria, was also an Ashʿarī, but more of a theologian (maṭāliʿī) than a jurist as such, judging from the *Kitāb al-Muṣāriʿ*, a commentary on the *K al-ʾIrshād ilā tahān qawād il-Nīṣābī* of the *Djauwānī* (d. 478/1085 [q.v.]).


**MAZĀTA**, the name of an ancient and powerful Berber people which belonged to the great tribal family of the Lawātā [q.v.]. According to Ibn Khaldūn, who makes brief mention of the Mazāta in his *Histoire des Berbères*, they constituted an important branch descended from Ṣāyir, son of Lawāt, ancestor of the Lawātā. According to Ibn Ḥawāk (4th/10th century), the Mazāta and the Lawātā belonged to the major Berber tribal group of the Zanāta. Yet another historian of the Berbers, Ibn Ḥāẓim (d. 456/1064), considers the Mazāta and the Lawātā as belonging to the Coptic, i.e. the Egyptian, race. This conception is to be understood as meaning that the ancestors of the Mazāta (who were, in the opinion of the present writer, the people known to the ancient Egyptians as the *Mashawasha*) as well as those of the other Libyan tribes (called Lebū or Lībī in the hieroglyphic sources) became intermingled, in antiquity, with the true Egyptians. This process of fusion probably took place predominantly in the western part of the Delta.

In considering the name of the tribe of the Mashawasha and its identification with that of the Mazāta, it must be stated that this form of nomenclature as found in the ancient hieroglyphic sources is a collective noun composed of the singular noun *Mashua* (a which is the name of the eponymous founder of the tribe—and the suffix -sa, the designation of a collective in Libyan and Old Berber. It appears furthermore that the Libycobarber suffix -sh (or -s) derives from another language which the linguists call Aegean and which was spoken by aboriginal small tribal hven, in the 13th and 12th centuries B.C., to the "Peoples of the Sea". It is read, for example, in the Egyptian inscriptions dating from this period that one of the tribes in question, the Achaeans, bore the name of *Akaywasha* and that the tribe of the Siculi which was later to inhabit Sicily was called *Shakalasha* (or *Sakalasa*). The same ethnic suffix was also used in Old Berber. Thus, e.g. it is discovered from the writings of Ibn Khaldūn that the descendants of a certain Dari formed the tribe which bore the name of *Dariya*, a collective nomenclature with the collective suffix -sa. Returning to the question of the Mashawasha (or Masawasa, i.e. Mazāta), it is to be believed that these two tribes were identical, or rather that the Mazāta were distant descendants of the ancient Mashawasha. In fact, the termination -sa, which concludes certain Berber ethnic names (e.g. that of the Lawātā) is composed of two suffixes, of which the first, -dt, which is Berber, added to the eponymous name, makes it a collective noun, and the second, the final -a (as in the names of the Lawātā and the Mazātā) has been added by mediaeval Arab authors to give this noun an Arabic plural (Lawātā, Mazātā). In this manner, the Berber suffix -sh has the same function as the Libycobarber suffix -s. (For a commentary on the *Kitāb al-Muṣāriʿ* of the Mazātā.)

Initially, the Mashawasha inhabited western Libya, in other words Tripolitania and what is now Tunisia. At about the time of the end of the New
Empire, they took the decision to conquer Cyrenaica and Marmarica, lands which had been occupied by other Libyan tribes. The population of these lands offered fierce resistance, but the Mashawasha managed to subjugate and subdue their forces. Since the conquerors brought with them their families and their livestock, this constituted a veritable Völkerwanderung. After the conquest of Cyrenaica and Mar-
marica, the Mashawasha resolved to attack Egypt. Their first attempts at conquest took place during the reigns of the Pharaohs Sethi I and Rameses II in the 13th century B.C., and ended in failure. It was only during the reign of the Pharaoh Merneptah that the chieftain of the Mashawasha named Meriai, son of Didi, achieved a degree of success. This chieftain was assured of the support of the “Peoples of the Sea”, a federation of tribes originating from southern Europe and western Asia who sowed terror throughout the Near East. With the aid of these peoples the Mashawasha succeeded, in 1227 B.C., in seizing the oasis situated on the Egypt-Libya frontier, as well as part of the western Delta. Later however, the Egyp-
tians struck a terrible blow against the Mashawasha and their allies in a major battle which took place at Per-Ir, to the north-west of Memphis. The soldiers of the Pharaoh, riding in chariots, pursued and massacred the fugitives. Among those slain on the battlefield were thousands of Mashawasha, of eastern Libyans and of Akayawga, and hundreds of Tura (Tursha), of Sandana (Shardana) and of Lycians. In spite of this defeat the Mashawasha, aided by the eastern Libyans, mounted a fresh inva-
sion in 1194 B.C. during the reign of Rameses III. The war was keenly contested, but the Mashawasha
were eventually defeated and forced to evacuate the western Delta. In the year 1188 B.C., during the reign of the same Pharaoh Rameses III, there was yet a third attempt at the conquest of Egypt on the part of the Mashawasha, aided by their Libyan allies, and this too ended with victory going to the Egyptians. But on this occasion the Pharaoh understood that it would be impossible to subdue the Mashawasha and the eastern Libyans, who had been driven to despair by the catastrophic state of their country which was becoming ever more apparent. He therefore permitted the Mashawasha and the eastern Libyans to settle in the Delta, in exchange for an undertaking on their part to supply mercenaries to the Egyptian army. In this manner, the military conflict between the Mashawasha and the eastern Libyans on the one hand and the Egyptians on the other was concluded in a kind of amicable arrangement. There thus began in the Delta a vigorous process of intermingling between the native Egyptians and the Mashawasha and Libyan settlers, facilitated by mixed marriages which became commonplace not only among the lower strata of society, but also among the upper classes, where the Mashawasha achieved posts of seniority in the sacerdotal and military hierarchy. In the 11th cen-
tury B.C. one of these dignitaries, named Sheshonq, married an Egyptian princess of the royal family, and his great-grandson, also named Sheshonq, who was commander of the Egyptian army and bore the title of “Grand Chieftain of the Mashawasha”, took over supreme power in the country in the year 950 B.C. and, after the death of the Pharaoh Psousennes II, founded the XXII Egyptian dynasty. The Mashawasha and the Libyans of the Delta and of Libya recognised the authority of Sheshonq. It should be added that until this moment, these two ethnic groups had lived in complete autonomy.

Towards the end of the XXII dynasty, a prince of this dynasty named PTOLEMY I succeeded the first Egyptian king. From that time the Pharaohs of these two dynasties reigned simultaneously, and also maintained the best of mutual relations. Thus there began the partition of the Delta, where in 747-30 B.C., three princes claimed the title of Pharaoh. Ultimately, a Libyan prince of Sais, probably himself a descendant of Sheshonq I, displaced the last Pharaohs of the two rival dynasties and founded the XXIV dynasty, known as the Saite. The Libyan period lasted two centuries, during which Egypt remained under the domination of the minority composition of Mashawasha and of other Libyan tribes. The Mazata and the Egyptians were still in evidence in the 2nd century A.D. These were without doubt the Libu-Aegypti who, according to Ptolemy, constituted the population of Mareotis, ter-
ritory situated in the western Delta around Lake Mariout.

With regard to the non-Egyptianised Mashawasha, outside Egypt, they may be identified, in all probabil-
ity, with the nomads of Libya known as Mazues and mentioned by Stephanus of Byzantium following Hecateus (6th century B.C.), and are to be distin-
guished from the Maxues who were established, according to Herodotus (5th century B.C.) in the coastal region of the lesser Syrte. It should be added that the Mazues were nomads while the Maxues were cultivators. Hecateus did not specify what part of Libya they inhabited. It is very likely that they are the ancestors of the Mazata of Cyrenaica and eastern Tripolitania. As for the name of this tribe, it is com-
pounded of the root Maz- (singular noun, of which Mazata is the Berber collective form) with the Greek
termination -nes (-yes). It also seems necessary to identify with the ancient Mashawasha (Mashawsha) known from the hieroglyphic inscriptions and the mediaeval Mazata of the Arab authors, the Libyan tribe of the Maxites (Mas-t-itae) located by Ptolemy in the province of Mareotis, in the region of Lake Mariout, on the western frontiers of the Delta. In this ethnonym, the termination -itas may probably be of Greek origin, and the suffix -i (in place of -a) the sign of the collective form of the noun.

The Arab historians and geographers knew of the Mazata at a very early date. In fact, when the renowned general 'Uqba b. Nāfi' set out for the Magrib in 46/666-7, passing through Maghadādh (formerly Macomades Selorum, currently Marsa Zafaran or Medinet es-Soltan), through Waddan (cur-
tently the oasis of Djofra) and through the Fazzan as far as the territory of Kawar, he made his return journey through the town of Zawila, one of the capitals of the Fazzān, whence he made his way towards the territory of the tribe of the Mazata in eastern Tripolitania. This tribe was, in the 7th cen-
tury A.D., quite powerful and it possessed a number of fortresses (Ar. kusur) which 'Uqba b. Nāfi' captured. This account, which is known to us through the intermediary of Ibn 'Abd al-Jākam (d. 257/871), is the earliest information available concerning the Mazata emanating from Arabic sources, being based on the accounts of numerous early informants, the earliest of whom, Ya'zid b. Abī Ḥābib, died in 1287/46, only eighty years after the expedition of 'Uqba b. Nāfi'. The other Arabic references to the Mazata are of much later date and derive from the period of the 3rd-8th/9th-14th centuries.

According to mediaeval Arab authors, the Mazata were a very numerous and prosperous people, simul-
taneously nomadic (or semi-nomadic) stockbreeders.
and cultivators, whose centres of population and pastures were dispersed throughout North Africa, from the province of al-Butayra (between Alexandria and Old Cairo) to the east as far as the neighbourhood of Tāḥār (Tiaret) to the west. They adopted orthodox Islam at a very early stage, but at the time of the Khaḍīrījī revolution which affected all the Berbers of North Africa at about the middle of the 8th century A.D., they went over to Khaḍīrījīsm. It is not impossible that they initially adopted Sufrī doctrines, as did the majority of the Berber tribes. However, some twenty or thirty years later, they were already professing Ibadism, sometimes following the very moderate doctrines of the Waḥbī branch, sometimes the very extremist doctrines of the Nukkārī branch, which became very popular among the Berbers from the period of Abū Yāzīd [q.v.], the ‘Man on the Donkey’, who rebelled in the first half of the 4th/10th century against the Fāṭimid caliphate. It was only at a fairly late date, probably about the 7th/13th century, that the Mazātā began, little by little, to reject Ibadī beliefs, turning to Sunnism. The written sources supply little information on this subject. It may be added, furthermore, that according to Ibn Hawkal (4th/10th century), a section of the Mazātā of Ḫirīkīya professed Muṭāzilī doctrines.

The Mazātā were divided into numerous more or less powerful sub-tribes (Ar. ḫābdītā, ‘tribe’), and many of their names are indicated by Ibn Hawkal, Ibn Khaldūn, an anonymous list from the 7th/13th century of eminent Ibadī personalities classified by tribe, and finally the Kitāb al-Sijar of Abū ʿAbd Allāh ʿAlī al-Shāmākhī, an Ibadī historian of the 10th/16th century. Among these texts, that of Ibn Hawkal gives a list of the sub-tribes of the Mazātā mingled with those of the Lawāta, in such a way that it is impossible to separate these peoples. The list of the Mazātā sub-tribes presented by Ibn Khaldūn is very incomplete (it includes the names of only six of these segments). As for al-Shāmākhī he supplies the names of the sub-tribes of the Mazātā and the nīshā on these names, and they are found dispersed among the biographies of renounced personalities mentioned in his Kitāb al-Sijar. He supposed that most of the Mazātā are also mentioned in other Ibadī works, including the Kitāb al-Sīna of Abū Zakariyyāʾ al-Wardjālānī (6th/12th century) or the Kitāb Tabakkīl al-mashāhīd of Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Dārdjīnī (7th/13th century).

The names of these Mazātā sub-tribes are as follows:—1. Banū Muṭākūd; 2. Banū Wīṣāl; 3. Banū Maḏūnā; 4. Zawmrat (this name is known only from the nisba al-Zawmraft; the Berber form of it is Izmārīt and the reading given by Ibn Hawkal is to be thus corrected); 5. Banū Zīmmārīn; 6. Banū Aṛḏān; 7. Banū Ḥādīm or Ḥādīmā (read Dāmga, Dāmaga); 8. Banū Maṣāra; 9. Banū Ilayān (in Ibn Khaldūn’s work, the incorrect orthography of this name is found: B. Lāyān); 10. Banū Fānāsā; 11. Banū Kāzīn; 12. Banū Kāna; 13. Banū Māmādīj; 14. Banū ʿAmāma (thus according to Ibn Hawkal; Ibn Khaldūn incorrectly writes it as Ḥamra); 15. Awnmāḏ (also ʿUmnāḏ); this last etymology seems to be composed of the prefix Auw- (ʿUw-) which signifies “son” in Berber, and of the eponymous name -mash-, to which has been added the Berber sign of the collective -t-, it closely resembles one of the ancient names of the Mazātā, this being Mas-t-taḥ, which has been considered above.

1. Egypt. The most easterly settlements of the Mazātā embraced, in the Middle Ages, the Egyptian province called al-Butayra [q.v.] situated on the western borders of the Delta, between Alexandria and Old Cairo, i.e. the same region previously inhabited by the ancestors of the Mazātā, the Masūwāshā of the hieroglyphic sources and the tribal names of the ancient sources. According to Ibn Khaldūn, there were to be found in the Butayra numerous nomadic (or rather semi-nomadic) peoples who belonged to the Berber tribes of the Mazātā, Ḥawwāra and Ẓanāṭa. According to him, these tribes followed in the Butayra to sow their crops but, at the approach of winter, moved to the neighbourhood of al-ʿAkkāba and Barka. He adds that the above-mentioned tribes paid a tax (Ar. khāndī) to the sultan of Egypt. It is not known which al-ʿAkkāba is in question here, since there are two places with this toponym, al-ʿAkkāba al-Saghīra (‘the small slope, pass’), Catabathmus parvus of the ancient sources, forty leagues from Alexandria to the west, and al-ʿAkkāba al-Kabīra (‘the great slope, pass’), Catabathmus magnus of the ancient sources), forty leagues to the west of the former. Al-Bakrī (3rd/11th century) mentions the settlements (or rather the winter habitat) of these Mazātā “at the foot of the slope of al-ʿAkkāba”, without specifying whether this is Catabathmus magnus or parvus. It is on this side of Egypt, to the east of al-ʿAkkāba al-Saghīra, that the place known as Rammāda is to be located, a site which according to al-Yaḥyā b. Abū Zakariyyāʾ al-Wardjālānī (6th/12th century) or the Fī Siyar, he supplies the names of the sub-tribes of the Mazātā, Hawwara and Zanata. The Mazātā are also mentioned in other Ibadī works, in number and relatively late. The earliest reference to the Mazātā of Cyrenaica is owed to Ibn Khaldūn. According to this historian, they participated in the Umayyad revolt which took place in Cyrenaica ca. 395/1004-5. Al-Idrīsī (6th/12th century) claims that in his time the Mazātā of Barka were already Arabised. These courageous horsemen inhabited the regions of Cyrenaica situated between the towns of al-Tumaythā (the ancient Ptolemais) and al-Lakka (Cape Locco or Luca on modern maps, not far from Tobruk). Two centuries later, Muḥammad b. ʿAbūl-Ṣafī al-Kutubī (Watwat, d. 718/1318) locates the settlements of the Mazātā of Barka on a mountain (Djamb al-Ajdādār) situated to the west of the town of Barka. An analogous reference is also found in the Cosmography of al-Dimashqī (d. 727/1327).

2. Tripolitania (Barka). If Ibn Khaldūn is to be believed, the regular haunts of these Mazātā who possessed agricultural land in Egypt, in the province of al-Butayra, on the Western borders of the Delta, were located in part in Cyrenaica (Barka), where this people invariably spent the winter. Arabic sources of information regarding the Mazātā of Cyrenaica are few and in number relatively late. The earliest mention is found in Ibn Khaldūn’s work, the incorrect orthography of this name is found: B. Lāyān); 10. Banū Fānāsā; 11. Banū Kāzīn; 12. Banū Kāna; 13. Banū Māmādīj; 14. Banū ʿAmāma (thus according to Ibn Hawkal; Ibn Khaldūn incorrectly writes it as Ḥamra); 15. Awnmāḏ (also ʿUmnāḏ); this last etymology seems to be composed of the prefix Auw- (ʿUw-) which signifies “son” in Berber, and of the eponymous name -mash-, to which has been added the Berber sign of the collective -t-, it closely resembles one of the ancient names of the Mazātā, this being Mas-t-taḥ, which has been considered above.

1. Egypt. The most easterly settlements of the Mazātā embraced, in the Middle Ages, the Egyptian province called al-Butayra [q.v.] situated on the
days' journey from the first-named place, which may be identified with what is now Tagrift (Tagrefet), was populated in the 4th/10th century by inhabitants of Waddan, in other words by Mazata mingled with Arabs. The oasis of Zahla (Sella or Zelda on modern maps) also formed, in the 4th-5th/10th-11th centuries, part of the territory of the Mazata, as is revealed by a passage from the writings of al-Bakri (Muhammad b. Yusuf, Ibn al-Warrak). Finally, in this period there belonged to the people of Waddan an unnamed manzil ("station") situated midway between Tamassa (Tmessa on modern maps, to the northeast of Mourn- zouk) and Zahla, and apparently to be identified with what is now el-Fugha or Fogha, a pleasant oasis and a village with ruins probably of Garamantian origin.

In the early Middle Ages, the land of the Mazata embraced two different districts, these being Surt and Waddan. The district of Surt corresponded to the coastal zone of what is now eastern Tripolitania, and that of Waddan occupied the whole interior of this land. The former of these districts was known, from the year 46/666-7, by the name of Surt or ard Surt ("land of Surt"). Later, the localities belonging to this territory received the name of Kuşar Surt ("Castles of Surt"). As for Waddan, which appears for the first time in the same year of 46/666-7 as a country having its own king, it was still considered in the 6th/12th century as an administrative district (A. Surt, Arab. ard Surt, "country") apart. It was, furthermore, closely linked to the land of Surt. The district of Waddan embraced, no doubt, all the places in the interior of eastern Tripolitania which were inhabited by Mazata and by people of Waddan, these being Zahla (Sella), Tagrift (Tagrift) and el-Fugha.

The Mazata of eastern Tripolitania who had probably inhabited this land since earliest times (it is likely that this land was the cradle of the ancient Maghawasha, distant ancestors of the Mazata) rallied at an early stage to the cause of Ibadism. The district of Surt constituted a province of the ephemeral Ibadī state of the imām Abu l-Khaṭṭāb (Abd ab Al-Ḥaṣib b. Al-Samḥ al-Maṣfīrī (140-4/757-61). Numerous individual, probably members of the branch of the Mazata which inhabited eastern Tripolitania, played a momentous role in the history of this imam. It was also in the territory of Surt, at Maghmadas (in ancient times Macomades Syrit or Macomades Selorum), that there took place in 141/759 a battle between the army of Abu l-Khaṭṭāb and that of the Ṣaffārid general Abu Al-Ahwās Umar b. Al-Ahwās al-Uḍghī. After the defeat and death of Abu l-Khaṭṭāb in 144/761, the victorious Arab general Ibn Al-Asḥath took control of the district of Surt and sent troops, in 145/762-3, to conquer the land of Waddan. The capital of this region was taken and its Ibadī population put to the sword.

In spite of the defeat of Abu l-Khaṭṭāb, Ibadism survived for a long period of time in eastern Tripolitania. In fact, the land of Surt appears in the time of the Ibadī imām (Abd Al-Wahhab b. Abd Al-Rahmān b. Rustum (168-208/784-823) as a province of the Rustumid state of Tāhār. The Mazata of eastern Tripolitania, throughout the period of the Ibadī doctrines. In fact, at about the end of the 3rd/9th century, the Mazata were still independent and governed by an indigenous chieftain, apparently an Ibadī. At a later date, al-Dardjī (7th/11th century) notes that among this segment of the Mazata that there were the Kastllīya (here = Bilad al-Djarād). In the canton of Kastllīya (Gabes) of the Kastllīya (Tozeur?), of Kaṣfā (Gafsa), of Naṣafīa, of al-Hamāmā, of Sumāmā and of Biṣhir (Bechri on modern maps). It is probably among this segment of the Mazata that there were recruited the Ḥijā ṣīn and theまたはマザータ of Mazata origin who lived, at about the 9th/11th century, if al-Shammāmkhi (10th/16th century) is to believed, in the Kaṣfīya (here = Bilād al-Djarād). In the canton of Naṣafīa (Nefsoua on modern maps) there lived a segment of the Mazātīn sub-tribe of the Baṣn Izmārā (or Izmārt) which professed the Ibadī faith; according to Ibn Khaldūn this group belonged not to the Mazata, as stated by Ibadī sources, but to the great Berber family of the Zanata. The town of Fānasa (Fernassa on modern maps) also owes its name to the homonymous Berber sub-tribe,
a branch of the Mazâta. Between Tayzur (Tozeur) and al-Hamma lived the Mazâta sub-tribe of the Kazîna.

Further to the north-east of the Bilâd al-Djarid and of Kafsa (Gaïfa), there were numerous Ibadî-Wahbî Mazatâ on the plain of Kayrawân (called Fahs or Kayrawân in the Ibadî chronicles). It is curious to note that, in spite of their Khâridjî faith, these Mazatâ were loyal servants of the Zirîd kings of Irikiya. A renowned Zirîd general had his origin in this segment of the Mazatâ which bore, in the chronicles of this period, the name of Mazatât al-Kayrawân.

In all probability, there were also Ibadî Mazatâ of the Djebel Oussellet, the Djebal Wasalât of the Arab geographers, a canton situated to the west of the town of Kayrawân. It is no wonder with this name that there should be associated the ethnic al-Wasalât, applied to numerous Ibadî individuals of the 4th/10th and 5th/11th centuries, members of the tribe of the Mazatâ, including for example of the shaykh ʿAbd al-Qâni, the Al-Wasalât al-Mazâtî, and the shaykh Faṭûb b. Abî Hâdîjî al-Wasalâtî al-Mazâtî. According to the anonymous list of Ibadî shaykhs of the 7th/13th century, ʿAbd al-Qâni belonged to the Mazatâ branch of Amwâhût.

According to the Ibadî historian Abu l-ʿAbbâs al-Djarîjî, the Mazatâ of Irikiya were very rich (in particular, they possessed a large number of horses) and very warlike. Ibn Hawkal mentions a village named Dâkma (Dâma), situated close to al-Masila, which in the time of this geographer was inhabited by the Ibadî group Ismâ'îl b. Zîrî (the ancient Tipasa), most probably that which Ibn Hawkal speaks, locating it between Tifâsh (the ancient Tipasa) and al-Masila, alongside a branch of the tribe of the Kutâmâ. Ibn Hawkal also mentions a village named Dâkma (Dâma), situated close to al-Masila, which in the time of this geographer was inhabited by the Kutâmâ, but the name of which is associated with that of one of the sub-tribes of the Mazatâ, this being Dâqûma (read Dâqûma). The same facts were repeated at a later date by al-Idrisî.

As for the Zâb, the Mazatâ of this land lived, being semi-nomadic, in brushwood shacks in the vicinity of the towns of Tubna (the ancient Tubunae) and of Biskra. In 360/971, they were massacred by Bulûggûn b. Zîrî, but subsequently they regained their strength. Al-Idrisî (10th/16th century) refers to the Mazatâ in question, describing various features of their history during the 5th/11th and 6th/12th centuries. They lived in encampments (Ar. ʿayyâ) and the Ibadî-Wahbî faith, with a certain tendency towards Nukkârî Ibadîm. They were, among others, military supporters of the renowned Nukkârî chief Abû Yazîd, mentioned above.

The names of the Mazatâ sub-tribes which inhabited the Zâb are not known. It is very likely that it is to these groups that the Madunâ belonged, and perhaps also the Amwâhût (Umâhût). In fact, the name of this latter people is found in that of the locality, Oummach on modern maps, which is situated midway between Téhouda (the ancient Thabudeos) and Milîî (the ancient Gemellae).

The Mazatâ of the Zâb and of the Hodna belonged to very rich tribes which did not use their wealth to support the Rustâmî imamate of Tahart. The Ibadî historians state in this context, quoting the words of one of the Rustâmî mîms, that the Ibadî-Wahbî religion “exists through the swords of the Naţûsî and the possessions of the Mazatâ”, also alluding to the religious zeal of the former of these tribes. Ibn Saḥîr, author of a chronicle of Tahart composed at the beginning of the 4th/10th century, says of the Mazatâ, the Sadrât and other tribes inhabiting the Zâb and the Hodna, that they “were in the habit, in the season of spring, of leaving the temporary lands that they occupied in the Maghrib or other regions to come to Tahart or its surrounding areas on account of the pastures that they found there and other advantages which the land offered them... When the nomads arrived to install their encampments, their dignitaries and leaders of groups presented themselves in the town where they were received with kindness and respect (by the mîms). Then they returned to their encampments where they remained until the time of their departure”.


(T. Lewicki)

AL-MAZĀTĪ, ABU ‘L-RABI‘ SULAYMĀN B. YĀḤIYĀ ABU ‘L-RABI‘ SULAYMĀN B. YĀḤIYĀ, famous Ibāḍī historian, theologian and jurisconsult. He was a member, as his nisba indicated, of the Banū Abī Bakr, a desert tribe of Ma‘zātī that probably came originally from the branch who lived in the mountains of south Tunisia near the island Tamulast. He was also, like his uncle, a member of the same region of Tunisia as Abu ‘l-Rabi‘.*

The date of his birth is uncertain. We know, however, that, as a young man, in the first decade of the 5th/11th century, he studied under the famous Ibadī historian Abu Zakariyya Yahyā b. Abī Bakr al-Wardjālānī, one of the cultural centres of the Ibadis of North Africa; this is the Kitāb al-Siyar, a collection of biographies of distinguished Ibāḍīs of the Magribī. We do not know the date of composition of this work, which appears to have been written after the year 450/1060-1.

After having finished his studies in Djārba, Abu ‘l-Rabi‘ returned to Tamulast, where he was soon surrounded by a wide circle of students whom he taught, among other subjects, ar-Rashīd, i.e. the history of the Ibāḍī sect and the biographies of distinguished Ibāḍīs. He was already there at the time of the death of his old master Abū ‘Abd Allāh Muhammad b. Bakīr in 440/1048-9. From Tamulast, Abu ‘l-Rabi‘ set out, before 449/1057-8, for Ka‘fat ‘Allī (also Ka‘fat Bani ‘Allī), a place situated in the Djebel Zanzafa, near Tamulast; he lived there with his students until 462/1069-70. He felt safer in this place than in Tamulast, through which passed the route of some Arab tribes (notably the Banū Hādīl) going from Tripolitania to Ifriqiya and returning to Tripolitania.

In the same year, Abu ‘l-Rabi‘ returned to Tāmulāst, where he stayed for some time, always surrounded by his students. Towards the end of his life, he went to settle in Tūnīs, a desert place situated in the mountains near Tāmulāst, where a halka or circle of students soon gathered around him. His students were recruited from among the peoples of the Sūf (Oued Said), Arīgh (Oued Righ), Wardjālānī (Ouardagh), Zab and Kaṣṭilīya. Among those who were especially interested in Ibāḍī history and sīyar, one should mention principally the famous future historian Abū Zakariyyā Yahyā b. Abī Bakr al-Wardjālānī.*

According to the old Ibāḍī chronicles, Abu ‘l-Rabi‘ died in 471/1070-9 in Tūnīs. However, the Ibāḍī tradition of Ouardagh places the tomb and mosque of Abu ‘l-Rabi‘ Sulaymān al-Ma‘zātī, who is doubtless none other than Abu ‘l-Rabi‘ Sulaymān b. Yakhlaf al-Ma‘zātī, in this latter town. Abu ‘l-Rabi‘ travelled extensively. We have already seen that he had passed his youth in the Oued Righ and on the island of Djārba in order to study there. From the Oued Righ, he went at least twice to Ouardagh, once in the company of his master Abū ‘Abd Allāh Muhammad b. Bakīr. In 450/1060-61 he visited, accompanied by his students, most of the Wābbī Ibāḍī groups of Tunisia and Algeria, passing by Kaṣṭilīya (Kaṣṭilīya), Na‘fzawa (Nefzaoua), Asuf (Oued Souf), Waghālāna (Ourlana), Tamāṣīn (Temacīn) and Ouardagh, from where he returned to the Djībel Zanzafa and Tāmulāst.

Abu ‘l-Rabi‘ Sulaymān b. Yakhlaf al-Ma‘zātī is the author of three works, of which one is of particular interest for the history of the Ibāḍīs of North Africa; this is the Kitāb al-Siyar, a collection of biographies of distinguished Ibāḍīs of the Magribī. We do not know the date of composition of this work, which appears to have been written after the year 450/1069. We know of the existence of two manuscript copies of the Kitāb al-Siyar, of which one, apparently complete, is in the Bāb Mzāb in Beni Isguene, in a library known as al-Maktab al-ghanna, while the other, incomplete, was inserted in the historical work of Abu Zakariyyā Yahyā b. Abī Bakr al-Wardjālānī (6th/12th century) who, as we know, was one, of the students of Abu ‘l-Rabi‘. One also finds several citations of Abu ‘l-Rabi‘ in al-Shaykh Arīshī’s work. It seems that numerous citations of Abu ‘l-Rabi‘ which appear in some later Ibāḍī historical and biographical works in the 9th/11th century come from the Kitāb al-Siyar, while it is not impossible that a part of these citations come directly from the mouth of this historian and were noted by his students. This applies especially to the citations of Abu ‘l-Rabi‘ inserted in the historical work of Abū Zakariyyā Yahyā b. Abī Bakr al-Wardjālānī (6th/12th century) who, as we know, was one, of the students of Abu ‘l-Rabi‘. One also finds several citations of Abu ‘l-Rabi‘ in al-Shaykh Arīshī’s work.

It is curious that the Kitāb al-Siyar of Abu ‘l-Rabi‘ should not have been cited in the catalogue of Ibāḍī books composed in the 8th/14th century by al-Barrādī, an Ibāḍī scholar who was moreover originally from the same region of Tunisia as Abu ‘l-Rabi‘. Abī Barrāḍī knows only two other works of this historian which dealt with theology and law.


MAZDAK (also Mazag, Mazdak), the leader of a revolutionary movement in Sasanian Iran, during the reign of Kabûdân, son of Firûz (Kavâd, son of Peroz) 488-96, 498-9 to 531). Klima regarded the name of Mazdak as a conflation of an Iranian name, Mazag, Mazdak, or Magdad ('the justifier'), with a Semitic name, Mazdek, from the root zdk ('righteous'). Klima also suggested that mazdak may have been what the leaders of this movement were called rather than a proper name, or even what its members were called (al-Mazdakanân, al-Mazâdikân in Arabic sources as well as al-Mazdakiyya).

Almost everything known about this movement comes from hostile sources. The earliest and only contemporary account is in the Syriac *Chronicle of Pseudo-Joshua the Stylite* (ed. and tr. W. Wright, Cambridge 1899, i, pp. 1-xx, xx-xiv). Subsequent, sixth-century, Greek accounts are given by Procopius (*Persian Wars*, i. v-xi, ii. ix), Agathias (*Histories*, tr. J. D. Frendo, Berlin-New York 1975, iv, chaps. 27-30, pp. 130-4), and Malalas of Antioch (*Chronographia*, in J. P. Migne (ed.), *Patrologia Graeca Completa*, Series Graeca, xxviii, Paris 1860, cols. 465, 633, 653). Theophanes (Migne, *op. cit.*, evii, Paris 1865, col. 396) merely repeats Malalas. There are scattered allusions to Mazdak in Mazdean Middle Persian literature. Klima suggested that references to Mazdak were deliberately omitted from the original Middle Persian text of the Sâsnâd royal chronicle, the *Khwarâš-nâmâg*, and credited Ibn al-Mukaffa (*d. 145/760* [q. v.]) with inserting an account about Mazdak into his Arabic translation of the *Khwarâš-nâmâg*. References to the main Arabic and Persian accounts of Mazdak based on this and other translations are given by Yarshater. Ibn al-Mukaffa also translated a Middle Persian work of fiction called the Mazdâkh-nâmâg into Arabic. This work was also translated into Arabic poetry by Abûn b. al-Hamîd al-Lâbi (d. 200/815-16 [q. v.]). According to Yarshater, who identifies the main fictional themes, this work was the basis for the Nîmûl’s account in the *Sîyâsat-nâmâ* and of the poetic version in Dârâb Hormâdzâ’s *Rîcâsit*. It was also used by al-Bûrînî (Alghârî, Ibn al-Balkhî (Fars-nâmâ), the Mazaghul al-tawârîkh, and Ibn al-Aţûrî (Kâmî). The most important source for Mazdakian doctrine is Abî ʿĪsa Muhammad b. Hûrin al-Warrâk (d. 247/861), a Manichaean or Mazdean convert to Islam who seems to have used some authentic Mazdakian work for his religious history (Kûûb al-Makâlût), His account is also the Shahristânî’s (468-548/1076-1153) source for Mazdakian doctrine in his Kûûb al-mâlûm wa l-nâhal. The Mazdakian book called the Dêmâd cited in Mubadh Shah’s 11th/17th-century *Dustânšt-i msgâkhî* [q. v.] is generally considered to be a fabrication because everything cited from it can also be found in al-Shâhrastânî or other works, although it could be argued on the same basis that this might have been the name of the work used by al-Warrâk. Some of the information in the *Fihrist* of Ibn al-Nadîm [q. v.] appears to be independent and rather neutral.

The Mazdakian movement is said to have been founded by a certain Zarâdush (or Zarâdush), son of Khurragân, moqâl or chief moqâl of Fasâ in Fars, after whom its members were called Zarâdushqalân. Christensen identified this Zarâdush with a Manichaean called Bundos who, according to Malalas, appeared at Rome in the time of DIOCLETIAN (245-313), held doctrines opposed to the majority of Manichaeans, and left for Persia where he spread his doctrine. His sect was called ‘those of the right religion’ (الشّامخون) from MP daris-darîn, and Malalas says that Daraish himself was a Daris-dar (Darîş-darîn). Christensen took Bundos to be an honorific title of Zarâdush, from MP bynrdk (‘the venerable’), and regarded Mazdakism as a re-forming Manichaean sect. However, Klima regarded Zarâdush and Bundos as separate persons, and Yarshater puts Zarâdush in the 5th century A.D. According to Arrigoni, Bundos is a mistake for Buddha, therefore a fictive re-personalisation of Bud- dha. Yarshater suggests that the founding of Zarâdush’s movement may have coincided with the end of the millennium of Zoroaster, which some calculations would put at the end of the 4th or the beginning of the 5th century A.D. It might also have been the doctrine combated by Adurâd Mârâspanân, who underwent an ordeal by fire to refute it in the time of Shâpur II. The movement seems to have been Zoroaster’s rather than the Manichaean in origin, although it acquired gnostic features that gave it an affinity to Manichaeism. It may have begun as an attempt to popularise Mazdâism and to spread it in a non-elitist form that would transcend class barriers and appeal to the general population. Textual support for the egalitarian sharing of wealth, women, and wisdom exists in the extant Avesta, such as Vendidad iv. 44: ‘If fellow-believers (kâmadâna), brothers or friends, come to ask for money, wife, or wisdom, he who asks for money should be given money; he who asks for a wife should be given a wife to marry; he who asks for wisdom should be taught the holy word.’ Ibn al-Nadîm describes the early Khurramiya (Maz- dakis) as a Zoroastrian sect founded by a certain Mazdak the Older (al-Kadim), who enjoined his followers to enjoy life’s pleasures, to satisfy their desire to eat and drink in a spirit of equality, to avoid dominating each other, to share women and family, to try to do good deeds, to avoid shedding blood and harming others and to be hospitable. In the time of Kûûbâd, the movement of Zarâdush was revived under Mazdak, son of Bâmdâb (‘the Sunrise’), called Mazdak the Younger by Ibn al-Nadîm. According to al-Tabâri, he was a native of ʿâlîf, which tends to be identified with al- Maĥârayya, near modern Kût al-ʿAmâra [q. v.], although von Wesendonk located it in Khuzistan. Istâkhâr and Tabriz are also given as Mazdak’s birthplace. He is said to have been a moqâl and is identified by Christensen with the Manichaean bishop Indarazâr, whom Malalas says was killed by the Per- sian king ca. 527. Indarazâr (Indazazor in Theophanes) is explained as andarazer (‘teacher’) by Noldeke; Klima suggested that the proper name Vin- dârâzâr lies behind it and speculated that if mazdak were an epithet, then that might have been his real name.

A series of disasters in the late 5th century increased distress and raised apocalyptic expectations. Iran suffered a seven-year-long drought and famine during the reign of Firûz. Defeat by the Hephthalites in 484 put the Sânsâdûn under the burden of paying tribute to them. The Hephthalite and dynastic civil wars also
decimated the military nobility, undermining their ability to preserve their privileged position. The common interest of the monarch and the people in curbing the power of the great nobles may have led Kubād to identify himself with the Zarādushṭakān. He may have seen this movement as a potential base of mass support against the nobles, and its programme as a means of restoring by transforming his kingdom. Nōdeke represented Kubād as a forceful, capable ruler, who, for purely secular motives, favoured Mazdakism as an expedient to reduce the power of the nobles and priests. Christensen argued that Kubād was a sincere convert and humanitarian ruler motivated by religious belief and a desire for the welfare of his subjects. Pigeuveskaya saw Kubād as a sincere Mazdakī rather than a shrewd and subtle politician. Klima rejected Christensen’s “humanitarian” characterisation of Kubād based on his behaviour in wars, although an Arabic source with a hostile bias says that, as a zandāk, Kubād feared to shed blood. Although there is no way to be certain, Kubād is most likely to have been motivated by a combination of political interests and religious belief.

To the extent that doctrines ascribed to Mazdak himself can be reconstructed from later sources, he seems to have advocated the enjoyment of material things in moderation and a peaceful, egalitarian and non-competitive social and economic order. Mīkawī believes that the early Mazdakīyya were called “the adherents of justice” (al-Adhīyeh) and they are sometimes compared to the egalitarian, gnostic sect of Carpocratians that also stood for social justice. According to al-Tha’alībī, Mazdak taught that God had put provisions for livelihood (arzāk) on earth for people to divide equally among themselves, with no one having more than his share. But people had wronged each other and sought to dominate; the strong had defeated the weak and monopolised the means of livelihood and property. It was necessary to take from the rich and give to the poor for everyone to become equal in wealth. Whoever had a surplus of property, women, or goods had no more right to it than anyone else. In Firdawsī, Mazdak is said to have taught that wealth and women must be shared in order to overcome the four demons of envy, wrath, vengeance, and greed that turn men from righteousness. This appears to be reflected in the refutation of a sectarian who represents sharing women and property as a remedy for passions in Dīnḵart, iii. 5.

If authentic, such a positive, anti-élite attitude toward material possessions could hardly have been Manichaein in origin. Christensen accepted the Manichean origin of the Mazdakīyya because they are called Manichaeans in the Greek sources. They may have been accused of Manichaeism by their enemies in Iran, and Malalas may simply have repeated the slander or have used the only name for an Iranian sect that he knew. Klima’s argument that Mazdak had to use Mazdaean terminology as a vehicle for the mass communication of his propaganda because he was in Iran is based on the assumption that Mazdaism was spread uniformly, socially and geographically, in 5th-century Iran. But it is questionable that the lower classes were already Mazdaean in the 5th century; Mazdaism seems rather to have been a vehicle to spread Mazdaean doctrine among them.

Puech regards Mazdaism as an optimistic reform of Manichaicism, but, as Yarshater points out, most scholars describe Mazdaism as a reform of Zoroastrianism. What is known about Mazdak’s doctrine is dualist and generally gnostic in character rather than specifically Manichaean. The gnostic elements that are claimed as the basis for affinity between Mazdaism and Manichaism include pacifism, asceticism, fatalism, esoteric interpretation and the dualist rejection of ritual. The prohibition of bloodshed appears in the context of social concord and is not necessarily either pacifist or vegetarian. The only other basis for claiming an ascetic element in Mazdaism is a hostile gloss to Vendidad, iv. 49 saying that Mazdak, son of Bāmdād, ate fully himself but subjected others to hunger and death. This is just as likely to refer to the consequence of Mazdak’s regulations for his own followers without additional corroboration. The alleged contrast between ascetic and hedonistic tendencies in Mazdaism is explained by Yarshater, by comparison with gnostic movements, in terms of a self-denying elite and wordly lay members. But this is the reverse of what the gloss suggests, and there is no other evidence for such elitism among the Mazdakīyya. According to al-Shahrastānī, Mazdak’s doctrine resembled Mani’s except that Darkness did not act of its own will and out of choice (bi ‘l-khayl wa ‘l-ittifāk), but blindly and by chance (bi ‘l-khabt wa ‘l-ittifāk), and that the mixture of Light with Darkness was produced in order to separate the others. According to al-Mutahhar b. Tāhir al-Makdīsī, the Sābiyān [q. v.] also believed in mixture bi ‘l-khabt wa ‘l-ittifāk. Although Sābiyān are sometimes mistaken for Manichaeans, belief in a blind fate is central to Zoroanism and thus available in a Zoroastrian context. Regarding esoteric interpretation, al-Mas’ūdī says that Mazdak was the first to interpret the Avesta according to its hidden meanings (hāṣṭa). Although this may have been a matter of adjusting Mazdaean doctrine for the masses, it made the Mazdakīyya into Zindiks [q. v.] along with the Manichaeans. According to the 3rd/9th century al-Mutawakkilī, Mazdak is also said to have persuaded Kubād to have all but the three original fires extinguished. Rather than being an attack on cult observance, a ghurab, Yarshater interprets this to mean that Mazdak sought to reduce the power of the Mazdaean priesthood and deprive them of property held by fire-temples. There may have been an attempt to found alternative institutions, since the Nestorian Chronicle of Sir’ī reports that Kubād ordered temples (hayaḵt) and hospices (fandīk) to be built throughout his kingdom where men and women would congregate for adoruty.

Beginning with the earliest sources, the Mazdakī ideal of sharing women has been represented in terms of sexual promiscuity with the resulting confusion of paternity. According to Pseudo-Joshua, the Zarādushṭakān believed that women should be shared and that every man should have intercourse with whom he pleased. This text also reports that Kubād allowed the wives of the nobles to commit adultery, while Procopius relates that Kubād issued a law that Persians should have intercourse with women in common nōmōn ἡγεμόν ἐπὶ νομῆς γυναῖκες μὲνα ἡγεμονίαν Ἐρέσ. Although such reports received lurid embellishments in later literature, it is more likely, according to Klima and Yarshater, that the Mazdakīyya advocated the right of each man to have a wife and the abolition of social barriers to marriage between nobles and commoners. They may also have encouraged the marriage of women outside of their immediate families. Klima suggests that famine and
the decimation of the nobility in recent warfare had caused a demographic crisis in Iran, and that the
The situation seems to have been stabilised with the Mazdakiyya in control after Kubābdh's return. The Mazdakiyya period is generally understood in terms of class conflict and the overturning of the social order. Soviet scholars see the movement as one of peasant protest and identify Mazdak's followers as poor farmers, although Piguilevskaya notes that the sources are not specific in this respect. Al-Tabari calls his followers commoners (damma, while al-Tha'ālabī simply calls them the poor (fakhrān, masākim) or the rabble (al-ghawghā). However, some nobles were Mazdakiyya, such as Sīyavūs, who commanded Kubābdh's army after his restoration, and Kubābdh's eldest son, Kāwūs, who governed Tabaristan as the Pudshahār ash-Shāh. Kubābdh seems to have favoured the conversion of non-Zoroastrians in order to increase religious conformity. He tried to force the Armenians to convert before he was deposed, and after he was restored, he required the Arab ruler of al-Hira, al-Mundhir III (ca. 502-54 [see LAKHMIDS]) to adopt Mazdaki doctrines. When al-Mundhir refused, Kubābdh got the ruler of the Kinda, al-Hārith b. ʿAmr, to agree to impose Mazdakism on the Arabs of the Najd and the Ḥiḍāj. Some Arabs in Mecca are said to have adopted Mazdakism (tazandaka) at that time, and some sarīdā are said to have still been there in the time of Muḥammad. Efforts to spread some form of Zoroastrianism lie behind the forced conversion of Jewish children that began under Fīrūz in 474, according to Shīrīr, or in 477 according to Ibn Dāwūd. Graetz and others have seen the revolt of the exilarch, Mar Zutrah, who is said to have made himself briefly independent at Mahoza near Ctesiphon in the early 6th century, as a reaction to the Mazdakiyya, although Neusner considers the entire episode implausible.
Since the Mazdakiyya supported the succession of Kāwūs, his younger brother, Khusrav, allied himself with the Mazdaean priests, challenged Mazdak's influence over Kubābdh, arranged for the Mazdakiyya to assemble at the capital for a religious disputa or for the proclamation of Kāwūs as successor, convinced his father that Mazdak's doctrines were false, and had him executed with thousands of his followers in 528 or early 529. When Khusrav succeeded his father in 531, there may have been a second persecution of Mazdakites; the sect was suppressed and its books destroyed. In reaction to thirty years of Mazdaki ascendency, the distinction between nobles and commoners was restored. Some indication of what had happened can be seen in the reforms of Khusrav I, who confiscated the property of Mazdaki leaders and gave it to the poor. He executed those who had taken property by force and returned it to its former owners. Those who had damaged property were ordered to pay for it. A child of disputed descent was to belong to the family with which it lived. A man who had seized a woman was to give her a marriage portion that satisfied her family; she could then decide to stay with him or marry someone else, but should return to her former husband if she had one. Khusrav took personal charge of children from noble families without anyone to care for them; he gave the girls dowries and found noble husbands for them, and found noble wives for the youths.
Any Mazdakiyya who survived did so in secret or escaped beyond the Sāsānids borders to Central Asia. There may have been an early centre near Ravy. By the early Islamic period, Neo-Mazdakian groups were scattered throughout Iran; they were called Mazdakiyya around Ravy and Hamadan, "wearers of red" (Maḥammad in Dūrjan), and "wearers of white" (Sūnī or Maḥammad or Muḥammad) in Central Asia. During the 2nd/8th and 3rd/9th centuries, they broke up into numerous sub-sect named after some leader. According to al-Warrāk, as cited by al-Shahrastānī, in the 3rd/9th century, Mazdakian doctrine was based on a dualism of Light and Darkness; Light, having knowledge and sensation, acted intentionally, while Darkness, being ignorant and blind, acted randomly. Both their mixtures and separation were accidental. The mingling of the three elements of Water, Fire, and Earth produced two demiurge-like Managers of Good and of Evil. Their object of worship (naḥbadahu) was enthroned in the upper world as the supreme monarch (khusrav) was in the lower world. Four spiritual powers (kuwā) called Discernment (tamziyya), Understanding (jalma), Preservation (hīfī), and Joy (turī) stand before His throne corresponding to the chief judge (nāḥfūn nāḥfāh), religious teacher (bīhīshāh ūrūbaḥī), army commander (spāhbed), and entertain-ment master (nāšīqān) who stood before the earthly king. The world was directed by the four powers with the aid of seven waṣīr and twelve spiritual forces. Anyone in whom the four, the seven, and the twelve were combined became godly (rabbanī) and freed from religious duties. Those who knew the sum of the let-ters that amounted to the most supreme Name (al-imāl) also knew the greatest secret (al-tur al-alāh). Those who did not know it remained blind and ignorant. The doctrine of correspondence seems to reflect late Sāsānids conditions, but it is difficult to tell whether the rest went back to Mazdak himself or whether it was the result of continuing doctrinal development. The Mazdakiyya tend to be credited with introducing number and letter mysticism, and may have contributed it to the Kaysaniyya (q. v.) Shīʿī groups with which they associated in the 2nd/8th century. The Neo-Mazdakian groups that emerged from this association such as the Abū Muslimiyā, Sunbād-iyya, Mukannā-iyya and, above all, the Khurramiyya (q. v.) or Khurramdiniyya and its subset of Kudhakiyya, seem to have acquired additional gnostic content from ghulū Shīʿī groups as a semi-Islamic disguise. However, both al-Shīʿī and al-Makdisī regarded the Khurramiyya as a category of Madjūs (q. v.). Mazdakiyya survived in Central Asia as late as the early 6th/12th century living at Kīgh.
Nakhashab and villages near Bukhara according to NarshakhT. According to Yakut, they inhabited the village of Dargazin between Hamadān and Zandān. The last references to Mazdakiyya occur in the Ilkhanid period, although the Mazdakiyya are listed as the fourteenth Zoroastrian sect in the Dabistān, as the fourteenth Zoroastrian sect in the Ihkāk Ma‘ārim, which the divinity or its attributes are made visible in a visible appearance or expression of an invisible reality, reflecting the popular contrast between the state and period of his concealment and the state and period of his revelation. This revelation takes place in the mazhar, a creating being in whom the Divinity manifests himself to its attributes, and to himself out of nothing, attributes. It is not, strictly speaking, the divine essence but is a Will that was created through recognition of him has only been attained through what they are. In this sense, the Perfect Man is the Isthmus of an external attribute manifesting a divine name. In his theory of the Perfect Man who acts as a mirror in which the Absolute may see itself manifested, Ibn al-‘Arabi parallels the Šīrī notion of the imām: man that is the place of manifestation of the divinity, ḫuwār mazdī Jāh hāk. In this sense, the Perfect Man is the Lūtus and karazākh joining the worlds of the Absolute and Creation (See Ibn al-‘Arabi, Fūsūs al-fikm.)

The Bāb [q.v.] developed a complex theory of theophany, distinguished between the imams and the mazdhār, where the number is incalculable. They are the mazhar of the “tree of reality” (mirāj), or “mirror” (haykal), “seat” (zuhūr, idem, (referred to variously as a “throne” (ardāh), “seat” (kursī), “temple” (haykal), or “mirror” (mirāj), or as the “tree of reality” (ṣafirat al-ḥakīka) and “primal point” (nuktat-yi ulla) is an ambivalent creature. He is outwardly mortal (“what your eyes beheld of the outward form of the thrones is but a handful of clay”, 242), but inwardly divine: “Look within them, for God has manifested Himself (tadjalld) to them and through them” (ibid.). The historical mazḍāh or ontologically a single being, the historical mazḍāh or “mirror” (tadjalld), is a synonym for mazdīh, which the divinity or its attributes are made visible in a visible appearance or expression of an invisible reality, reflecting the popular contrast between the state and period of his concealment and the state and period of his revelation. This revelation takes place in the mazhar, a creating being in whom the Divinity manifests himself to its attributes, and to himself out of nothing, attributes. It is not, strictly speaking, the divine essence but is a Will that was created through recognition of him has only been attained through what they are.
tions of the divinity (see MacEoin, Hierarchy, 109 ff.). His chief follower, Mirzâ Muhammad ʿAlî Kuddûs, is referred to in one source quite simply as mazhar-i ḥudâ (ibid., 110). In theological terms, this is explained by the concept of an infinite progression of mirrors reflecting the Divine Will and forming a complex descending hierarchy of mazhûr. These secondary, tertiary, and subsequent mirrors appear, not only during the lifetime of the primary mirror, but throughout the period of bahûn, when he is in a state of concealment (ibid., 117-19).

Bahâʾî doctrine follows that of Bûbism very closely, but tends to be more restrictive in its attribution of the status of mazharîyya, which is generally limited to the founders of the major religions. The full technical term for such figures is mazharî šâhî (in English Bahâʾî usage, “Manifestation of God”). At the same time, a broader definition of religious truth allows Bahâʾîs to include among the mazharî figures such as Buddha and Krishna (whom they regard as the “founder” of Hinduism). Bahâʾî Allâh [q.v.] is the latest mazharî and will not be followed by another for at least one thousand years. Not only is he accorded a high status with regard to previous and future mazhûr (who have either prepared the way for him or will function under his shadow), but he himself often speaks in terms that are close to those of bahûn. This is “the forefather of all things”, in whom “the essence of the pre-existent has appeared”; in one place, he claims that “he has been born who begets not nor is begetten” (see MacEoin, Charismatic authority, 168). Modern Bahâʾî doctrine, however, explicitly5 rejects an incarnationist interpretation of the status of the mazharî.


(For D. MacEoin)

MAZHAR, MIRZĀ ĐEÑĐEÑAN (1111-95/1700-81), an Urdu poet and eminent Sûfî, was born in Tâlâbâq, Mâlâwâ. He was received into the Nakshbandi order by Sayyid Mîr Muhammad Badâ'înâ, and into the Kâdîrî order by Muhammad ʿAbîd Sumâmî. He was shot in Delhi by a Shiʿî fanatic in revenge for his critical remarks about the Muslim celebrations, but though he survived three days, he refused to identify his assailant, this is Emperor. He was—and remains—a famous religious leader. He had many disciples and was even credited with miracles. As a writer, however, his position is not so clear-cut. His letters, in Persian, have been published along with miracles. As a writer, however, his position is not so clear-cut. His letters, in Persian, have been published with some so clear-cut. His letters, in Persian, have been published with some
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Mazin originally meant "the emigrants" and was used in a general way of any ethnic group which became separated from its own tribe and was incorporated in a strange tribe. This etymology, like almost all those of the names of Arab tribes, is of course only a hypothesis.

The sources give a certain number of geographical and historical references to different tribes called Mazin; but they are generally very scanty, none of these tribes having attained sufficient importance to make it independent of the larger body to which it was attached. We have a few details about the Mazin tribe of Hamdil (not cited by Ibn Al-Kalbi) and the Mazin dialect of other RabT tribes, we have a few details about the Mazin tribe of Hamdil (not cited by Ibn Al-Kalbi) and the Mazin dialect of other RabT tribes, which the Tamlm belonged to the Mazin. We may note however Hilal b. As'l of the Umayyad period (Aghdni, ii, 186); Malik b. Al-Rayb, poet and brigand, contemporary of Al-Hadath (Aghdni, xix, 162-9; Ibn Kutayba, Al-Shurr wa'l-Shar'a, ed. de Goeje, 205-7, etc.); Zuhayr b. Urwa Al-Sakb (Aghdni, xix, 156; the few verses that we have by him, often quoted, are also attributed to his father, Urwa b. Dja'lan, and even to Abd Al-Rahman b. Hassân b. Thabit: cf. Mufaddal (Aghdni, ed. Lyall, 249, n. 5). Lastly, it may be mentioned that the Mazin have given to Arab philology two of its most illustrious masters: Abû 'Amr b. al-'Ala\(\text{a}\) [q.v.], d. 154/771; and Al-Nadr b. Shumayl, whose genealogies are given in Wüstenfeld, Tabellen (I.).

Very few of the remarkable number of poets produced by the Tamlm belonged to the Mazin. We may note however Hilal b. As'l of the Umayyad period (Aghdni, ii, 186); Malik b. Al-Rayb, poet and brigand, contemporary of Al-Hadath (Aghdni, xix, 162-9; Ibn Kutayba, Al-Shurr wa'l-Shar'a, ed. de Goeje, 205-7, etc.); Zuhayr b. Urwa Al-Sakb (Aghdni, xix, 156; the few verses that we have by him, often quoted, are also attributed to his father, Urwa b. Dja'lan, and even to Abd Al-Rahman b. Hassân b. Thabit: cf. Mufaddal (Aghdni, ed. Lyall, 249, n. 5). Lastly, it may be mentioned that the Mazin have given to Arab philology two of its most illustrious masters: Abû 'Amr b. al-'Ala\(\text{a}\) [q.v.], d. 154/771; and Al-Nadr b. Shumayl, whose genealogies are given in Wüstenfeld, Tabellen (I.).

Information about his life and works is scarce and partly contradictory. Already discutable is the name of his grandfather and his supposed lineal descent from the Banu Mazin [q.v.]; the tradition that he was only a member of the Banu Mazin is more likely to be correct. Al-Mazini uses materials taken from Abû Zayd Al-Ansari, Abû 'l-Hasan Al-Abdah, Al-Aṣma\(\text{a}\) and Abû 'l-Boyada [q.v.]. Among his disciples, Al-Mubarrad (d. 286/900) is to be mentioned in the first place. The stories—some of which refer to his arrival in Baghdad during the caliphate of Al-Mu'tasim (218-27/835-42) and connect him with the court of his successors Al-Walid and Al-Mutawakkil in Sāmarrā—and are not to be distinguished by their anecdotal character and pointed narration from the numerous comparable aṣhab adab and tabaqāt literature. Within these traditions, judgements and opinions about Al-Mazini's learning and madhhab are interspersed. Al-Mubarrad considered him next, after Sibawayh, as one of the most learned of grammarians; others suggested that he was an adherent of the Imāmiyya or Mudjdi\(\text{a}\), or else of the Kādiyya or Mu'tazila. Even the information about the date of his death in his home town is varying. The dates differ by up to 19 years. Preference is to be given to the note that he died in the same year as the caliph Al-Mutawakkil (232-47/847-61) or—as often quoted—little later in the year 249/863.

Nothing is preserved of Al-Mazini's supposed works on grammar, lexicography and metrics, of his explanations concerning Sibawayh's Kitab and the Kur\(\text{\text{'}}\)an books which have been enumerated, e.g. by Yākūt, Umdat\(\text{\text{'}}\), ii, 388. Only one text, the Kitab—

---
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**AL-MAZINI, Abû 'Uṣma'ān Bakr b. Muḥammad, Arab philologist and Kur\(\text{\text{'}}\)ān reader from al-Basra.
Tarif, a very significant treatise on morphology, has been transmitted in a ruwdta, that is to say, lecture notes. The teacher is addressing the student directly; else he refers to the authority of al-Khalll. This Kitab al-Tasrif li-Abi 'Uthmdn al-Mdzini, a book written in language, not infrequently embedded in aphorisms, including verses of reference to the guidance of his teacher al-Farisi (d. 377/987) or al-Munsif and enlarged it with two appendices (see his preface, i, 1; ii, 208, 261). The first appendix comprises additional lexicographical explanations, including verses of reference to the previous chapters. It is entitled Tafsir al-lugha min kitab Abi 'Uthmdn bi-shawdhidihi wa-huajadihi wa-innamadih. The second appendix, is called Musal'd min 'ausi al-Tasrif, deals with 15 specific questions. Ibn Djinnl derives his entire material from the madjlis, traditions, referring mainly to his teacher al-Farisi. Besides speculative topics, he inserts numerous observations concerning the use of language, the basic radicals of the learned. These works have been edited under the title al-Mansf, ghrakh Abi 'Uthmdn b. Djinnl li-Kita'at al-Tasrif li-Abi 'Uthmdn al-Mazini, by Ibrahim Mustafa and Abd Allah Amln, 3 vols., Cairo 1373-955-60.


(R. Sellheim)
Teachers' Training College, al-Mazim had benefited from his readings in English which enabled him to discover Byron, Shelley, the "Lake Poets" Wordsworth and Coleridge, and Browning. Since that time al-Mazim, captivated by romantic sensibility, felt the need to express melancholy, sadness and the pain of living, the result of which was his Diwan (first section 1913; second 1917; third, posthumously, 1960; published in entirety in 1961).

However, this convinced modernist hardly sanctified a revolution in poetic forms; his greatest audacity consisted in abandoning the single rhyme in favour of the alternate rhyme. This is no doubt explained by the fact that his discovery of foreign poetry was accompanied by a deepening of his Arabic culture. At this time, the publication of the Arabic classics was in progress, and al-Mazim thus read the poets of the 'Arabi, Ibn al-Rūmī and al-Ma'arrī, being also drawn to the prose-writer al-Dhābi, whose spirit and style left their mark on him. Not all of these published editions were perfect, and it is said that he often went to Dār al-Kutub to consult the manuscript of al-Aghāni; it also seems that Shukrī and he spent hours there recopying the manuscript of the Diwan of Ibn al-Rūmī. He was 55 years old when, in an article appearing in al-Maqrīzī of December 1944, he announced that he had undertaken and consented to a systematic study of Arab literature, applying the method which he had acquired from the school of the English writers. But he quite soon gave up composing poetry. In explaining this decision, he said that he had never been entirely satisfied with his production in this field, even regretting that he had not had the courage to destroy his compositions. On the other hand, his role as a literary critic continued to command respect.

Crucial. In an article appearing in al-Mustamī al-'Arabi of 1949, Tāhā Husayn expressed the opinion that for some twenty years, the Egyptian writer had ceased to limit his horizon to his own country and had begun to take an interest in the outside World. There were in fact two schools of modernists: a French school where, following Ahmad Luṭfī al-Sayyid, the most distinguished figures were Tāhā Husayn and Muhammad Husayn Haykal; and an English school where, following ʿAbd al-Rahmān Shukrī, the two leaders were al-Akkaḍ and al-Mazim. This "school" published its manifesto, al-Diwan, in 1921. To be more exact, this was the beginning of an unfinished critical work. The two writers al-Akkaḍ and al-Mazim declared their intention to write ten fascicles in which they would show, successively, in what ways the literary celebrations of the time were overrated and what should be the new characteristics of Arabic poetry. Only the first two fascicles appeared, and what is known as the Diwan is thus limited to violent criticism of the contemporary idols, the poet Ahmad Shawki and the prose-writer al-Manfalūtī. To these two targets, the two iconoclasts added a completely unexpected third, ʿAbd al-Rahmān Shukrī! It is even in reference to him that al-Mazīnī—to whom it fell to analyse him—uses the term "idol". It is impossible not to be astonished at this sudden reversal when it is known what close friends the two men were, a friendship which lasted in particular on perfect similarity of views in questions of poetry.

Some years before the publication of the Diwan, al-Mazim had, for the first time, propounded entirely new principles for the criticism of Arabic poetry, principles which he had drawn from his reading of Hazlitt, Arnold and Macaulay. In a small monograph which appeared in 1915 (al-Shīr, ghashiyatu wu-wassāʿih), he demands of the poet that he should be sincere and that he should not produce work in a mechanical fashion but compose a personal poetry. The same year, under the title Ṣūḥ Hāfīẓ, he reprinted articles which he had devoted to the eminent Egyptian poet and had published in the review ʿUkāk in 1913. According to him, Hāfīẓ is a charlatan who is capable of composing poetry on subjects which do not genuinely affect him, which are supplied to him by the circumstances of actuality; he is a criminal who perverts the taste of readers, accuses them to lie and damn them! In order the better to pursue this vulgar versifier (nāzīm bi ʾiṣ-ṣarāʿ) he compares him with a true poet, a poet of innate talent (maḥbūb) ... Shukrī in fact. His method consists in comparing, theme by theme, the verses of each of the two men in order to demonstrate the accuracy of his judgment. But since certain partisans of Hāfīẓ reproach him for concentrating on only the worst verses of the poet, he addsuce proof to show that his best compositions, for their part, are only plagiarism of the ancients. It may be noted in passing that the modernist al-Mazīnī falls into step with the most traditional of Arabic criticism, since he practises parallelism (muwawwana) and is concerned to uncover plagiarisms (sārikāt). However, the harmonious relationship between al-Mazīnī and Shukrī did not survive the latter's death and the publication of al-Shīr, in which he revealed that his colleague had borrowed many of the themes of his Diwan—if not entire verses—from Palgrave's Golden treasury, an anthology of English lyric poetry after Shakespeare. Nothing more is needed to explain the sudden antipathy of al-Mazīnī with regard to Shukrī in his two fascicles of the Diwan, even though, subsequently, he felt obliged to retract his strictures and to acknowledge, in an article in al-Sayḥa of 5 April 1950, that it was to him that he owed his discovery of the essence of poetry.

With regard to ancient Arabic poetry, he is interested particularly in al-Mutanabbī and Ibn al-Rūmī, whom he studies as a priority, as does his companion and model al-Akkaḍ. He seeks to reconsider the question of the scale of traditionally fixed values. Ibn al-Rūmī seems to him to have been unfairly treated, no doubt because he was of Byzantine ancestry (rūmī). He considers that this should be in itself a sufficient reason for placing him above other poets. He states: "We do not try to mock the Arabs or to discredit their poetry. We mean only to say that the Arabs are not the most poetic people". According to him, all the human qualities are to be found in Western poetry, and he concludes by declaring himself a fanatical partisan of the West, eulogising the "Aryan peoples". Western theoreticians assist him to make progress in the evaluation of the resources of poetry: the German Lessing enables him to verify, in the work of Ibn al-Rūmī, again, that descriptive poetry, unlike painting on canvas, creates the illusion of movement; the Englishman Locke uncovers for him the latter's misunderstanding of magic and symbol (tanz). Through contact with European works, he poses in new terms the problem of the imagination. He tends to see here only the faculty of establishing a new combination of given elements from which innovation emerges. If he seems to ignore creative imagination, this is because of his rejection of the implausibilities which sometimes mar classical Arabic poetry. Like al-Akkaḍ, he does not accept gratuitous extravagance, the senseless hyperbole which Arabic poetry shamelessly displays, under the guise of poetic genius.

Al-Mazīnī is renowned as being a man of hard judgment, but while he has a grasp of concise for-
umae, he also possesses an immoderate taste for digression, and it is the middle course, which dates from 1914—few works of note appeared in the succeeding years: Thaqafya (1922) by ʿIṣâʿi ʿUbayd is rather a long short story, and Ibnat al-mamluk (1926) by Ibn ʿAbi Ḥadid is a historical novel. This being so, chronologically al-Mazini produced the second novel which had ever appeared in Egypt when he published Ibrahim al-kāṭib (1931), the second edition of Zaynah, in 1922. The critical work which already had the memory of the first. It is also appropriate to mention that al-Mazini had published a version of the first five chapters from the end of 1925 in several issues of the review Rās al-Yaḥṣūb. The author was already known, was even eminent, as an innovating poet counted among the proponents of the modern school of literary criticism, and the role that he played in crossing swords with ʿAbd, Shawkī and others was not to be forgotten on account of the fact that he renewed his attacks in the columns of the press, also making a name for himself in the discussion of social and political questions in al-Akbār, al-ʿIttibāʿ and al-Siyāsā, in which his vivid style and caustic tone were widely recognised. On account of all these factors, his novel was eagerly awaited, and it did indeed, in a general sense, achieve success, for three essential reasons:

The leading character who bears the same name as the author is, in fact, his double, and nobody can doubt that they both think, act and feel in the same way; he is charming and impulsive, a sceptic if not a pessimist, considering others and himself with humour. The story related, on the other hand, does not fail to engage curiosity, since the three women with whom Ibrahim is romantically involved pose such fundamental questions as the importance of tradition, the role of women and the meaning of marriage. Finally, as to the tone of the novel, its unity is maintained on account of the fact that the narration is in the first person, facilitating the transfer from abstract meditation to lively and satirical description or to vivid dialogue. Al-Mazini's first contribution to fiction would thus appear to be entirely creditable, leading one to suppose that he would not be slow to repeat this success. However, it was not until 1943 that he added to his corpus, publishing four novels in the same year: Ibrahim al-thānī, Thalāthā rājīḍ wa-maʿa, ʿAwd ʿalā ḥadd, Miṣūr wa-sharākhū. Some have tended to attribute special significance to the first two, linking them with the novel already discussed to constitute a "trilogy" (cf. ʿAbd Wādī ʿAṣūr, al-Marʿār fi ʿArbaʿa al-muʿāṣirūn, Cairo, 1953). This cannot be substantiated, not even in reference to Ibrahim al-thānī, which could indeed be taken to represent that which befalls the hero of the earlier novel some years after his marriage, when conjugal monotony begins to weigh upon him and he finds himself dangerously tempted by the young women who surround him. It is true, however, that a certain evolution is perceptible running through the three books in question as regards the role of the wife. Time has passed since Ibrahim al-kāṭib, but some ten years more and the equality in principle of the two spouses are not sufficient to make the life of the couple in Ibrahim al-thānī euphoric. On the other hand, the acquisition by the wife of responsibility in Thalāthā rājīḍ makes of her a character quite unique, capable of initiative, and the form accords with the content—it is no longer an account written in the first person. During the five remaining years of his life, al-Mazini was not to publish a new novel. It may be mentioned here that he published a single theatrical piece, Ghazirat al-marʿār wa ḥukm al-tāʿa (1930), not only to indicate that, on the stage also, the question of feminine rights seems to him to require treatment—like many other intellectuals, he supported the movement for the reform of ideas initiated by Kasim Amin at the beginning of the century—but also to tackle a question which has taken on a particular importance in the eyes of Egyptian critics studying the works of al-Mazini. The point at issue is the "borrowings" of this writer. In itself, the subject seems predominantly to concern the critics, for in the first place the problem of "compilation to remain at home" (ḥukm al-tāʿa) which every Egyptian husband has the right to impose on his reputedly disobedient wife is a scandalous sexual privilege, a denial of justice which should not long be tolerated by the legislators. The literary critic of al-Baladī ʿAshūr revealed that, in essence, the plot and some of the scenes of the play had been taken from a novel by Galsworthy. It was in 1932 that there took place the polemic between al-Mazini and his accuser, this being the year that Galsworthy, the famous author of The Forsyte Saga, received the Nobel Prize. Although he did not admit his plagiarism, our writer's protestations were far from convincing. The opinion of scholars has been quite united in this regard, just as nobody doubts that al-Mazini padded out his novel Ibrahim al-kāṭib (1931) by incorporating in it five pages from a Russian novel (Sanine by Artzybashčev) which he himself had translated in 1920 for the Musāmarāt al-šaḥāb. When challenged on this point, the author did not deny it, contenting himself with a declaration of his good faith (he read a great deal, retained material easily and was ultimately unable to tell what genuinely was his own creation!). Such disarming naivety is perplexing, all the more so since it is hard to understand what real benefit he could have gained from the practice. One may also ask why—in his first novel—he is observed to repeat several pages already published some years before in a collection of his articles, Kābd al-rīḥ (1927). In this instance he is plagiarising himself. The answer to this question supplied by an enquirer very favourably disposed towards him is that he is consistent in his ideas which he puts into the mouth of his fictional hero (on this question, cf. Mme Niʿmat ʿAḥmad Fuṣād, Adab al-Mazīnī, Cairo 1961). If his theatre is almost non-existent and his work as a novelist less significant than might have been hoped, al-Mazini remains a remarkable storyteller. He is seen fulminating in the Dīdān against the morbid, grandiloquent and ultimately dishonest literature of al-Mansūṭī. The first fruits of Arabic narrative writing more credible because more in tune with society and people as they are, appear in the short stories of the Taymūr brothers, but also to be
found among the many texts published by al-Mazini himself. In fact, alongside his analysis and assessment which may be found today in eight collections, of which the most notable are Sanduk al-dunyâ (1929) and Khuyûû al-`ankabût (1935). The bibliography of the work by Sakkut and Jones mentioned above refers to a further 114 "narrative works" which appeared in periodicals, of which 76 have never been reprinted. All these narratives, of variable length, approximate more or less to the living tableau or short story, such, tending rather to resemble what Anglo-Saxons call the "essay" or "sketch". Most often, the fiction is minimal, the author embroidering with humour and fancy upon a reflection, a memory or an observation. He also enjoys making himself a central figure in the scene that is sketched out or making himself a target for his own jesting, since his small stature and the limp from which he suffered are easily evoked in a few words. Some suppose that this constant jesting is a means of exercising a sense of shame which could have become a complex. In any event, this quasi-systematic procedure facilitates the establishment of a complicity with his reader which al-Mazini manifestly seeks. He does not take himself seriously, and treats other writers, whoever they may be, with equal levity. Mentioned in the book by the Bibliothèque de l'Exilé, the Book of Job, he has a tendency to agree with the famous line "Vanity of vanities, all is vanity". It is noticeable that each chapter of his Ihrahim al-kâtib bears as a heading a phrase drawn from a verse of the Old Testament and the titles of almost all his collections indicate the illusory nature of human existence and of its works; already there has been observed the illusion of writing symbolised by "the kaleidoscope" (Sunduk al-dunya) and the incongruity of the "threads of the spider" (Khuyûû al-`ankabût), but to these may be added the mirage of "a harvest of grass" (Hasad al-haqlîm, 1924) and the nothingness of a "handful of wind" (Kabîl al-rîh, 1927). Our writer expresses himself on a very flexible canvas, since all that he hears is his fantasy. Malicious sketches, incidental reminiscences and anecdotes form his technique by which he finds a reason for the enjoyment of the reader. To be sure, not everything is said in a jocular tone, for he has written moving pages describing his mother, whom he adored, or his daughter, who died at an early age. Nor is everything bizarre, and there are times when reality prevails over the "nonsense", in particular when he evokes his childhood, giving the reader the opportunity to imagine a Cairo home at the end of the last century and the life that was lived there. But this is a retrospective view conducted with a sense of the humorous and the unusual. Humour is always in evidence with him, even when he travels to Mecca; his Rehîba hîdâysiya (1930) contains some excellent jokes. In the attempt to decide with whom to compare this virtuoso of comic prose, this independent spirit hostile to protocol and to the conventional, the names of al-Dîhghih and Mark Twain spring to mind. But al-Mazini was most certainly both typically Egyptian and tremendously modern. Towards the end of his life, he became a member the Cairo Academy and the speech that he gave on this occasion was striking for its anti-conformism—as might indeed be expected from the man who nicknamed this venerable institution "the cemetery of the immortals." 

**Biography**: Besides the references cited in the article, see Hâmîd ʿAbdul al-Hawwâl, al-Sukhriyya fi adab al-Mâzînî, Cairo 1972; Muḥammad Mandûr, al-Shârî fi Misr baʿd Shamsî, Cairo 1944; P. Counillon, A propos d'une nouvelle d'al-Mâzînî in Bull. Et. arabes, v (January-February 1942), 5-6.

MAZLUM (a), a technical term of Shi’i, especially Twelve, Islam, which nevertheless retains its current term maḍīl from the root sala:ma: someone or something “treated or used wrongfully, unjustly, injuriously, or tyrannically” (Lane, 1923). In Persian, a language in which a large part of the literature referred to here mentions it, the word means also sitam rasîda (Farhang-i ʿAnvaraddî, vi, 404v) or "injured, oppressed, seized forcibly ... and, consequently, "mild, gentle, modest" (Stein-gass, 1263).

Mazlum is one of the attributes which characterise the Imâms, and it is coupled with shahid and sometimes substituted for it. This fits in with the theological and hagiographical vision in the time of the Imâms, a vision which claims them as martyrs, pure (maṣûm) victims because they are pure by definition, their role being to bear a witness which is expressed by means of the conscious sacrifice of their life. Thus they are mazlûm because they have for their opponents those who are zâlim: ... man aṣlâm mînaman katama shâhadatun ʿindahu min Allâh ... (Kurʾān, II, 140/134, "Who then is more unjust than he who conceals testimony which he possesses from God"). The testimony in the case of the abû al-dâ’ir, the reference to his martyrdom. The full meaning of this testimony depends, moreover, on the fact that they are, vis-à-vis humanity, the hadjûdâl Allâh, the proof of God par excellence, i.e. the proof that man should recognise in order to obtain his eternal salvation.

Until now the discussion has been general, and may perhaps be further generalised, in the sense that all the abîl al-bayt are defined as mazlûm according to a famous hadîth, for which we give here a typical reference, KâshîfI, 170: naḥnu kawm mazlûmûn, naḥnu kawm mafûldûn, naḥnu kawm mahdûrûn, which indicates in the genealogy of Abû Tâlib, the "we" in question.

To belong to the "family" means to be ready for martyrdom, to undergo the violence of the zâlim and be destined for exile, as the word maṣûm explains; but the root mazlûm itself indicates another, more personal, "to put something in a place which is not its own" (LA, s.v.) and Shi’î Persian literature appears moreover to refer to it when it adds to the attributes mazlûm and shahid that of gharîb.

Mazlum has a particular significance in the case of two Imâms who are the symbol of the perfect martyr, being maṣûm and mazlûm, sc. al-Husayn b. ’Ali and ’Ali al-Riḍâ. The former is often substituted for it. This is more unjust than he who conceals testimony which he possesses from God?

The full meaning of this testimony depends, moreover, on the fact that they are, vis-à-vis humanity, the hadjûdâl Allâh, the proof of God par excellence, i.e. the proof that man should recognise in order to obtain his eternal salvation.

The full meaning of this testimony depends, moreover, on the fact that they are, vis-à-vis humanity, the hadjûdâl Allâh, the proof of God par excellence, i.e. the proof that man should recognise in order to obtain his eternal salvation.
order to be liberated in this world and to find salvation in the next, the matter is clear enough. The history of mankind finds in the life of the Al-Husayn and in Karba'ī its paradigm and a daily proof (khidja yaumiyiyya). And, in this sense, mazlum is a word which also defines, in opposition to all that is ma^zul, oppressed (Shams al-Dīn, 11 ff.), who alone can become what al-Imam al-Husayn b. Zain al-Abidin (d. 60/680) is defending. And, in this sense, (Shams al-Dīn, 11 ff.), who alone can become what al-Imam al-Husayn b. Zain al-Abidin (d. 60/680) is defending.


(B. SCARICA AMORETTI)

MAZRA'A (s.), mazra'a, mezra in Turkish, means in general arable land, a field; as used in the Ottoman survey registers, it designates a periodic settlement or a deserted village and its fields. According to a regulation, to register a piece of land as mazra'a it was required that it be checked whether the place had a village site in ruins, its own water supply and a cemetery (Barkan, 53, 133, 190). Such a piece of land is occasionally called mazirak yer, abandoned land. In the faḍarīs [q.v.] we often find the following note on mazra'a:s; "previously it was a village, now its population is scattered and the fields abandoned (khilīt)." Usually a mazra'a has fixed boundaries. A mazra'a might have gained over time a few families of settlers, but would still be registered as a mazra'a.

Every mazra'a is referred to by a specific name which often reveals its origin or first possessor. In the province of Karāmān, for example, many mazra'a names are coupled with kılıç, referring probably to abandoned Byzantine castles, or with qazil "sheepfold", or having reference to a nomadic group which used the site as pastureland. A great number of village names in Anatolia bearing the name qıvası or qıvası must originally have been mazra'a:s which over the course of time were transformed into full villages. But when we speak of mazra'a as an abandoned village we mean basically not just the site of the village itself, but rather its fields.

In western Anatolia and the Balkans, the Ottomans inherited the Byzantine rural landscape with its sub-villages and periodic settlements. The earliest reference to a mazra'a appears in Sultan Orkhan's waqf for the bridge he built at Alma-Pınarı. Under the Byzantines, the mazra'a-type lands as dependencies of a village were known as agria and prosostia, the former designating partly settled and the latter unsettled satellite land (Ostrogorsky, 1962, 149). As was the case under the Ottomans, when the village rented such land collectively it paid the rent collectively (ibid., 114), but this special case cannot be used as an argument for the theory that in general village land was subject to collective ownership under the Byzantines.

In the survey registers, abandoned villages or čiftlik are shown also as khāli, uninhabited, or qazil, in ruins, or kılıç (in Syria). In these registers, the former are deserted periodically and used lands with different sizes and were shown under different names. Theoretically, the largest one was a mazra'a, sometimes with water and a cemetery, and was always considered capable of being converted into a village, so that all mazra'a:s were carefully recorded. Other such lands of smaller size are, in order, čiftlik [q.v.], zamin (in Turkish zemine), kılıç and qıvası "individual field". In practice, the word mazra'a was occasionally used for a čiftlik or a zamin of a few donün (1 donün equals about 920 m²) or any piece of land not possessed under the tapa system.

The abandoned land might be turned into a pasture or a vineyard and still retain the name mazra'a. From the standpoint of land use, a mazra'a is a field for grain production as opposed to pasture, vineyard, orchard, etc.

The hypothesis that in Anatolia the settled population chose to have their settlement sites on the hillsides in order to escape malaria and all kinds of marauders, soldiers, brigands, and passers-by, and maintained as a satellite exploitation a mazra'a down on the flat land (dılık, ova) (Tanoğlu, 1954, 27-8), holds true for many areas. Hüteroth (1968, 36-53) demonstrated it for central Anatolia, and Tanoğlu gives some examples for eastern Anatolia. While on the hillsides viticulture, horticulture, olive growing, and livestock breeding were preponderant, fields for grain production were located in the mazra'a down on the flat land. The Syrian and Palestinian villages with vineyards, orchards and olive groves on the hillsides and mazra'a down on the lowland or in the valleys also provide instances of this pattern (Hüteroth and Abdullahtah, 1977; B. Lewis and A. Cohen, 1978). This village-mazra'a pattern develops into an upper village and a lower village when the satellite mazra'a on the lowland is settled. Village names preceded with zir- and bălu-, yurkari- and aslıqat-, or in the Balkans dolni-dólne-, gurni-görüne-görüne- reflect the same process.

The fact that most of the mazra'a:s were registered as dependent (tābī') on a village as its ekinlik, reserved fields, can be taken as proof that the Ottoman administration generally recognised the mazra'a as an indivisible part of village economy. Such mazra'a:s secured an extra source of income for the villagers and provided land for the surplus population. Often villagers cultivated such land without the government's knowledge, arguing that it had always belonged to them. As a result, the rule was made that no abandoned land could be exploited without the Sultan's prior approval (Meħemmed the Conqueror's Kānīn-nāme, Barkān 390, art. 16). Because the benefits of such exploitation were vital for the village economy, villagers vigorously contested against timār-holders or government agents who chose to rent such mazra'a:s to outsiders. In opposition to such outsiders, including members of the military elite, who were particularly interested in renting mazra'a:s in order to turn them into big čiftlik, villagers often rented them collectively.

Whether a mazra'a was registered in the faḍarī or not determined its status. It could be registered as part of a village or of a timār or of a waqf independently in the register. A mazra'a, being abandoned land, quite often escaped the surveyor. When discovered it was called "unregistered mazra'a with no fixed taxes"
Such mazraca's were rented out and their revenue collected by government agents called kharidji emini. Such lands could also be assigned to a timar-holder (Arunad defteri, no. 178). This was because the government was concerned that no arable land, however small, be left uncultivated and without bringing in some sort of revenue. Under the mukàa’a system, such abandoned or unregistered lands as mazra’a, çiftlik, or samin were offered to any bidder, military or townsfolk, Muslim or Christian, or even to a foreigner, anyone who would guarantee to the treasury a steady revenue from it. In 1545 in Bosnia, Venetians were able to rent mazra’a (Gökbilgin, 1964, 208). Otherwise, in principle, the government’s policy was ultimately to convert all such lands into villages or ra‘iyyet çiftlikts [see çiftlik] under the tapu system. In other words, arable lands were basically reserved for the exploitation of the registered peasants, ra‘ûya [q.v.], excluding the townsfolk and the military, and such lands, comprising the great majority of arable land in the empire, were categorized as tapulu ardî. Under the tapu system, the peasants were responsible for paying regular ra‘iyyet taxes, including çifresmi [q.v.]. In contrast, those lands not in the possession of the registered ra‘ûya were treated fisally as a separate category under the mukàa’a system, and such lands were called mukàa’a ‘ulu ardî as opposed to the tapulu ardî.

Newly-conquered and abandoned land, since no previous record was available for its taxation, was also treated as a mazra’a and was submitted to auction in order to achieve the highest possible revenue derivable under the circumstances (Kanun i Kanunname, 1, 64). It was through an auction that the mazra’a amount of a mazra’a was determined. The usual reference, “it is cultivated by those who come from outside” (khrigidjing eden ekilur) on mazra’a and mukàa’a ‘ulu çiftlikts indicates a situation in which the land was not possessed and cultivated by yerî, the local ra‘ûya, under the tapu system, but by those ra‘ûya who were not registered with the land and were consequently considered “outsiders”. The latter were normally déymungânek, literally “people living in tents”, but in practice meaning any wandering ra‘ûYa who might come and exploit the land on a temporary basis, paying rent or tithes to the ‘owner’, sâhib, of the mukàa’a, the ‘owner’ being the renter of the land. If the ‘outsider’ settled on a timar-holder’s or on a vakif land for three consecutive years he automatically became a yerî and then the land was given to him under the tapu.

Thus in principle, mazra’a were fisally exploited under the mukàa’a system, which consisted simply of renting under a contract, temessuk or hâdidjet. The record of the rental in the register, which specified the possessor and the obligation, had binding force for both the state and the individual. The possessor’s payment for the mazra’a consisted either of tithes or of a fixed amount in cash. When a mazra’a was given in the way of yardûluk (ber vâdî-i yardûluk), it was possessed as a hereditary frehold property, usually on condition of sending a cavalryman [see tekkânîy] to the sultan’s campaigns. In some cases, this obligation was forgiven (Konya TT’40, 17).

The next question is to determine how mazra’a emerged and under what conditions their number increased or decreased. The peasant populations would abandon their villages, temporarily or permanently, for various reasons. Natural and economic conditions conducive to mass flight included exhaustion of the land, desertification, and epidemics. Social and political conditions were no less important. First and foremost, peasants left their villages en masse to avoid being despoiled by passing troops, brigand bands, or caravans. A particularly important cause of flight was to avoid registration for taxes [see tapu] and tax collection. The peasant’s most effective means of getting a tax reduced or abolished was the threat of being scattered abroad (perâkende ve perîgân olmak). Assuming the character of a mass protest, scattering became in effect a peasant strike and was frequently resorted to. When it made it more frequent was that peasants did not own the land they cultivated under the tapu system, and there were always other lands available. The growing number of villages in the forests is largely due to this situation. On the other hand, the big landowners, and particularly vakif lands, promised better conditions in order to attract the registered ra‘ûya of the tapu lands. Thus the rural population in the Ottoman Empire, especially in Anatolia and the Balkans, became quite a mobile population, which accounts for the unusually large number of deserted villages in the Empire.

The increase or decrease in the number of mazra’a can be taken as an indication of demographic and economic decline or development in a particular region; and the relative number of villages and mazra’a can be determined for most of the provinces through the survey books (see tapu, and maps in Tanoglu, 1954; Hütteroth and Abdülâfettah, 1977). In 1597 in some districts in Palestine (Hütteroth and Abdülâfettah, 23, 24, and maps nos. 3, 10, and 13) the number of mazra’a was two or three times greater than the number of villages (in the sanjak of Safad there were 610 mazra’a as against 282 villages), whereas in the sanjak of Aleppo before the mukàa’a and the mazra’a numbered about one thousand (Venzke). Hütteroth (1986, 25) estimates that at the turn of the 18th century, about half of the Anatolian population depended on the various types of periodic settlements, and he finds it one of the most important features of the Middle Eastern cultural area.

In the formation of mazra’a conditions other than peasant exodus were also to be taken into consideration. Sometimes the peasants used nearby marginal land for cultivation, or reclamation were made on wasteland (mauvât [q.v.]) in the forests or swamps, or pasturelands in the yayla were used for cultivation; mazra’a formed in these ways are frequently referred to in the survey registers. Also, conversion of the tapulu lands into livestock ranches gave rise to mazra’a-type formations. When the central bureaucracy’s control weakened during protracted wars, struggles for succession to the throne, uprisings, etc., the military’s acquisition of abandoned lands became widespread. Those who acquired such lands under mukàa’a were called ashab-i mukàa’a, owners of the mukàa’a ‘ulu land.

Since the abandoned mazra’a could be given to anybody paying the rent, mukàa’a, including the military, the latter used this loophole in the Ottoman land system to enter into possession of the mirî [q.v.] or state-owned lands, and to run the land as an estate. As such mazra’a needed a labour force for their cultivation, the military offered favourable conditions to attract registered ra‘ûya and thus caused disruption in the mirî-based settlements. At other times, because of the labour shortage, they converted their mazra’a into livestock ranches. When the large landowners were able to attract ra‘ûya to their lands, they usually had recourse to the method of sharecropping (ortaklijik). They furnished land and often seed, oxen, and domiciles to the sharecroppers.
In Anatolia, large areas of arable land abandoned by villagers were converted into ranches, partly because of the high price of meat in general and partly because of the military's difficulty in finding sufficient labour for cultivation. In any case, the Ottoman military class, unlike western landlords, was not capable, for various reasons, of owning land and organising it as big estates. In the period 1596-1610, the Djeñli [see Icara in Suppl.] depredations and insecurity in the countryside caused a tremendous increase of mazra'as and mazraca's land use throughout Asia Minor, resulting in a great diminution of agricultural land and grain production. A similar usurpation of the small plots of peasant families by “the powerful” in the provinces occurred in Byzantine Asia during the 10th century, and the emperors were forced to take radical measures against this development.

The second method used by the military to provide agricultural labour was the settlement of war prisoners on the land. As early survey registers demonstrate, the first Ottoman sultans as well as the members of the military class, the frontier begs in particular, employed this practice quite extensively.

The sub-village periodic settlements and exploitations could increase or decrease, and thus a pasture (çayır, yayla, kâğıla, or oba) could become a mazraa over the course of time by being converted into fields, or vice-versa. The state took the initiative in promoting settlement and cultivation and in restoring abandoned villages. The grant of land as freehold, tamlik (sec milk), is one method.

In Serbia, abandoned villages were brought back to cultivation by the settlement of the Vlachs in the same way that nomads or wandering peasants (boyamângi) were encouraged to settle on the land. (Farroghi, 1984, 191-266.)

This situation reflects the economic dependence of the towns on such agricultural reserve land, without which the towns could not survive. Given the exorbitant transportation costs of the time, towns had to rely on this hinterland for an important part of the foodstuffs, fuel for their populations and raw materials such as cotton, wood, and hides for their handicrafts. The economic and social dynamics of such villages and sub-village settlements appear to be vivid and complex compared to that of “independent” rural settlements. The villages near towns were transformed into mazraa'os or çiftlik probably because the village population, attracted by better opportunities in town, migrated there, and once deserted, the village land was acquired under mukâlaa by well-to-do town residents and turned into a kind of estate çiftlik (Farroghi, 1980, 87-99).

As far as present-day Anatolia is concerned, human geographers (A. Tanoğlu, 1954; Hütteroth, 1968, 24-52; Tunçdelik, 1971, 17-55; Hütteroth and Abdülfattah, 1977, 29-32) study mazra'as among the periodic settlements or small rural settlements on the way to becoming villages—rural mahalle, yayla(k), kâğıla(k), omb, oba, and diwan. Throughout eastern Anatolia today, a great number of villages with a small settlement and having no formal village institutions such as mukâhâtlik come under the name mazer, mezze, or mezê. Settlement of marginal lands as the result of rural overpopulation is considered to be the underlying reason for such settlements. In the survey books, no mention is made of kum or rural mahalle, which may be local names for mazraa (cf. Tunçdelik, 1971, 43).

Kum is to be found in eastern Anatolia; it differs from a mazraa by being a kind of ranch for animal breeding and is usually owned by an absentee landlord. It surrounds sheepfolds and shepherd huts. Oba is the grazing area of a nomadic household and should be studied rather within the yayla structure (Tunçdelik, 1971, 44). When settled by the nomad households which shift to agriculture as their main occupation, the oba assumes rather the character of a mazraa. The process is attested from early Ottoman history. At the present time, all obas are of this developed type. Doun was apparently a tribal superstructure over the obas (Tunçdelik, 47-8; Barkan, Kanuni, 28-32), which disappeared as settlement progressed. Some isolated çiftlik, settled by one or a few families devoted to agriculture and livestock breeding, are considered, like the mazraa, as a kind of settlement liable to develop into a village (Tunçdelik, 43). In Palestine, Transjordan, and Syria (Hütteroth and Abdülfattah, 1977, 29-32), mazra'as were “small agricultural areas, dispersed amongst the hills, lying within the village area but apart from the main fields belonging to the village, as is still the case today.”

According to the regulations and survey registers (ibid., 31), the size of a mazraa varies widely. It may consist of only one or two çiftlik or have the size of a village, judging from its estimated revenue. However, as was made explicit in some kâmûn-names (q.v.), the typical mazraa is a deserted village which always has a large area of arable land, a water source and a centre marked as a village.


*In Anatolia, large areas of arable land abandoned* by villagers were converted into ranches, partly because of the high price of meat in general and partly because of the military's difficulty in finding sufficient labour for cultivation. In any case, the Ottoman military class, unlike western landlords, was not capable, for various reasons, of owning land and organising it as big estates. In the period 1596-1610, the Djeñli [see Icara in Suppl.] depredations and insecurity in the countryside caused a tremendous increase of mazra'as and mazraca's land use throughout Asia Minor, resulting in a great diminution of agricultural land and grain production. A similar usurpation of the small plots of peasant families by “the powerful” in the provinces occurred in Byzantine Asia during the 10th century, and the emperors were forced to take radical measures against this development.

The second method used by the military to provide agricultural labour was the settlement of war prisoners on the land. As early survey registers demonstrate, the first Ottoman sultans as well as the members of the military class, the frontier begs in particular, employed this practice quite extensively.

The sub-village periodic settlements and exploitations could increase or decrease, and thus a pasture (çayır, yayla, kâğıla, or oba) could become a mazraa over the course of time by being converted into fields, or vice-versa. The state took the initiative in promoting settlement and cultivation and in restoring abandoned villages. The grant of land as freehold, tamlik (sec milk), is one method.

In Serbia, abandoned villages were brought back to cultivation by the settlement of the Vlachs in the same way that nomads or wandering peasants (boyamângi) were encouraged to settle on the land. (Farroghi, 1984, 191-266.)

This situation reflects the economic dependence of the towns on such agricultural reserve land, without which the towns could not survive. Given the exorbitant transportation costs of the time, towns had to rely on this hinterland for an important part of the foodstuffs, fuel for their populations and raw materials such as cotton, wood, and hides for their handicrafts. The social and economic dynamics of such villages and sub-village settlements appear to be vivid and complex compared to that of “independent” rural settlements. The villages near towns were transformed into mazraa'os or çiftlik probably because the village population, attracted by better opportunities in town, migrated there, and once deserted, the village land was acquired under mukâlaa by well-to-do town residents and turned into a kind of estate çiftlik (Farroghi, 1980, 87-99).

As far as present-day Anatolia is concerned, human geographers (A. Tanoğlu, 1954; Hütteroth, 1968, 24-52; Tunçdelik, 1971, 17-55; Hütteroth and Abdülfattah, 1977, 29-32) study mazra'as among the periodic settlements or small rural settlements on the way to becoming villages—rural mahalle, yayla(k), kâğıla(k), omb, oba, and diwan. Throughout eastern Anatolia today, a great number of villages with a small settlement and having no formal village institutions such as mukâhâtlik come under the name mazer, mezze, or mezê. Settlement of marginal lands as the result of rural overpopulation is considered to be the underlying reason for such settlements. In the survey books, no mention is made of kum or rural mahalle, which may be local names for mazraa (cf. Tunçdelik, 1971, 43).

Kum is to be found in eastern Anatolia; it differs from a mazraa by being a kind of ranch for animal breeding and is usually owned by an absentee landlord. It surrounds sheepfolds and shepherd huts. Oba is the grazing area of a nomadic household and should be studied rather within the yayla structure (Tunçdelik, 1971, 44). When settled by the nomad households which shift to agriculture as their main occupation, the oba assumes rather the character of a mazraa. The process is attested from early Ottoman history. At the present time, all obas are of this developed type. Doun was apparently a tribal superstructure over the obas (Tunçdelik, 47-8; Barkan, Kanuni, 28-32), which disappeared as settlement progressed. Some isolated çiftlik, settled by one or a few families devoted to agriculture and livestock breeding, are considered, like the mazraa, as a kind of settlement liable to develop into a village (Tunçdelik, 43). In Palestine, Transjordan, and Syria (Hütteroth and Abdülfattah, 1977, 29-32), mazra'as were “small agricultural areas, dispersed amongst the hills, lying within the village area but apart from the main fields belonging to the village, as is still the case today.”

According to the regulations and survey registers (ibid., 31), the size of a mazraa varies widely. It may consist of only one or two çiftlik or have the size of a village, judging from its estimated revenue. However, as was made explicit in some kâmûn-names (q.v.), the typical mazraa is a deserted village which always has a large area of arable land, a water source and a centre marked as a village.

shaykh recognised as head of the family resides.

In East Africa, in Kenya and on the island of Pemba (in the present Republic of Tanzania), fourteen lineages are recorded, descended from three lineages which migrated from `Umân between ca. 1698 and ca. 1800. Of these, the most celebrated provided an almost uninterrupted succession of rulers of Mombasa from 1698 until 1837, when twenty-five of the principal males were banished to Bandar `Abbâs by Sayyid Sa'id of `Umân and Zanzibar, many of them dying unaccountably on the voyage and the remainder in prison. Other Mazru'î lineages and the main one also provided subordinate rulers at Takaungu and Gazi, and of Pemba Island, generally with the Swahili title liwalî, corrupted from Ar. khalîf. In addition, the family produced a remarkable number of men of high ability and personal distinction, kâdîs and junior magistrates, lawyers, administrators, historians, genealogists, scholars, poets, merchants and landowners, military commanders, a steamship captain and a harbourmaster, as well as men of religion. The history of the family from 1698 to 1835 is recounted in Shaykh al-Amlî b. Ahmad al-Malindi, a member of the former royal family of Malindi, a member of the former royal family of Malindi [q. v.], and including several subordinate rulers of towns and settlements. At the successful conclusion of the siege in December 1696, Nâsur's appointment was by no means uncontested. The Swahili, as they saw it, called the `Umânîs in as allies; and an important faction, lead by an individual with the strange name of Sese Rumbe, rebelled against the `Umânî determination to stay as conquerors. After some fighting, a composition was reached by which Nâsur was recognised in office and married either a sister or a daughter of a certain Shaykh b. Ahmad al-Malindi, which the Portuguese had installed as kadî of Mombasa [see Mombasa], in 1698-1727, m. Karima bt. Shaykh b. Muhammad al-Malindi, karima of the lineage of Shaykh al-Malindi. Two sons, incl. Ahmad, kâdî of Mombasa *ca. 1850-40

2. Muhammed b. Sa'id al-Ma'amirî 1729-30
3. Sâlih b. Muhammad al-Hâdrâmi 1730-33
5. Sayf b. Khalaf 1746-7

According to Shaykh al-Amlî, the first of the family to come to East Africa, Nâsur b. `Abd Allâh, was appointed liwalî of Mombasa at the same time that Mbarak b. Qarib was appointed commander of the `Umânî forces at the siege of Fort Jesus, Mombasa [see Mombasa], in 1696-8. The actual date of appointment is not known. His remit was as "overseer of all the `Umânî possessions in East Africa", an area defined by Shaykh al-Amlî as from Ras Ngomeni, north of Malindi, to the town of Pangani, on the River Ruvu, and including several subordinate rulers of towns and settlements. At the successful conclusion of the siege in December 1696, Nâsur's appointment was by no means uncontested. The Swahili had, as they saw it, called the `Umânîs in as allies; and an important faction, lead by an individual with the strange name of Sese Rumbe, rebelled against the `Umânî determination to stay as conquerors. After some fighting, a composition was reached by which Nâsur was recognised in office and married either a sister or a daughter of a certain Shaykh b. Ahmad al-Malindi, a member of the former royal family of Malindi [q. v.], which the Portuguese had installed as sultans of Mombasa in 1592, when the Shirârî dynasty of Mombasa failed for want of heirs. (The word Shaykh is used as a given name quite commonly in East Africa.) This was a political move of profound local significance, with precedents at Kilwa and at Pate [q. v.] at the foundation of both dynasties. Thereafter, apart from Portuguese raids, Nâsur's
term of office appears to have been peaceable. He died on a visit to Uman.

No concept of a hereditary succession of governors is apparent at this point. Nāsur had recommended the succession of his nephew Muhammad b. 'Uthmān, but two other Liwalīs followed in rapid succession who were not members of the family. It is not known why Muhammad b. Sa'id al-Mā'āmirī was relieved after only a year, but Sāliḥ b. Muhammad al-Hadrami was so harsh in his dealings with the people that he was removed from office when civil war broke out. Muhammad b. 'Uthmān was now proclaimed Liwalī, and his succession welcomed in Mombasa. He had been ruled for ten years when the Yaʿrub dynasty was deposed in Uman by Ahmad b. Sa'id al-Bū Sa'idī. This was no clear-cut transition [see 'Uman], for chaos ensued for several years, and 'Uthmān ceased to remit taxes to Maskat. That he said "The Imam has usurped 'Uman, and I have usurped Mombasa" is a most unlikely use of language that several writers have placed in his mouth. Nevertheless, it reflects local sentiment, in the same way that the Swahili History of Pate speaks of Ahmad b. Sa'id al-Bū Sa'idī as a shopkeeper, with every assumption of an aristocratic disdain. Shopkeeper or not, Ahmad knew how to consolidate power, and he had Muhammad b. 'Uthmān assassinated, by assassins sent from 'Uman, but with the support of the faction that had earlier opposed Nāsur. One of the assassins, Sayf b. Khalaf, was now appointed Liwalī. Shaykh al-Amlı's account at this point is by no means clear, and by misconception there is no reliable account in any European source.

Ahmad b. 'Uthmān's brother 'Ali was imprisoned by Sayf b. Khalaf, and several accounts exist of his exciting escape from the fort with the connivance of Balūfī soldiers of Ahmad b. Sa'id's that, nevertheless, were loyal to the Mazrūtī. Then, at the critical moment, a European arrived with an armed vessel, which by agreement with 'Ali, bombarded the fort. Sayf b. Khalaf was taken prisoner and killed, and 'Ali acclaimed as Liwalī by those who had supported his brother and uncle. An attempt by Ahmad b. Sa'id to install one 'Abd Allāh b. Dja'id al-Bū Sa'idī as Liwalī was frustrated, and 'Ali now ruled with confidence.

It is a mark of that confidence that was now felt in Mombasa that in 1754 'Ali assembled a fleet and an army to take Zanzibar from the Bū Sa'idī. It is claimed that he went with 80 ships, but we do not know their size or complements. Certainly, they were enough for success to be immediate. At this juncture, however, 'Ali's nephew Khalaf ran amok and stabbed him in the back. Various reasons have been suggested, that he was mad, that he was possessed by magical powers, or that he had a genuine ambition to seize power from his uncle. Occurrences such as this are paralleled in plenty in the annals of the Gulf States. A son of Nāsur, Mas'ūd, now took power, and led a demoralised army back to Mombasa. There is some argument whether or not a second attack on Zanzibar was to take place, but nothing happened.

By all accounts, Mas'ūd was an astute politician, adroit in seeking conciliation. It is in his reign that Mombasa's involvement in the affairs of the sultanate of Pate begins, with a garrison sent to Pate to assist the sultan in keeping out the Bū Sa'idī. In 1776 the Kilifi faction that had opposed the preceding Mazrūtī Liwalīs encouraged certain persons in Pate to attack Mombasa. It was not countenanced by the Sultan of Pate, and amounted to no more than a raid that was easily scotched. A rebellion now took place in Pate against Sultan Bwana Mkuu b. Shhe, and in the mêlée of his assassination the Khalaf who had murdered 'Ali b. 'Uthmān was himself murdered while attempting to defend the sultan. Then in 1779 Mas'ūd died. Shaykh al-Amin praises him for his cunning and diplomacy. His days, he says, were days of prosperity, ease and peace, in which he was much engaged in trade. This, perhaps, was the halcyon period of Mazrūtī rule.

On his death, eleven sons of previous Liwalīs contested the succession "violently", but within the day they settled upon 'Abd Allāh b. Muhammad. Shaykh al-Amin is silent about his short reign of two years only: "like his predecessor, he was of good character and fair from making war". His next brother, Ahmad, succeeded him and now ruled for twenty years. Shortly after his accession he had to deal with a rebellion in Tanga. At the end of his reign, war arose between Mombasa and Pate on the one hand, and Lamu on the other [see Pate], with the result that the Mombasa forces were severely defeated at Shela. Very shortly after, Ahmad died: his epitaph in the Mazrūtī cemetery describes him as malik, the only liwalī so to describe himself or be so described on an epitaph. It is a reflection, perhaps, of the weakness in East Africa of the earlier part of the reign of Sayyid Sa'id that a liwalī should be able to use so uncompromising a title of royalty with impunity.

Ahmad's son 'Abd Allāh, the former commander of the Lamu garrison, now succeeded him, without any opposition, as the man with the most experience and competence. His first action was to reorganise the army and the administration, appointing several new subordinate liwalīs. One of these, Sa'id b. 'Abd Allāh al-Buhīrī, was murdered by the Digo tribe on his way to take up his post as Liwalī at Mtang'ata. (His great-grandson, 'Ali b. Humayd b. 'Abd Allāh, of Tanga, was said by the late J. Schacht to be the most learned authority on Islamic law that he had ever encountered.) The murderer was none other than the chief and spiritual head of the Digo, but he was forgiven on payment of the blood price. 'Abd Allāh now turned his attention to Lamu, and to Sayyid Sa'id, to whom he sent, as a gesture to show his independence, a coat of mail, a horn for measuring powder, a small quantity of powder and some musket balls, intimating that Sa'id could come and fight. Here indeed was provocation, and on the monsoon of 1238/1822 Sa'id's uncle Hamad b. Ahmad b. Sa'idī came with 4,000 men and thirty ships. At Lamu, he defeated 'Abd Allāh's son Mbarak, and got possession of Pate as well. He then proceeded to Pemba, which he took after several days' battle. The loss broke 'Abd Allāh's heart, and he died.

His uncle Sulaymān b. 'Ali was now elected as a compromise candidate. Shaykh al-Amin describes him as "an intelligent man, decisive and a lover of peace"; a British official document describes him as "aged and feeble"; while Captain W. F. W. Owen, who met him personally, described him as "an old dotard who had outlived every passion except avarice". Fearing to lose Mombasa to Sayyid Sa'id, a delegation was sent to Bombay to ask for the protection of the British Government. Before a reply could arrive, a letter came to request that the British be permitted to survey Mombasa Island and to purchase cattle. No one could read it. The Mazrūtī and the people took it as an affirmative answer, and hoisted the Union Flag. On 3 December 1823, H. M. S. Barraeus, under the command of Lieutenant Boteler, arrived at Mombasa, as part of Captain Vidal's command engaged in surveying the islands. Lieutenant Boteler, joined shortly by Vidal, knew of no reason to
acquire for Britain an unimportant city on the African coast that had no commercial or strategic advantages. They fended the Mazrū'i off as best they could. But on 7 February, Captain W. F. W. Owen arrived on H. M. S. Leen, at the very moment that a fleet sent by Sayyid Saʿīd was bombarding the Mazrūʾi into submission. Owen was a passionate crusader against the slave trade, and believing that Mombasa could be used as a centre from which to destroy it, he ascended to the request for a Protectorate. A treaty was drawn up, of which Shaykh al-Amin’s version differs somewhat, but only in detail, from British sources. It was that:

(1) Great Britain would cause to return to the Liwalī all the territories he had ruled formerly;
(2) The Chief of the Mazrūʾi should administer the sultanate which would be hereditary in his descendants;
(3) A Commissioner of the Protecting Power would reside with the Liwalī;
(4) Customs duties would be divided between the contracting powers;
(5) British subjects would have permission to trade in the interior;
(6) An end would be put to the slave trade in Mombasa.

Shaykh al-Amin claims that ‘Abd Allah b. Sulaym, the commander of Sayyid Saʿīd’s forces, was delighted with the treaty, a view wholly contrary to that evidenced in British official documents. Saʿīd, indeed, awaited the reaction of Bombay, which, with Whitehall, took the view that neither Mombasa nor its coast, in fact, awaited the reaction of Bombay, which, with Whitehall, took the view that neither Mombasa nor its coast, indeed, awaited the reaction of Bombay, which, with Whitehall, took the view that neither Mombasa nor its coast, indeed, awaited the reaction of Bombay, which, with Whitehall, took the view that neither Mombasa nor its coast, indeed, awaited the reaction of Bombay, which, with Whitehall, took the view that neither Mombasa nor its coast, indeed, awaited the reaction of Bombay, which, with Whitehall, took the view that neither Mombasa nor its coast, indeed, awaited the reaction of Bombay, which, with Whitehall, took the view that neither Mombasa nor its coast, indeed, awaited the reaction of Bombay, which, with Whitehall, took the view that neither Mombasa nor its coast, indeed, awaited the reaction of Bombay, which, with Whitehall, took the view that neither Mombasa nor its coast, indeed, awaited the reaction of Bombay, which, with Whitehall, took the view that neither Mombasa nor its coast, indeed, awaited the reaction of Bombay, which, with Whitehall, took the view that neither Mombasa nor its coast, indeed, awaited the reaction of Bombay, which, with Whitehall, took the view that neither Mombasa nor its coast, indeed, awaited the reaction of Bombay, which, with Whitehall, took the view that neither Mombasa nor its coast, indeed, awaited the reaction of Bombay, which, with Whitehall, took the view that neither Mombasa nor its coast, indeed, awaited the reaction of Bombay, which, with Whitehall, took the view that neither Mombasa nor its coast, indeed, awaited the reaction of Bombay, which, with Whitehall, took the view that neither Mombasa nor its coast, indeed, awaited the reaction of Bombay, which, with Whitehall, took the view that neither Mombasa nor its coast, indeed, awaited the reaction of Bombay, which, with Whitehall, took the view that neither Mombasa nor its coast, indeed, awaited the reaction of Bombay, which, with Whitehall, took the view that neither Mombasa nor its coast, indeed, awaited the reaction of Bombay, which, with Whitehall, took the view that neither Mombasa nor its coast, indeed, awaited the reaction of Bombay, which, with Whitehall, took the view that neither Mombasa nor its coast, indeed, awaited the reaction of Bombay, which, with Whitehall, took the view that neither Mombasa nor its coast, indeed, awaited the reaction of Bombay, which, with Whitehall, took the view that neither Mombasa nor its coast, indeed, awaited the reaction of Bombay, which, with Whitehall, took the view that neither Mombasa nor its coast, indeed, awaited the reaction of Bombay, which, with Whitehall, took the view that neither Mombasa nor its coast, indeed, awaited the reaction of Bombay, which, with Whitehall, took the view that neither Mombasa nor its coast, indeed, awaited the reaction of Bombay, which, with Whitehall, took the view that neither Mombasa nor its coast, indeed, awaited the reaction of Bombay, which, with Whitehall, took the view that neither Mombasa nor its coast, indeed, awaited the reaction of Bombay, which, with Whitehall, took the view that neither Mombasa nor its coast, indeed, awaited the reaction of Bombay, which, with Whitehall, took the view that neither Mombasa nor its coast, indeed, awaited the reaction of Bombay, which, with Whitehall, took the view that neither Mombasa nor its coast, indeed, awaited the reaction of Bombay, which, with Whitehall, took the view that neither Mombasa nor its coast, indeed, awaited the reaction of Bombay, which, with Whitehall, took the view that neither Mombasa nor its coast, indeed, awaited the reaction of Bombay, which, with Whitehall, took the view that neither Mombasa nor its coast, indeed, awaited the reaction of Bombay, which, with Whitehall, took the view that neither Mombasa nor its coast, indeed, awaited the reaction of Bombay, which, with Whitehall, took the view that neither Mombasa nor its coast, indeed, awaited the reaction of Bombay, which, with Whitehall, took the view that neither Mombasa nor its coast, indeed, awaited the reaction of Bombay, which, with Whitehall, took the view that neither Mombasa nor its coast, indeed, awaited the reaction of Bombay, which, with Whitehall, took the view that neither Mombasa nor its coast, indeed, awaited the reaction of Bombay, which, with Whitehall, took the view that neither Mombasa nor its coast, indeed, awaited the reaction of Bombay, which, with Whitehall, took the view that neither Mombasa nor its coast, indeed, awaited the reaction of Bombay, which, with Whitehall, took the view that neither Mombasa nor its coast, indeed, awaited the reaction of Bombay, which, with Whitehall, took the view that neither Mombasa nor its coast, indeed, awaited the reaction of Bombay, which, with Whitehall, took the view that neither Mombasa nor its coast, indeed, awaited the reaction of Bomba...
The origins of the Mazrāïdids, as established by G. Makdisi (see BIBL. p. 66) and as reported by the family itself, were in the 9th century. The family first appears on the political scene in the 9th and 10th centuries, when it came to power in the region of Khuzestan. The Mazrāïdids were able to maintain their power for several centuries, despite the constant threats they faced from both internal and external enemies.

The Mazrāïdids were known for their military prowess and their ability to handle internal conflicts. They were also able to maintain a strong connection with the Abbasid caliphate, which provided them with support and legitimacy. Despite these strengths, the Mazrāïdids were eventually overthrown by the Buyid dynasty in the late 10th century. The Mazrāïdids' legacy, however, continued to influence the region for centuries to come.
ther trouble from a third brother Thabīt, who allied with the Turkish commander Arslān Bāṣāsīrī [q.v.], and from the rival Khaṣṣāja Bedūins. During the fighting in central ʿIrāk which finally led to the establishment of the Saldjūk protectorate over Bāḥgādād, Dūbays now supported Bāṣāsīrī in proclaiming the cause of the Shīʿī Fāṭimīdīs at Bāḥgādād, espousing what was in the end to prove the losing side, whilst his enemy the ʿUkaylīd Kurayyah b. Bādrān at first supported Toghrīl Beg. Nevertheless, after the pacification by Toghrīl of ʿIrāk, Dūbays managed to retain his position, dying in 474/1082 at the age of 58. After the brief reign of his son Bāḥā al-Dawla ʿAbū Kāmīl Mānsūr, the latter was succeeded in 479/1086-7 by Sayf al-Dawla Abu ʿl-Ḥasan Sāḍaqa (I) b. Mānsūr, who was recognised by the Saldjūk sultan Malik Shāh as lord of the central ʿIrāk lands to the west of the Tigrīs. In the subsequent struggle for power between Malik Shāh’s two sons Bērk-Yaʿrub and Muḥammad, Sāḍaqa at first supported the former, but after a dispute with Bērk-Yaʿrub’s vizier, in 494/1100-1 switched his allegiance to Muḥammad, at first making the Khiṭa in al-Hilla for Muḥammad but soon afterwards dropping the name of both Saldjūks from it and acknowledging only the ʿAbbasīd caliph al-Mustaṣḥirī. It was Sāḍaqa who, as noted above, launched extensive building operations in his capital. The confused situation in ʿIrāk further allowed him to expand Māzyādīd influence over a wide sector of the country, including Hit, Wāsiṭ (in 497/1104), al-ʿBaṣra (499/1106) and Takrit (500/1106). Muḥammad, by now the sole Saldjūk sultan in the west, became alarmed at the rising power of his subject; he set out in 501/1108 with an army from Bāḥgādād, defeated and killed Sāḍaqa at al-Nuʿmānīyya and captured his son Dūbays. Like others of his family, Sāḍaqa had been commonly accorded the title of Malik al-ʿArab “Lord of the Arabs” [i.e. of the Bedūins along the ʿIrāk desert fringes], Rex Arabum in Latin Crusader sources, and contemporaries mourned his passing as a brave and noble figure, uniting the ideals of Bedūin chivalry and Islamic fervour, and as a generous patron of Arabic learning.

The same sort of praise is accorded to his son and successor Nūr al-Dawla Abu ʿl-ʿAzz Dūbays (II), whom al-Harrīrī [q.v.] refers to in his 39th mašākima, that of ʿUmayn, as an ideal figure for nobility and piety. He was only able to regain his seat in al-Hilla after Muḥammad’s death in 511/1118, but soon enjoyed a new authority as a consequence of the rivalry between the two Saldjūk contenders for the sultanate, Muḥammad’s sons Muḥammad and ʿAbd al-Muṣṭarṣīd, against whom the Shīʿī Dūbays uttered threats of razing Bāḥgādād to the ground. During these years, various reverses at the hands of these rulers nevertheless sent him in temporary flight to the Frankish Crusaders in northern Syria, where in 518/1124 he allied with the King of Jerusalem Baldwin II in a fruitless attack on Aleppo; to his father-in-law the Artūkīd Il-Ghāzī in Mārūn; and, in alliance with the Saldjūk prince Toghrīl b. Muḥammad, to the Saldjūk sultan in the east, Sandjār. The reviving power of the ʿAbbasīd caliphate blocked his plans for expansion in ʿIrāk, and he had finally to take refuge at Marāṣqa [q.v.] in Aḍḥabāʾyddīn with the Saldjūk Mašūd, who in 529/1135 treacherously killed both al-Muṣṭarṣīd and Dūbays. Sayf al-Dawla Sāḍaqa (II) supported Mašūd’s cause against his nephew Dāwūd b. Muḥammad, but lost his life in the course of this warfare (332/1137-8). His brother Muḥammad was then recognised as lord of al-Hilla, but soon afterwards lost the town to his brother ʿAli (II), and when the latter died in 545/1150-1, control of the town oscillated between the ʿAbbasīd caliph al-Muṭakaff and Turkish commanders of the Saldjūk sultan Muḥammad b. Arslān Shāh. The caliphal troops withdrew from al-Hilla in 551/1156-7, but in 558/1163 the caliph al-Mustanẓījd, whose power in ʿIrāk was increasing with the decline of Saldjūk authority, sent an army against al-Hilla. His troops and their allies of the Banu ʿl-Muṭaṣṭīfīk wrought slaughter amongst the remaining Māzyādīds and their Asādī supporters, and expelled those left alive. The hold of the Asād on the town was thus permanently broken.

That the Māzyādīds, coming as they did from an untutored Bedūin background, were able to survive for two centuries as a significant force in the intricate politics and changing patterns of alliances in ʿIrāk is a tribute to the skill and sagacity of their leaders; and it is probable that their leadership as fervent Shīʿīs furthered the expansion of Shīʿīsm in central and southern ʿIrāk.

### Genealogical table of the Māzyādīds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Maṣūd</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Maḥmūd</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ʿAli</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Dūbays</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mānsūr</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Sāḍaqa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Dūbays II</td>
<td>Bādrān</td>
<td>Mānsūr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Sāḍaqa II</td>
<td>Muḥammad</td>
<td>ʿAli II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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(C. E. Bosworth)

### MAZYĀR [see KĀRĪNĪDS].

MBWENI, a settlement on the East African coast. It lies on the Tanzanian coast north of Dar es Salaam, and has a ruined Friday mosque of 14th or
15th century date divided into two aisles by three central pillars. There is an extensive cemetery, with tombs, some highly decorated with elaborate carvings, of the past five centuries. It includes a pillar and also as Yarhisar-oghfi Kosc Me (whilst his given name was Mehmed). He is one of a considerable number of modestly gifted, as yet imperfectly known poets who share the popular Turkish taste in choice and handling of subject matter. (It is true, perhaps, that Meâlî led a rather more libertine life than most of his peers.) He is very fond of puns and lavish in his use of idiomatic expressions. He is very fond of food and incense. The deceased was a member of a family celebrated for its energy in disseminating the teachings of the Uwaysî branch of the Kâdiriyâ.


MEÅLÎ, minor Ottoman poet of the first half of the 10th/16th century, known under this medâfî and also as Yarhisâr-oghfi Kösî Meâlî (whilst his given name was Mehmed). He is one of a considerable number of modestly gifted, as yet imperfectly known poets who share the popular Turkish taste in choice and handling of subject matter. (It is true, perhaps, that Meâlî led a rather more libertine life than most of his peers.) He is very fond of puns and lavish in his use of idiomatic expressions. At times he has a candid tongue. His sense of humour, though never subtle (and sometimes more than crude), can show an endearing playfulness. Meâlî's father was Muşâfâ b. Ewhak al-Dirî Yarhisâr (a man derris and later kâdi of Istanbul; his mother Fatima bint Mehmed Beg was a Fenârî. The date and place of his birth are unknown. He became a müddâm (q. v.) of Tabrîz-zade Diwâ'î Celebi and of Zeyrek-zâde Rûkân al-Înî Efendi and subsequently kâdi of Muhâlîl-Kebîlûd-Fîrît, of Fîlîbe, and lastly of Gelibolu, where he died in 942/1535-6.

Meâlî's poems are to be found in the one known (incomplete) copy of his Divân in various medâfîm/âs. The bulk of his Divân consists of 270 gazelât, a special interest is a dershân in hâfez metre and a charmân-camân on the death of his cat.


(E. G. Ameros)

MEASURES [see Dîrâs; makâyîl; misâhâ].

MECCA [see MAKRA].

MECELLE [see MEDEJLLE].

MECHANICAL TECHNOLOGY [see hîyal].

Mêd, a people who lived in Sindh at the time of the early Arab invasions. Arab historians mention the Mêd in their brief descriptions of the battles which the Arabs waged in Sind but fail to furnish us with any substantial information concerning them. Even the form of the name is not certain: the manuscripts read either m-ya'd or m-n-d (cf. al-Balâdhûri, 435 n. f; al-İsâhârî, 176 n. c), and the article on this people appeared in EP under MAND. However, some modern ethnographers report that the name is Mêd (H. Riesle, The people of India, London 1913, 145, 328); this is valuable evidence in support of this version.

Several encounters with the Mêd are reported by al-Balâdhûri. Râqûd b. 'Amr al-Dîjûdayî, appointed by Ziyâd b. Abîbi to rule the area of Makrân [q. v.] on the Indian frontier, was killed by them during an incursion into Sind (al-Balâdhûri, 435). An attack perpetrated by the "Mêd of Daybul" (q. v.) on a ship bringing Muslim women from "the island of rubies" (ızzârîl-ı-yâkût); this has been frequently identified with Ceylon, but see S. Q. Fatimi, The identification of Jâzîrât al-Yaqût, in Islâm. of the Asiatic Soc. of Pakistan, xi [1964], 19-35, who suggested identifying it with Sumatra) is given as the reason for which al-Hodjîdî decided to launch around 90-2/708-11 a major expedition to Sind (al-Balâdhûri, 435-6; Gibelî, in East ad West, xv [1964-5], 282-3; Friedmann, in M. Rosent-Ayalon, ed., Studies in memory of Gaston Wiet, Jerusalem 1977, 312 n. 19). Muhammad b. al-İsâm, who commanded this expedition, concluded an armistice with the people of Surat (?), who were "Mêd, pirates of the sea" (yâkûsâna fi l-bahr) (al-Balâdhûri, 440); the name of this place recalls Şarûhârja, i.e., Kâshâwî (B.C. Law, Historical geography of ancient India, Paris 1954, 297-9). In the reign of al-Mu'asâîm, İmrîm b. Mûsâ attacked the Mêd, killed 3,000 of them and built a dam known as "the dam of the Mêd" (şakr al-İmed), probably to disturb their irrigation (ibid., 445). Then he resumed the campaign against the Mêd with the support of the Ẓût [q. v.], whom he had subjugated; a canal (şehr) was dug from the sea and the lagoon (bafta) of the Mêd was inundated with salt water. Later on, a certain Muhammad b. al-İfa'd b. Mâhân launched a naval expedition against "the Mêd of Hind" and conquered a city of theirs (ibid., 446).

Of the geographers, Ibn Khurradâbhîm mentions al-Mêd both as a geographical region (56) and as a people who lived about four days' journey to the east of the Indus and were robbers (62). Al-İsa'udî, who went to India in 304/916-17 (Brockelmann, i, 44) says that the city of al-Mansûra [q. v.] is continually at war with the Mêd (Mûsîdî, i, 378; cf. also Tanbîh, 55). Al-İsâhârî (176 = Ibn Hâwâl, 323-4) says that the infidel peoples of Sind are the Budha and the Mêd. The Mêd lived on the banks of the Indus (şâhrî Mîhrân [see MIHRAN], from Mûlât [q. v.] to the sea, and occupied parages in the desert which stretched between the Indus and the city of Kâmuhul. According to al-İdrîsî (Opus geographicum, Naples-Rome 1970-8, 170; tr. Jaubert, i, 163), the Mêd dwelt on the borders of the desert of Sind. They were nomads (rabbâhâ; Jaubert, loc. cit., seems to have read râdja'dja and translated "un peuple très brave"); cf. S. Maqîbal Ahmîd, India and the neighbouring territories as described by ... 171, 336), and pastured their flocks up to the border of Mîmânhul (Kâmuhul?)). They were numerous and owned many horses and camels; their raids extended as far as al-Rîr (cf. Elliot and Dowson, The history of India as told by its own historians, London 1867, i, 363) and sometimes even to Makrân.

The town of Kâmuhul, which marks the south-eastern limit of the area inhabited by the Mêd, was identified by Elliot and Dowson (op. cit., i, 363; S. Hodîvâl, Studies in Indo-Muslim history, Bombay 1939, 38) with Anhâlwarâ, which is modern Patan in northern Baroda (cf. EP, iii, 407; Imperial gazetteer of India", Oxford 1908, xx); Cunningham (Report 1863-864, 290) places "Mîmânhul" at  İstanbul; this would place the Mêd much more firmly in Sind. Of special interest among the Muslim sources is the anonymous Mûdîm al-tawâjîr, Storey, i, 67). A part of this work seems to be a résumé of the Mâkâhîbîrâtâ. It begins with a chapter on the Mêd and the Ẓût who
lived in Sind and are said to be descendants of Hām, the son of Noah. The two peoples were hostile to each other and fought a number of wars. Having become tired of fighting, they resolved to approach king Daḥğan b. Dahrān (Duryodhana son of Dhratarṣastra) and asked him to appoint a ruler over them. Daḥghan gave the country to his sister Dusal (Daḥslālā), who married the powerful king Dṃdrat (Jayadratha). The country was then divided between the Zutt and the Mēd (J. Reimand, *Fragments arabes et persans inédits*, Paris 1845, repr. 1974, 2-3, 25-7). The story reflects an attempt to forge a link between the history of the Mēd and the Zutt and the Indian tradition. It must be noted, however, that the Sanskrit original of the *Mahābhārata* makes no mention of peoples bearing these names in the passage dealing with Daḥslālā’s marriage to Jayadratha, king of Sindhu (Mahābhārata, i. 108. 18). Moreover, the Indian tradition does not seem to contain anything definite about the Mēd, with the possible exception of occasional remarks in the *dharmasastra* literature about a low caste or, according to some, untouchable people called Meda, of unspecified geographical location or provenance (*Manusmṛti* 10.36, with Medhāhitihis’s remarks; cf. Rai Bahadur B.A. Gupte, *The Mēds of Makran, in* *Indian Antiquary*, xl [1941], 147-9).

It seems that the Mēd are not mentioned in later Muslim sources. It is true, however, that the *Cāc-nāma* (ed. Daudpota, New Delhi 1939, 89) mentions a people called *N-h-a-m-r-a* or *N-h-a-m-r-ñ* which they appear in *al-Baladhun*. In its description of the *dharmasastra* which not only swept away all such new ideas but also brought a period of anarchy and indecisiveness lasting until 1839, when a new era of the *Tanzimāt* (*q.v.*) reforms was opened. The reformers mentioned above in its description of the model to be emulated and were pointing out decisively the desirability of the appropriation of the superior (*mergāb*) methods of civilisation.

The shortcomings of the *Tanzimāt* efforts of appropriating the fundamentals of *Medeniyyet* were due to a great extent to the vagueness, devoid of historical and sociological dimensions, and the naivety displayed in the mechanistic views of these men. A small group of intellectuals (the “New Ottomans” or Yeni ʿOğmānlar), who lived abroad in exile, saw shortcomings in the *medeniyyet* current in Europe. In their criticisms of the *Tanzimāt* reforms they made implicit, and sometimes explicit, distinctions between the “material” and the “moral” parts in all civilisations. They too lavished praises on the achievements of material civilisation achieved in Europe, but they were less enthusiastic about the second part.

Thus from the late 1860s onward the word *medeniyyet* ceased to imply a political régime and one peculiar only to Europe. Later years saw the rise of much wider connotations of the term and of controversies, particularly when it was challenged by another term, *hargā*, coined by Ziyā (Diya) Gökals to correspond to the much older Western concept of culture.

Though the term *medeniyyet* had lost its early political meaning, it still carried a political tinge in 1920s during the War of Independence. A poem written and intended as the national anthem contained a verse cursing *medeniyyet* as “the monster with one remaining tooth”—an obvious reference to European imperialism. When Muṣṭafā Kemāl (Atāturk) glorified what he called “contemporary civilisation”, he appears to have taken side with those who identified *medeniyyet* only with enlightenment and progress, but not with a political régime.


(Niyazi Berkes)

MEDİHI, the pen name (makbûs) used by a number of Ottoman poets whose poetry is known to date mainly through the samples found in medânastrâ and telhkires. Judging by these, they are all poets of secondary importance at best. Two should be singled out.

1. Mahmûd Efendi of Gelibolu (Gallipoli), known as Kara Mahmûd (or Kara Kâzî-zade according to Beyânî). A madâzim of Şeykûh al-Islâm Abu 'l-Suûd Efendi [q.v.], he first became a müderres. After being dismissed from a position with a daily salary of forty akçes, he was appointed in 984/1576 to the Şâh Kûlbân medresesi in Istanbul (cf. Câhid Baltaci, XV- XVI. asırlarda Osmanlı medreseleri, Istanbul 1976, 435). In 987/1579 he became miftûh of Kefî, in 992/1594 kâdi of Marâşh, from 994/1595-6 until 995/1596 he was kâdi of Kütahya, from 996/1595 until 998/1599 again kâdi of Marâşh, from 1000/1599 until 1002/1599 and from 1003/1599 until 1004/1596 kâdi of Gelibolu, and from 1005/1597 until 1006/1597 kâdi of Tripoli in Syria. He died in 1006/1597-8 in Gelibolu, and is buried there in the vicinity of the Çâhiû Sultan Pasha mosque. The târîkh or chronogram Fâtiha Mahmûd Efendi râhîna inscribed on his tombstone (as described by Bursâh Mîhmed Tâhir), which is by Na'îr or according to others by Ni'meti, confirms this.

A very short passage of his Kâlemiye, a treatise in Arabic, is quoted by 'Atâ'î. Two mss. of his Dîvân are known to exist (Mîlet Ktp., Emiri, manzum eserler ser. 399, and Hürrem Pasaâ look) (Mîrûsh Sultan 37076, 435).

Bibliography: Cf. the telhkires of 'Abîd, Mîlet Ktp., Emiri, tarh, 774, fol. 177a; Kâniýe-zade Hasan Celebi, ed. i. Kutuk, ii, Ankara 1981, 885-6; Beyânî, Mîlet Ktp., Emiri, tarh, 757, fols. 94b-95a; Riâyî, Nuruosmaniye Ktp., 3724, fol. 133b; Kâfâ-zade Fâîîîî, Mîlet Ktp., Emiri, manzum, 1325, fol. 99a; also 'Atâ'î, Dîvân-i Şahgîyî, Istanbul 1268, 416-5; M. Thüreyyê, Sûfîîî-i Âmîhînî, iv, Istanbul 1315, 353; Bursâh Mîhmed Tâhir, Âmîhînî mû'ellîfîleri, ii, Istanbul 1333, 384-5.

2. Nûh-zade Scyyîd Mûsâtîfâ Celebi of Bursa stands out because his name has come down to us also as a medâd [q.v.]. Actually, he started a career as a müderres after being a madâzim of Şeykûh al-Islâm Âbu Sa'id Efendi. Upon his dismissal from a position with a daily salary of forty akçes, he aspired to a career as kâdi. When, however, he was promised the kâdâ of Çoru but the realisation of this promise was delayed, he became a medâd. He died on 18 Râbi'î 1091/14 August 1680, and was buried in Bursa in the vicinity of the tomb of Emîr Sulûh.


MEDHİ, the pen name (makbûs) of two Ottoman poets whose poetry is known to date only as far as the samples found in medânastrâ and telhkires allow. On the strength of these, neither appears to be of more than minor importance.

1. Muştâfâ (according to Kâniýe-zade Hasan Celebi and Beyânî, whereas 'Aşîkî Celebi gives his name as Muşîl—or Muşlu, the Turkish abbreviation of Muşûl al-Din) Celebi of Shirûz (Serres), who lived during the reigns of Suleymân I (926-74/1520-66), Selim II (974-82/1566-74) and up to the middle of that of Murâd III (982-1003/1574-95). A dâvûnîmhed of Kâziâ-zade Ahmed Efendi (who became kâdi-âsker under Selim II), then a madâzim of 'Atâ'î Allah Efendi, he served as kâdi of a number of kasâbas, the last being Shirûz. He came to be known in the circle of his peers for his numerous servants and attendants and his love of display.


2. Mehmed of Istanbul was a madâzim, then a müderres until he attained a position with a daily salary of forty akçes. Upon dismissal from this position, he agreed to a career as kâdi and went to Egypt (according to the ms. Österr. Nationalbibl., H. 139, of Şafîîîî telhkîresi, he was appointed as kâdi to the kâdâ of Burullus), where he became renowned for his ability for story-telling and his indulgence in the pleasures of life. He died in 1083/1672-3.


MEDINE, town in Saudi Arabia [see AL-MADINA].

MEDICINE [see THIB].

MEDINA, from Arabic madina "town", is used in French (médine) to designate, above all in the Maghrib, the ancient part of the great Islamic cities, beyond which have been constructed the modern quarters of the city. Moreover, Medina has survived in Spain in a certain number of toponyms. The main ones of these are: Medina de las Torres, in the province of Badajoz; Medina del Campo and Medina de Rioseco, in that of Valladolid; Medina de Pomar, in that of Burgos; and also, Medinaceli [see MADINAT SALIM] and Medina-Sidonia [see MADRIN].

(MEDINA) TOWN IN SAUDI ARABIA [see AL-MADINA].

MEDINE — MEDINA 969
MEDINACELI, a leader, as Rā'ī Când Pūrbiya, of the Pūrbiya (= "eastern") Rajputs, with tribal possessions in the Čandānegī [q.v.] district and hence feudatories of the sultans of Mālwā [q.v.], who became prominent in Mālwā-Gujaratī-Mewār-Dīhlī politics early in the 10th/16th century.

The Mālwā succession had been fiercely contested after the death of Nāṣir al-Dīn Shāh Khādджī in 918/1512, who had designated his third son, A'ẓām Humāyūn as his heir. He duly succeeded, as Māhmūd Shāh Khādджī [q.v.], with his elder brothers Shībāb al-Dīn and Sāhīb Khān as active contenders for the throne in a situation exacerbated by rival factions of Muslim nobles at court; one faction had already compassed the assassination of the strong and competent (Hindu) wazīr and the banishment of a second Hindu minister. The perpetrators remained unpunished by Māhmūd, and their power increased until the leader of the second faction, Muhāfiz Khān, turned the sultan against them. They escaped to Khāndērī [q.v.] to join Shībāb al-Dīn, but the latter died suddenly before any action could be taken. In the meantime, Muhāfiz Khān, now appointed wazīr, had become too powerful, and confined Māhmūd to his palace, proclaiming Sāhīb Khān sultan as Muhām-med Shāh in the capital MāndĪ [q.v.]. Māhmūd managed to escape, chased by his brother, to Čandānegī, where he received no support from the governor Bahdjar Khān, on the pretense that he obeyed only the ruler of MāndĪ. At this point, Rā'ī Când Pūrbiya brought his Rājdūṭ troops to Māhmūd's assistance, and, becoming Māhmūd's adviser, was given the title of Mēdīnī Rā'ī. He pursued Sāhīb Khān and expelled him from MāndĪ (917/1512); Sāhīb Khān fled to Gujaratī, accompanied by Muhāfiz Khān.

Mēdīnī Rā'ī, appointed wazīr at MāndĪ, strengthened the administration and appointed his own Rājdūṭs to some important posts; but there was some opposition from Muslim nobles, increased when Sāhīb Khān returned from Gujārāt without, however, having secured any assistance from its sultan. In 918/1512 the governors of both Satwār (Nēmāwar) and Mālwā, accompanied by Mūshish Khān, surrendered the disturbances at Satwār and then, with Māhmūd, marched on Čandānegī, where Bahdjar Khān (not obeying the ruler of MāndĪ!) had not only proclaimed Sāhīb Khān as sultan but also sought help from the Dīhlī sultan Sikandar Lodi, promising to read the khutba and Gudjaratī influence, requested Muzaffar to recall it; but after this was done, Malwa lost much of its territories to Rana Sanga or lost little under his protection, including Mēdīnī Rā'ī, who was established in the now independent Čandānegī. He fought with Rana Sanga against Bābur in the battle of Khānuwā in 933/1527, and shortly afterwards was killed in Bābur's assault on Čandānegī. He was the most able of the minor Rājdūṭ chieftains, as skilful in warfare as in administration; he never abandoned his respect for or courtesy to Māhmūd Shāh, treating him and his family with consideration and generosity.


J. BURTON-PAGE

MEDJDI, MEHMEĐ ĖLĪBÁRI, an Ottoman literate and biographer of the 10th/16th century known by the pen-name of Medđi, d. 1599/1591. He was born the son of a merchant in Edirne (Allī, Kānī al-ākhbār, Ist. Univ. Lib. TY 5959, fol. 493b). He completed his education at the Bāyezīdíyye madrasa in Edirne, and became a dāntīmīnd ("advanced student") of the Bāyezīdíyye. He later spent time in the Gudjarat-body of troops and in the Bāyezīdíyye, while Newr-ī-zādī "Aṭār (Hadīk al-Shakdīk) ft takmirat al-Shaβakatī, Istanbul 1268, 334 states that he became a candidate for office (mulāzim) under the quota of nominees allowed Akhaweyn as a mūdirīn at the Şahīn, where he taught before being appointed to the Bāyezīdíyye. Medđi held a number of kāḏīfīls in Rumeli and reached the rank of 150 aṣpers' daily salary; he died in Istanbul in 1599/1591 while awaiting a new appointment and was buried at the zādwīye of Emīr Bakhrāī outside the Edirne gate.

As a poet, Medđi was particularly influenced by Emīr (also a native of Edirne) and by his teacher Akhaweyn, and his contemporaries "Aḥđī (Gūlghān-ī shavāra)," Ist. Univ. Lib. TY 2604, fols. 110 ff. At the death of Rā'yādī Meḥmed, Tādšīkī, Ist. Univ. Lib. TY 761, fol. 119a; Beyānī Muştāfatī, Tādšīkī, Ist. Univ. Lib. TY 2568, fol. 79a; Kāfāfè Pādhī, Zadālāt al-āğrār, Ist. Univ. Lib. TY 1646, fols. 97a-98a; "Aṣṭī, 356-65) and in contrast to Edirne Hist. (I. tunkarsī, musāmīrīn, Millet Lib., Emīrī, tarih no. 68, fol. 80b; Bādi, Rā'yādī-i bele-ye Edirne, Bayezid Devlet Lib. no. 10392, i, 545-6; O. N. Peremeci, Edirne tarihi, Istan-
The significance of the Medjelle can be measured not only by the work more widely available, undertaken its translation into Turkish, which he completed and dedicated to Murad III in 995/1587. Medjdi compensated for the dry simplicity of the original with a courtly style and capacity to compose good Arabic prose with two treatises: Sayf-Al(Kuddiliz) and Asaigion (Şuleymanlı Lib., Esad Ef. no. 3416, fols. 28b-30b) and the Şam'iyâ (quoted in part by 'Ali, Külâizâde, Beyâni and 'Atâ'î, loc. cit.).

Medjdi displayed his scholarly and literary ability in the work for which he is justly renowned, his translation of the Shâkâh'âl-Nâmînîyya fi 'ulâmâ'î al-‘adwâ’î al-âdâwî ‘al-‘Othmânîyya. As previous translations and commentaries, his was the most suited to the conditions of the times, in accordance with the principle of taqlîdyya. While the justificatory memorandum (sebbâhî mazăibe nadbatâ) submitted to the Council of Ministers, said that the authors of the code “never went outside the Hanafî rite” (Liebesny, 69; Berki, 12; Dutrânî, i, 27; Aristarchi, vi, 15), some of these opinions had in fact originated with non-Hanafî jurists (Anderson, 17, 47-8). Such eclecticism became a major feature of later efforts on the part of the state. See A. Subhi Furat's notes to his edition of the Medjelle over the period from 1285/1869 to 1293/1876 (Dutrânî, i, 20-164; ii, 38-425; iv, 93-125; Berki, passim; Aristarchi, vi-vii; Young, vi). The various books were placed in force by decrees (irâde) of the sultan, dating from 6 Dhu ‘l-Ka‘da 1286/1870 (Berki, 113) to 25 Sha‘bân 1293/1877 (ibid., 422).

In the şarÎî terms, the Medjelle thus acquired legal force from the power of the sultan as sanî ‘almî-l-mussîlin in order which several legal opinions should be followed in a given matter (Dutrânî, i, 29; Heidborn, i, 286; Anderson, 48). The Medjelle opens with two sections which define fîkh and its divisions and which state its basic principles largely according to the Aghâhî wa-l-nâzîrîr (Aristarchi, vii-viii [1945], 136 ff.) and the Şâkâh ‘al-Nâmînîyya tercime ve zeyilleri, in Türkiye Memnuat, vii-viii [1945], 136 ff.) had been made, some scholars had added explanatory and supplementary notes (bâhâzîs and mlâ‘ikî) to the margins of the Arabic text. Medjdi, in order to make the work more widely available, undertook its translation into Turkish, which he completed and dedicated to Murad III in 995/1587. Medjdi compensated for the dry simplicity of the original with a courtly style and ornate language, adorning his translation with poetry, aphorisms, word plays and chronograms. He also used the sources at his disposal to expand and correct the work. These sources included marginal additions to the original Şâkâh‘al-Nâmînîyya, such as the notes made by 'Arab-zâde (see Medjdi, 331, 373-4, 385, 486) and Seyrek-zâde (ibid., 494); documents such as waqf-nâmes, hudjîfsiz and temessûs found in the judicial (kâddîlık) archives; authors such as al-Suyûtî, Ibn 'Arabgâhî, and Hanbali-zâde; early Ottoman chronicles, particularly the Haci bâktî; tadhkîrîe authors such as Sehî, Laﬁûî and 'Asghîrî; and such works written by the subjects of his biographies as he was able to see plus accounts transmitted by their relatives and students (for an indication of the extent of these additions, which Medjdi labels tadhkîrî, see A. Subhi Furat’s notes to his edition of the original, qiy-Şâkâh'âl-n-Nâmînîyya fi 'ulâmâ'î d-devletî l-‘Othmânîye, Istanbul 1985). Thus it can be said that Medjdi’s work, which he entitled Hâdâ’î‘al-Şâkâh‘al-Medjelle, rather than being a translation, represents an attempt to produce a new work based on the Şâkâh‘al-Medjelle, as a complement to the Şâkâh‘al-Medjelle which was of high literary quality, became the formal and stylistic model for later continuations, and the edition published in 1269/1852 is a primary reference work for researchers.

Medjelle (A. Madjalla). Originally meaning a book or other writing containing wisdom, or even any book or writing, the term refers in its best-known use to a book or other writing containing wisdom, or even any book or other writing.

The drafting commission evidently intended to continue its work by codifying the law on the family and inheritance, but soon found itself paralysed by the suspicions of the new sultan. 'Abd-ül-Hamîd II (1876-1909 [g.v.]) (Heidborn, i, 285; Mardin, art. Mecelle, 435). Despite its bases in fîkh, the Medjelle differs from traditional şarÎî law in several respects, including its codification and official promulgation and its explicit admission—necessary, given its intended scope of application—of non-Muslims as witnesses (Schacht, 93). The Medjelle also differs from European civil codes in omitting non-contractual obligations, types of real property other than freehold (milk), joint ownership and partnership (shirkâ), and inheritance, as well as in including some şarÎî procedural provisions (Liebesny, 65).

The significance of the Medjelle can be measured not always incorporate the dominant opinions of that school. Rather, all of the opinions ever advanced by Hanafi jurists, the code incorporated those deemed most suited to the conditions of the times, in accordance with the principle of taqlîdyya. While the justificatory memorandum (sebbâhî mazăibe nadbatâ) submitted to the Council of Ministers, said that the authors of the code “never went outside the Hanafi rite” (Liebesny, 69; Berki, 12; Dutrânî, i, 27; Aristarchi, vi, 15), some of these opinions had in fact originated with non-Hanafi jurists (Anderson, 17, 47-8).
only from the respect that it continues to command as evidence of the possibility of achieving its original purpose, that of systematising the şari'a so as to obviate the adoption of new family law codes (Fadzul Rahman, 29), but in a more tangible way, the code's significance also appears from its remarkable afterlife. In the niṣānimya, though not the şari'a courts, the Ottoman government did replace the procedural provisions of the Medjelle with a Code of Civil Procedure, based on French law, in 1879 (Liebesny, 66; Heidborn, i, 386-7; Diirer, iv, 257-317; Young, vii, 171-225). The Turkish republic thus abrogated the Medjelle in 1926. Yet it remained in force in Bosnia-Herzegovina after the Austrian occupation of 1878, in Albania until 1928, and in Cyprus at least into the 1960s. In the Middle East, the Medjelle, though never in force in Egypt, was not replaced by new civil codes until 1932 in Lebanon, 1949 in Syria, and 1953 in 'Iraq, where many elements of it survived in the new civil code of that year. The Medjelle has remained basic to the civil law of Israel and Jordan. It has also continued to serve as the civil law of Kuwait (Schacht, 93; Liebesny, 93, 100, 109).

In terms of the approach to legal reform which it represented, another aspect of the Medjelle's continuing influence appears in the Ottoman Law of Family Rights (Hukuk-i Âtile Kanûnînmesi) of 8 Muharram 1337/21 February 1919 (Schacht, 39-40, 48-50; Schacht, 103). Enactment of this law completed what appears to have been the original programme of the drafters of the Medjelle. In addition, the new law resembled the Medjelle in combining codification with an eclectic approach to şari'a sources, as well as in applying to both Muslim and non-Muslim subjects, a breadth achieved in this case by incorporating provisions drawn from the religious law of the various sources, as well as in applying to both Muslim and non-Muslim subjects, a breadth achieved in this case by incorporating provisions drawn from the religious law of the various communities (Shaw and Shaw, 307). The 1917 family law further resembled the Medjelle in that it remained in force in various of the successor states much longer than in Ottoman territory, where it was repealed in 1337/1919 (Shaw and Shaw, 333; Diirer, xi, 299-300). For the 1917 law "remained valid in Syria, Lebanon, Palestine, and Transjordan (as they then were), and is still part of the family law of the Muslims in Lebanon and in Israel" (Schacht, 1964, 103).


MEDJIDIYYE (Romanian, Medgidia), a small town in eastern Romania, situated in the central Dobrudja (q.v.), midway between the Danube and Constanța (Kustendje), and on the site of the earlier Ottoman settlement of Karasu, which had served as a relay-station on the old sâgh kol, the military road from Istanbul to the lower Danube and the Crimea. The importance of Medjidiyye stems from its being, in its inception, a mid-19th century Ottoman planned town, founded by the local wâli, Sa'id Paşa, in the course of the Crimean war, to house Krım Tatar refugees, and named in honour of the reigning sultan ʿAbd al-Medjîd. Within a few months of its foundation in 1854 it contained over one thousand completed houses, a khan and a bazaar. The large mosque, which still stands, and serves a population still 30% Muslim, is dated 1277/1860-1. In the reorganisation of the provincial administration of Rumel in 1284/1864, Medjidiyye, as a kâdâr in the sâğk of Tuhla (not Varna, as in E², art. Dobrudja), formed part of the new Tuna wilâyet (Sâhâname 1294, 432), and its prosperity was subsequently increased by the building of the railway from Bucharest to Constanța. By the terms of the Treaty of Berlin (art. xvi), Medjidiyye passed from Ottoman into Romanian possession, along with all that part of the Dobrudja north of a line drawn from Silistra to the Black Sea. At the time of the out- break of the First World War, its population was estimated at approximately 2,200 Muslim and 1,300 non-Muslim households.

Bibliography: Sâhâname 1294, Istanbul 1294; Gazette autrichienne, řv. 1855; A. Ubicini, La Dobrudja et le delta du Danube, in Revue de Géographie, iv (1879); E.H. Ayverdi, Avrupada Osmanlı mimari eserleri, vii, 2, Istanbul 1979, 53, 55-6; IA art. Dobruca (A. Decei); E² art. Dobrudja (H. Inalok). (C.J. Heywood)

MEDJIDIYYE [see SIKKA].

MEDJILIS-I WALA, in full, the Ottoman Medjîls-i Walâ-yi Âkhâm-i ʿAdliye, or Supreme Council of Judicial Ordinances. This was created in 1838 by the reformer Mustafâ Reşid Paşa for the purpose of taking over the legislative duties of the old Divân-i Hümâyûn in order to originate or review proposed legislation and thereby create an "ordered and established" state by means of "beneficent reorderings" (tanzimat-i hâyiyye) of state and society, with all other legislation being turned over to a second legislative body, the Dâr-i Şirâ-i Bâb-i Âli (Deliberative Council of the Sublime Porte). The Medjîlî-i asâlî hardly had a chance to begin its deliberations when, following the accession of Sultan ʿAbd al-Medjîd I (q.v.) and promulgation of the Khatâ-i Hümâyûn of Gûlkânne which proclaimed the Tanzimat reform movement as the
major goal of the new régime, it was expanded into the principal legislative body of state with the abolition of its sister body. Beginning its work on 8 March 1840 in a building constructed especially for it near the office of the Grand Vizier at the Sublime Porte, it originated most of the Tanzimat legislation, though its powers were severely limited by regulations which allowed it only to consider legislation proposed to it by the ministries or the executive. It was supplanted for reform legislation by the Meclis-i Vâlâ-yl Ahkâm-î Âdliyye, which was divided into departments for Laws and Regulations, which assumed the legislative functions of both councils, Administration and Finance, which investigated complaints against the administrative misconduct, and Judicial Cases, which assumed the old council's judicial functions, acting as a court of appeals for judicial appeals. Conflicts of jurisdiction between the two bodies, however, and a substantially increasing workload created such a backlog of legislation that in 1861 the two were brought back together into a new Medjlis-i Vâlâ-yl Ahkâm-î Âdliyye, which was divided into departments for Laws and Regulations, which assumed the legislative functions of both councils, Administration and Finance, which investigated complaints against the administrative misconduct, and Judicial Cases, which assumed the old council's judicial functions, acting as a court of appeals for cases decided by the provincial councils of justice and as a court of first instance in cases involving misconduct on the part of higher officials in the central government. Regulations allowed it to originate as well as to review proposed legislation, to question members of the executive and to try such officials for misdeeds, greatly increased its ability to act decisively in order to meet the problems of the time, with the sultans interfering only rarely to veto or change the results of its work. In 1867, however, in response to complaints about the autocratic nature of the Tanzimat system, the Medjlis-i Vâlâ was replaced by separate legislative and judicial bodies, the Vâlâ-yl Dewlet, or Council of State, whose members were at least partially elected and representative, and the Divân-î Ahkâm-î Âdliyye, chaired respectively by the famous Tanzimat leaders Midhat Paşa and Ahmed Djewdet Paşa.

Bibliography: S.J. Shaw, The Central Legislative Councils in the nineteenth century Ottoman reform movement before 1876, in IJMES, i (1970), 51-84; S.J. Shaw and E.K. Shaw, History of the Ottoman empire and modern Turkey, London and New York 1977, repr. 1985, ii, 38, 76-81; Başbakanlık Arşivi, İrade, Meclisi-i Mehtes-i Meclis-i Mehtes-i Mecûs; see G. Moravcsik, "Tanzimat des Mehemmed I" in Das Aufzeichnen des Genuesen laçope de Promontorio... um 1475, Munich 1957, 29, n. 1 (where Colín's note, mentioned above, is also given); see also, for an example of deliberate alteration (Mamad), L.P. Harvey, Crypto-Islam in sixteenth century Spain, in Actas del primer congreso de estudios árabes e islámicos, Madrid 1964, 199, no. 15, 177, l. 9. Contemporary Byzantine and European sources indicate that in the 9th/10th century the predominant pronunciation of the name was "Mahmoud"; F. Babinger, commenting on the form "Mehmet" in Die Aufzeichnungen des Genuesen laçope de Promontorio... um 1475, Munich 1957, 29, n. 1 (and there, with further bibliography, proposing "Mehemed" as the current pronunciation), adds Angiolello's "Mehemmed", and the Myzqüt and similar forms which is regular in Ducas, Sphrantzes and Çritoboulos (for these and the other Byzantine texts see G. Moravcsik, Byzantinoturcica, ii, s.v. Myzqütça). In modern Turkey, the name finally appears as "Mehmet", as a consequence of the general phonological principles (J. Deny, Principes de grammaire turque, Paris 1955) of the devocalizing of a final voiced consonant, the predilection for front vowels in loanwords, the assimilation (progressive and regressive) of vowels, and the fall of an unstressed middle vowel in a tri-syllable.

The Editors, taking the view that to employ the spelling "Muhammad" in the Ottoman context would be hypercorrect (and "Mehmed", for the earlier centuries, anachronistic) have adopted the convention that all the relevant Ottoman rulers figuring in the Encyclopedia will be referred to consistently as "Mehmed", whilst lesser personages shall be referred to as "Mehmed". (Ed.)

MEHAMED I, Ottoman sultan, reigned 816-24/1413-21, also known as Çelebi (Turkish "of high descent", "prince") or as Krytzes (from Krýtze, meaning in Greek "young lord"). During the period of interregnum, 804-16/1402-13, he ruled over Anatolia from Tokat, Amasya, and Bursa while his brothers Süleyman (804-13/1402-11) and Musa (813-16/1411-13) had control of Rûm (from Edirne. Mehemed brought under his rule Bursa and western Anatolia in the years 805-6/1403-4 and 813-16/1410-13, and finally achieved the unification of the two parts of the Ottoman state under his sole sovereignty in 816/1413. He was the fourth son of Bäyezid I [q.v.] by a slave girl Dewlet Khâtnûn (Uzunçarşı, in IA, viii, 496).

1. Birth and early years.

Born in 788/1386 or 789/1387, Mehemed was sent when he reached the Şârî age of adolescence in 973 [q.v.] attached to the Prophet's name without risking letting it become profaned, above all by insults and abuse addressed specifically by name to these persons. On the problems posed by alterations of this kind in the sphere of Islam and those which the name of Muhammad has undergone in the European languages, see G.S. Colin, Muhammad-Mahomet, in BSLP, xxvi (1925), 109; J. Mouradian, Notes sur les alterations du nom de Mahomet chez les Noirs islamisés de l'Afrique Occidentale, in Bull. du Comité des études historiques et scientifiques de l'Afrique Occidentale Française, xxi (1938), 459-62; A. Fischer, Vergleichung und Tabuisierung des Namens Muhammad's bei den Muslimen in Beiträge zur Arabistik, Semitistik und Islamwissenschaft, Leipzig 1944, 307-39; F. de la Granja, A propósito del nombre Muhammad y sus variantes en Occidente, in And., xxxiii (1968), 231-40 (where Colin's note, mentioned above, is also given); see also, for an example of
Shawwal 801/June 1399 as governor over the province of Rüm, which included Amasya, Tokat, Sivas and Ankara, formerly the territory of the Ėreṇa [q.v.] dynasty. Mehemmed’s six brothers were Erteğrul (died 802/1400, Zachariadou, Erteğrul, 157), Mustafā (captured by Timūr and taken to Samarkand in 804/1402; Dostār-nāme, 90), Süleyman (in contemporary sources also known as Muslumān or Amuslumān), ʿĪsā, Mūsā and ʿ Jáṣīm. In 804/1402, ʿ Jáṣīm, aged under 12, was in Bursa in the palace while Mūsā was captured together with his father by Timūr. Süleyman, ʿĪsā, Mūsā, and Mustafā fought to get control of Bursa, still considered as the Dār al-Saltāna, and of Edirne, capital city of Rûmili.

2. The status quo established by Timūr in Anatolia.

During Timūr’s siege of İzmīr (from 6 Dūmādā I 805/2 December 1402 until 10 Dūmādā II/6 January 1403), Süleyman was given a jurāfā granting him the rule of ‘all the territories beyond the Bosphorus’ (arastā-yaka, Yazdi, fol. 424b). Mehemmed, whom Timūr called to come in person to Kütahiya, could not or would not obey the order (for details in the Manākbār-nāme, see Bibl.).

Mehemmed’s first deeds against the Turcoman begs in the Tokat-Amasya region, rendered in an epic style in the Manākbār-nāme, appear actually to have been local clashes which evidently resulted in compromises giving recognition of Mehemmed’s overlordship in return for his confirmation of the begs’ freehold possession of their lands (cf. Neşri, ii, 480). In the future, these hereditary mulk ṭimārāns would create problems when Ottoman centralist control was re-established. These local dynasts in control of Turcoman and ‘Tatar’ forces would provide the bulk of Mehemmed’s army (cf. divisions of Tatars and Türkmen in the battle against Mūsā in 816/1413; Neşri, ii, 512-13).

Kara Dwesteqhān, Kubād-oglu, Mīzād Beg and the family of Tāʃān (on the family’s origin, see Bazmīrīyye).

As the well-established Turkish tradition, every son of a ruler had the right to succeed his father, and his legitimacy could not be contested since there was no law which regulated succession (see Inalcik, Verāšt). As the Manākbār-nāme (see Neşri, ii, 432, 446, 456, 461, 504, 508) makes clear, people at large often told the rival princes struggling for recognition that they had first to win the fight, which was interpreted as a sign of God’s favour. The principle of seniority was never decisive, although Mehemmed at the beginning recognised his elder brother Süleyman as representing supreme authority (Anonymous chron. Paris, Bibl. Nat. 1047, fol. 29b; ed. Giese, 47).

On the struggle among the Ottoman princes, Celebis, the account of the Manākbār-nāme, which is actually a contemporary account of the events for the period 1402-13, should be followed. According to this source, in various encounters Mehemmed defeated ʿĪsā and took Bursa, although the latter secured the alliance of the western Anatolian begs and İsfendiyār of Kastamuni (Manākbār-nāme, in Neşri, ii, 422-50; İdris, 263-7). Mehemmed finally captured and killed him at Eskişehir (apparently in 806/403-4; Zachariadou, Süleyman, 281-3, believes that ʿĪsā was killed by Süleyman in 1403). Then, in 806 (begins 21 July 1403), Mehemmed lost Bursa and Ankara to Süleyman (Mehemmed minted an akçe in Bursa in the same Hīḏra year, see Table, nos. 3, 4). Mehemmed had to retreat to his Tokat-Amasya base, and later encouraged Mūsā to go to Rūmeli (Manākbār-nāme, in Neşri, ii, 474; İdris, 275-6). Accepting the Wallachian Vâyvode Mircea’s invitation, Mūsā arrived by sea in Wallachia in 809/1406 (A. Dersca

### TABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ruler and title</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Mining place</th>
<th>Metal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Amīr Sulaymān b. Bāyāzdīd</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>silver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Amīr Sulaymān Bāyāzdīd</td>
<td>806</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>silver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Muḥammad b. Bāyāzdīd Khān/Demūr Khān Kurkān</td>
<td>806</td>
<td>Bursa</td>
<td>silver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Ghiyāth al-Dūnayā wa ‘l-Dīn Muḥammad b. Bāyāzdīd</td>
<td>806</td>
<td>Bursa</td>
<td>silver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Ghiyāth al-Dūnayā wa ‘l-Dīn Muḥammad b. Bāyāzdīd</td>
<td>806</td>
<td>Eṅgūriyye</td>
<td>silver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. al-Sulṭān al-A’zam Mūḥammad b. Bāyāzdīd Khān</td>
<td>808</td>
<td>Amāṣya</td>
<td>silver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Ghiyāth al-Dūnayā wa ‘l-Dīn Muḥammad b. Bāyāzdīd Khān</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>Amāṣya</td>
<td>silver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Dūnayyā Ḥażīl/Muḥammad b. Bāyāzdīd</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>silver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Amīr Sulaymān b. [.....]</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>Edīrne</td>
<td>silver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. al-Sulṭān al-Malik al-A’zam Mūḥammad b. Bāyāzdīd</td>
<td>813</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>copper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Mūṣā b. Bāyāzdīd</td>
<td>813</td>
<td>Edīrne</td>
<td>silver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Sulṭān b. Mūḥammad [b.] Bāyāzdīd Khān</td>
<td>816</td>
<td>Temirhisar</td>
<td>copper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Amīr Sulaymān b. Bāyāzdīd</td>
<td>816</td>
<td>Edīrne</td>
<td>silver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Mūḥammad b. Bāyāzdīd Khān</td>
<td>821</td>
<td>Edīrne</td>
<td>silver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Muṣṭafā b. Bāyāzdīd Khān</td>
<td>822</td>
<td>Bursa, Amāṣya, Serez, Ayasoluk</td>
<td>silver</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Bulgaru, Les relations, 116-17, citing Guboglu, gives the year 1406; the date is confirmed by the details in Mehemmed, in Negri, ii, 478. For Mehemmed’s death which occurred in 17 Radjab 809/28 December 1406; Idris, 278). His success in the eastern Balkans finally forced Suleyman to leave Bursa for Rumi. At first victorious at the battle of Yanbolu (13 February 1410), MUIS was later twice defeated (June and July 1410, A. Dersca Bulgaru, 122, 123). Finally, by a surprise attack, MUIS captured Edirne and killed Suleyman (17 February 1411). Upon Suleyman’s departure from Anatolia, Mehemmed re-occupied Bursa (Menekh-nâme, in Negri, ii, 480). Not honouring his agreement with Mehemmed, MUIS acted independently, and espousing the frontier begs’ aggressive policy, he alienated the vassal states from himself, who now sided with Mehemmed (Menekh-nâme, in Negri, ii, 490-500; Idris, 281-4) in 814 (begins 25 May 1411); these two clashes are confirmed by Ducas, 109-110) Mehemmed finally overcame his rival and eliminated him, thanks to the alliance of the frontier begs and vassal states (Menekh-nâme, in Negri, ii, 506-16; Idris, 286-8; Braun, 47-55) on 5 Rabî’ II 816/15 July 1411. According to the Menekh-nâme, in Negri, 88, 486, 516 and 544, Mehemmed, Suleyman reigned 10 years, 10 months and 17 days, MUIS 2 years, 7 months and 20 days and Mehemmed 7 months, 11 days. 

The principal Anatolian dynasties, the DJandarids, the Karamanids, the rulers of Germiyân, Sarukhân, and Aydîn in Western Anatolia, which had all been restored to their principalities under Timûr’s overlordship, were actively involved in the struggles between the Ottoman princes for Bursa, still considered the principal capital or Dâr al-Salâma. Their policies were basically determined, like those of Byzantium, Wallachia and Serbia, by their concern to maintain the status quo established after the battle of Ankara. Each Ottoman prince, for his part, tried to gain their support or neutrality by showing himself respectful of their autonomy or independence. However, Timûr’s departure made the Anatolian dynasties realise that Ottoman power and supremacy were still a fact, and some of them, for the sake of survival, recognised the overlordship of whichever Ottoman prince had control of Bursa.

Byzantium and the vassal states in the Balkans, subjected and paying tribute under Murâd I [q.v.] and Bayezid I, were now independent and even recovered some of their territories (see Jorga, COR, i, 325-77; Barker, 200-385; Zachariadou, Suleyman; Jirecek, ii, 137-56) They played off one Ottoman prince against another, gave refuge to and used the Ottoman pretenders against any Ottoman prince whenever he became powerful enough to assert his sovereignty over them. Thus, the political manoeuvres of Mircea and the Byzantine Emperor Manuel II strongly influenced the struggle between the Ottoman princes. Except for MUIS, who adopted the policy of the frontier begs of recovering lost lands and engaging in raiding, the other princes, Suleyman and Mehemmed, involved themselves politically with the Christian rulers, often making compromises and concessions to them. All through the Ottoman interregnum—Byzantium plunged into a social role and managed to keep the respect of rival Ottoman princes. This was actually due to the fact that, after the treaty of 1403 (Denis, Treaty, Zachariadou, Suleyman, 270-83), the Byzantines controlled the sea passage between Anatolia and Rumi. Ottoman public opinion (see Anonymous Paris 1047, fol. 29b) interpreted the treaty of 1403 as such. When in 806/1403 Suleyman decided to remove the legitimate successor of Orkhan from the Ottoman throne as the legitimate successor of Suleyman.

Mehemmed’s final success depended a great deal on his conciliatory and even compliant attitude towards the Emperor, whom he called father (Ducas, ii, 114). Apparently, MUIS’s harsh personality, or rather, his centralist and autocratic policy, which the hereditary frontier begs resented, alienated them from him.

3. Unification and the resurgence of the Ottoman supremacy.

In 816/1413, upon his accession to the throne in Edirne as the sole ruler of the Ottoman lands, Mehemmed I received embassies from tribute-paying vassal countries, including Byzantium, Serbia, Wallachia, Yanina, the Morean despotate and the Prince of Achaia (Athens), and sent them back with strong guarantees of peace and friendship (Ducas, ii; Setton, ii, 6, cf. Anonymous Paris 1047, fol. 35a).

Feeling secure in the Balkans, Mehemmed made in the following two years a series of campaigns to reassert his sovereignty in Anatolia and to punish those amirs who had helped MUIS against him. In 817/1414 he made the whole of western Anatolia submit by defeating Djunayd, who, abandoning MUIS, had returned and revived his emirate of Izmir (Ducas, 115-19). The emirate was invaded and turned into an Ottoman sanjak. In this campaign, Germiyân, Menteşe, and the Genoese of Chios, Mytilene and Phoceca and the Hospitalers of Rhodes, were allied with Mehemmed on account of Djunayd’s aggressive acts. During this campaign, Mehemmed demolished the fortress which the Hospitalers had begun to construct again in Izmir. The ruler of Menteşe now recognised Mehemmed as suzerain (Wittek, Menteşe, 97).

In 816/1413, while Mehemmed was in Rumi preparing against MUIS, the Karamanids Mehmed II laid siege to Bursa and burned down the quarters around the castle (al-Makrizi, Suluk, iv, 47a; Negri, 141-2). Upon the news of Mehemmed’s victory over MUIS, the Karamanids retreated after a 31-day siege. Mehemmed at first proposed a campaign against Isfendiyar of Kastamuni, who however submitted in time, promising to send auxiliary forces to Mehemmed’s planned campaign against Karaman. Germiyân, which had been invaded by the Karamanids, was a natural ally and vassal (Negri, ii, 516-34). Prior to the major campaign against Karaman, Mehemmed sent an embassy with rich presents to the Sultan of Egypt, who was considered a protector of the Karamanids (Ibn Hâdîjî, ii, 518; letter from Inegöl, in Feridûn, i, 145, dated awâsîl Qiatis 3/317/817/February 1415). Mehemmed defeated the Karamanids and laid siege to Konya (Muhammar 818/13 March-11 April 1415). The Hamîd-îli and Sa‘îd-îli were annexed to the Ottoman state (Vakseski, 20, 56; al-Makrizi, iv, 51a).

With the Ottoman re-unification of Anatolia and Rumi under one ruler and that ruler’s attempts at re-imposing suzerainty on the former Ottoman vassal states, the Emperor increased his diplomatic activities in conjunction with the Pope and Venice, calling for
a crusade against the Ottomans (Barker, 290-353; Thiriet, ii, no. 1592). Profiting from the Ottoman interregnum, Venice had succeeded in extending her control in Epirus, Albania and the Morea. Negotiation for an agreement with Mehemmed after his final victory over his brothers dragged on unsuccessfully. During the campaign against Djunayd in 1414, the Venetian Duke of Naxos had not joined the other Aegean Latin rulers in the renewal of submission. So, in 1415, Mehemmed released the sea ghazis of western Anatolia against Venetian possessions in the Aegean, and sent his fleet of Gallipoli (112 ships, 13 of them galleys) under Calf Beg to strike at the Cyclades (Ducas, 119; Thiriet, ii, nos. 1563, 1564). Mehemmed's fleet and the Emperor (Thiriet, ii, nos. 1563, 1564). Mehemmed's fleet and the Emperor (Thiriet, ii, nos. 1563, 1564). Mehemmed's fleet and the Emperor (Thiriet, ii, nos. 1563, 1564). Mehemmed's fleet and the Emperor (Thiriet, ii, nos. 1563, 1564). Mehemmed's fleet and the Emperor (Thiriet, ii, nos. 1563, 1564). Mehemmed's fleet and the Emperor (Thiriet, ii, nos. 1563, 1564). Mehemmed's fleet and the Emperor (Thiriet, ii, nos. 1563, 1564). Mehemmed's fleet and the Emperor (Thiriet, ii, nos. 1563, 1564).

Mehemmed's brother Mustafa brought back internecine war in the Ottoman empire, which brought back internecine war in the Ottoman empire, which brought back internecine war in the Ottoman empire, which brought back internecine war in the Ottoman empire, which brought back internecine war in the Ottoman empire, which brought back internecine war in the Ottoman empire, which brought back internecine war in the Ottoman empire, which brought back internecine war in the Ottoman empire, which brought back internecine war in the Ottoman empire. Mehemmed had at the same time to deal with a Timurid plan becomes clear in Shahrūkh's preparations for a large-scale campaign in the west. First, he released Mustafa from captivity in Samarkand, an action which brought back internecine war in the Ottoman empire, which brought back internecine war in the Ottoman empire, which brought back internecine war in the Ottoman empire, which brought back internecine war in the Ottoman empire, which brought back internecine war in the Ottoman empire, which brought back internecine war in the Ottoman empire, which brought back internecine war in the Ottoman empire, which brought back internecine war in the Ottoman empire, which brought back internecine war in the Ottoman empire, which brought back internecine war in the Ottoman empire. Shahrūkh's protest against Mehemmed's elimination of his brothers (his letter to Mehemmed, Feridun, i, 150-1). In his reply, the latter tried to prove that he did not support the Karakoyunlu Kara Yusuf, and argued that the division of the Ottoman state only helped the enemies of Islam, many places including Salonica having been lost to Islam because of that division. Shahrūkh's preparstions for a large-scale campaign in the west in 1422/1419 caused great concern in the Ottoman capital and generated an exchange of embassies between the Kara Koyunlu and the Ottomans (Feridun, i, 150-7). Invading Adharbaydjan, Shahrūkh warned Mehemmed not to give refuge to the son of the defeated Rūm sultan who might take refuge in Ottoman territory (Dhu 'l-Hijjah 823/January 1420). In his reply, Mehemmed expressed his complete submission (farman-bar). The Ottoman court was meanwhile following in great anxiety the developments on the eastern frontier (see Taktakmir, 20, 56). Upon Iskandar's victory over the Ask Koyunlu Kara "Oğlan (Rabi' II 824/April 1421), Shahrūkh entered eastern Anatolia and won a crushing victory against Iskandar (Radjab 284/July 1421). All this time, Mehemmed was maintaining friendly relations with the Mamluks (Feridun, i, 145-6, 164-7), equally threatened by Shahrūkh. In his last years, Mehemmed appears to have fallen ill. Now his great concern was to secure the throne for his eldest son Murād without a crisis. Although Sülüymān's son Orkhan was blinded and kept in custody, Mehemmed's brother Mustafa was a serious rival, since he had actually been recognised as sultan by some of the Ottoman leaders and could be released by the Emperor at any time. Prince Murād's supporters spread the rumour that Mustafa had died and that the challenger was a false (duzme) Mustafa. To make sure of Murād's accession, Mehemmed showed himself most liberal toward the members of the ruling elite and made an agreement with the Emperor (Ducas, 129; for the agreement of the same nature with Stefan of Serbia, see Braun, 56-8) that Murād
Mehmed II, Ottoman sultan (reigned 848-50/1444-6 and 855-86/1451-81), called Abū l-Fath or Fatih "the Conqueror".

Considered the ultimate founder of the Ottoman Empire, he was born in Edirne on 27 Radžab 835/30 March 1432 as the fourth son of Murād II [q.v.] from a slave girl in the hareem, and as a youth was sent to the governorship of the province of Armania with his two lalaq [q.v.] in the spring of 846/1443. In Rabii' II 848/July 1444, at the age of twelve, he was recalled and declared sultan by his father, who abdicated in his favour in order to ensure his succession against Orkhan, an Ottoman pretender in Constantinople. Mehemmed's first sultanate, Rabī' II 848/July 1444-Đīumādā II 850/August 1448, witnessed a fierce rivalry for power between the grand vizier, Candarlı Fahtих, and the young sultan's two lalaq, Zaghānūz and İbrahim. While Candarlı, of 'ulamā' background, favoured a foreign policy of peace and compromise, Zaghānūz, who belonged to the military faction, advocated a programme of conquest—having particularly in mind the conquest of Constantinople—which would secure full authority to the young sultan and his lalaq. Because of the youth of the sultan and his inability to neutralise the rivalry among the two factions, the Ottoman state could not deal decisively with the fateful internal and external crises facing it (the Ḥurūf uprising in Edirne on 8 Đīumādā II 848/22 September 1444 and a Crusader army which crossed the Danube 4-8 Đīumādā II 848/18-22 September 1444). Everywhere in the Balkans the vassal rulers and seigneurs set about recovering their independence and lost territories. In panic, many Turks began to emigrate to Anatolia. However, Orkhan's attempt in the summer of 848/1444 to attract the frontier begars and to seize Edirne failed. While the Crusader army came to lay siege to Varna in Radžab 848/November 1444, Candarlı hastened to call the sultan's father with the Anatolian army to come and take command of the Ottoman forces. The Ottoman army was at Varna (28 Radžab 848/10 November 1444) created an ambiguity about who was really the sultan. Officially, Mehemmed II was still sultan, but Candarlı acted as if Murād had resumed the sultanate. Finally, by secretly inciting the Janissaries to rise, Candarlı brought Murād back to the throne in actuality (9 Đīumādā I 850/2 August 1446). Mehemmed was sent to the governorship of Manisa with his lalaq Zaghānūz and İbrahim. Although deposed, Mehemmed was treated by his supporters as still having the supreme power (see İnalık, Fathih deর, 102-9). Anxious to ensure his son's succession after his death, Murād II took Mehemmed with him to his major campaigns in the Balkans and against the Hungarians at Kossova in 852/1448, and against the Albanians in the summer of 854/1450. Murād married his son to Sitti Fahtих, the daughter of the Dhu 'l-Kādirid [see DHU 'L-KADR] ruler, who was traditionally considered an Ottoman ally against the Karamānids. It was only shortly thereafter that Mehemmed received the news of the death of his father; he ascended to the Ottoman throne for the second time on 16 Muharram 855/18 February 1451. In order to obtain concessions from Mehemmed, who was seen as an inexperienced young man, the Byzantine Emperor attempted to obtain further concessions by a second threat to release Orkhan. Mehemmed came to an agreement with the Karamānīd and quickly returned to Edirne to deal with this new challenge. Under the influence of Zaghānūz, he decided to put an end to the truncated Byzantine empire and began to make preparations for the conquest of Constantinople. As the construction of the Boghaz-Kesen castle on the Bosporus. Already agreements with Venice (13 Shāhān 855/10 September 1451) and Hungary (25 Shāwāl 855/20 November 1451) secured peace in the west and the hire of Urban, a Hungarian expert, who would make for Mehemmed the most powerful cannons ever seen in order to batter the city's legendary walls. In an extraordinary meeting in Edirne, where the decision for the siege was taken, Candarlı drew attention to the impregnability of the walls and the danger of a crusade from the West, while the war party, principally Zaghānūz and Şihāb al-Dīn, enthusiastically supporting the sultan's decision, emphasised the constant threat which Byzantium posed to the existence and unity of the Ottoman state. The outcome of the siege depended on the timely arrival of the Ottoman artillery. A long siege would give the Hungarian and Venetian forces the opportunity to come to the aid of the besieged. Thanks to the bombardment of the Ottoman heavy cannons, which tore down the walls, the whole siege took less than two months (26 Rabī' II 857/6 April 1453 until 20 Đīumādā I 857/29 May 1453; on the siege itself, now see sources collected and edited by Pertusi). The most dramatic moment during the siege was the failure of the Ottoman navy to bar the entry of provisions ships into the Golden Horn. At this critical point, defeatist rumours arose among the besiegers, and Candarlı advised the lifting of the siege. Zaghānūz and Ak Şams al-Dīn [q.v.], Mehemmed's spiritual mentor, emerged as strong supporters of the young sultan, who was being blamed by the Janissaries for lack of resolution by the soldiery. The preparations for the final general assault were made by Zaghānūz. On 20 Đīumādā I 857/29 May 1453, the city was taken by assault [see ISTANBUL]. I] and the consequences of an 'amānī conquest were inevitable [see HARĀB]. Mehemmed regretted the ruin of the imperial city, which he immediately declared his capital. Throughout his reign, one of his main concerns was to build and repopulate it [see ISTANBUL I]. The Podestà of the Genoese Pera [see GHALATA in Suppl.] surrendered sulhām on the same day. Mehemmed granted an 'ahd-nāme on 1 June 1453 which guaranteed amān [q.v.] and certain communal privileges for the indigenous non-Muslim population as 'ulāmā subjects of the Ottoman state and capitulary privileges for the Genoese merchants. Mehemmed's first acts after the victory were the arrest of Candarlı and the execution of Prince Orkhan, who had fought against Mehemmed on the walls. Zaghānūz was made grand vizier. By the conquest of Kustantiniyya al-Uzma [see KUSTANTINIYYA], as it was designated in Islamic tradition, Mehemmed II assumed an unprecedented charisma and claimed to be the sole 'holder of the sword of the ghaza' in the Islamic world (in his fathām to the Sultan of Egypt, Fawād, i, 236). Ghaza' became indeed the legitimising principle of the Ottoman sultan even against his Islamic rivals. Muslim rulers who resisted or challenged him...
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(Anatolian Turcoman rulers, the Ak Koyunlu Uzun Hasan [q.v.] and the Mamluk sultan of Egypt) were declared to be acting against the true interests of Islam by handing them over to ghazi activities. This assumption would lead the Ottomans to claim supremacy throughout the whole Islamic world in the 10th/16th century (see Camb. hist. of Islam, i, 320-3). Also, by declaring himself the Kayser, the sole heir to the Roman Empire, as the possessor of the imperial city, Mehemmed believed that he could eliminate all the members of the Byzantine imperial family (Ibn Kamal, vii, 86, 113) and lay claim to all the territories once under the eastern Roman Empire, including the Balkans, the southern coasts of the Crimea and Italy. Following Byzantine tradition, he claimed the supremacy of Constantinople over Rome, and his taking of Otranto in 885/1480 was considered a prelude to the conquest of Italy. The conquest of Rome, symbolised as Kilil Elma, the Golden Glove, remained as the ultimate goal for the Ottoman ghazi ideology. Mehemmed's use of historical traditions and images served as legitimation of his efforts at conquest. Again, in order to legitimise his campaigns to annex the Serbian despotate, he always cited his inheritance rights through the marriage of his predecessors with Serbian princesses [see a'azar]. On the other hand, the revival of the first Ottoman Empire as founded under Bayazid (791-804/1389-1402) definitely motivated the Conqueror in his conquests (Ibn Kamal, vii, 288).

Although his conquering activities were determined basically by his plan to build up a centralist empire in the Balkans and Anatolia, the course of his military actions followed historical circumstances (Babinger's work, Mehmed the Conqueror and his time, is the latest attempt at centralization and monograph of the event; for a review of it, see Inalcik, Mehmed, in Speculum, xxxv [1960], 408-27; A. Pertusi, La caduta; Inalcik, art. Mehmed II, in IA, v, 510-12). In the last analysis, Mehemmed's wars appear to have been motivated by his plan to establish his control of the Straits, the Black Sea and the Aegean, the Balkans north to the Danube and the principalities in the lower Danubian basin, as well as central Europe and the Ottoman capture of the area and the Uighurs. His main interest was in the west. During the fourteen-year period after 1453, Mehemmed made a series of campaigns in Europe to eliminate the Balkan dynasts: the Serbian despot (1454-9), the Greek despots and Latin seigneurs in the Morea and the Aegean and the Euphrates as the natural borders of his empire. By fortifying the Dardanelles and the Straits, the Conqueror in his conquests of the region. The Ottoman-Ak Koyunlu rivalry developed into an extremely dangerous crisis for Mehemmed, since Uzun Hasan [q.v.] and Venice attempted to make a common enemy of the Ottoman Empire and to bring together all the small states in the Levant into an anti-Ottoman coalition (Inalcik, art. Mehmed II, in IA, v, 523-9; Babinger, Mehmed, 267-327, Setton, op. cit., 315-45). Mehemmed's victory at Bash-kent (16 Rabii 1 886/3 May 1481), was against the Mamluks rather than against the Hospitallers of Rhodes.

Keeping Hungary and Venice neutral with peace talks over this period, 873-8/1468-73, Mehemmed focused his attention on central Anatolia, where the dynastic disputes among the Karamanids had given a pretext to the rising Ak Koyunlu (Woods, The Aqquyunlu, 100-14) to extend their influence in the region. The Ottoman-Ak Koyunlu rivalry developed into an extremely dangerous crisis for Mehemmed, since Uzun Hasan [q.v.] and Venice attempted to make a common enemy of the Ottoman Empire and to bring together all the small states in the Levant into an anti-Ottoman coalition (Inalcik, art. Mehmed II, in IA, v, 523-9; Babinger, Mehmed, 267-327, Setton, op. cit., 315-45). Mehemmed's victory at Bash-kent (16 Rabii 1 886/3 May 1481) was indeed a turning point in his whole career and confirmed the Ottoman annexation of the Karamanid territory (865/1469). However, it took six years to subdue the Turcoman tribes in the Taurus range. This also led to an open rivalry between Mehemmed and the Mamluks, who claimed a protectorate over the Karamanids and saw a challenge in Mehemmed's alliance with and protection of the Dhul-Kadrinds. It was said (Tursun Beg, Tavibâ, text, fols. 157b-158a) that Mehemmed's last campaign, on which he was engaged when he died (4 Rabii 1 866/5 March 1481), was against the Mamluks rather than against the Hospitallers of Rhodes.

Mehemmed II is the true founder of the classical Ottoman Empire, establishing its territorial, ideological and economic bases. Territorially, he organised his autocratic rule the lands between the Danube and the Euphrates as a centralised domain which remained for four centuries afterwards the solid core of the Ottoman Empire. Byzantine tradition and early Ottoman documents show how Mehemmed was able to establish full control over the Danube, the Straits, the Aegean and the Euphrates as the natural borders of his empire. By fortifying the Dardanelles and the
Bosphorus, he achieved a compact empire, duly taking the title of the sultan of the two continents, Anatolia and Rumelia, and the Kâbus of the two seas, the Black Sea and the Mediterranean. His centralist empire came into being by the suppression or reduction under central control of the local aristocratic landed families in the Balkans and Anatolia. Such families either became regular Ottoman timars-holders or were totally replaced by the sultan’s kuls [q. v.]. His sweeping “land reform” of 883/1478, in which a great number of the freehold (mâl) and wa’d lands in the control of such hereditary landlords were turned into state lands (see Inalcik, op. cit., at 533), constituted his major move in this direction. Also, by emerging as the greatest ghażâ, he overshadowed and reduced the autonomy of the principal frontier beg families who had thus far played a determining role in the empire’s politics [see MEHEMMED I and MURAD II]. In brief, Mehemmed II created in his person the typical autonomous Ottoman Pâdâlisâh.

In his efforts to establish a bureaucratic machinery, the principal tool of his centralist empire, Mehemmed employed indiscriminately experts of various origins, Persian Azeris, Arabs, Greeks, Jews, Italians, as well as native Ottoman Turks (râmis). In this, as attested by his Kânun-nâme [q. v.] of state organisation and by biographies of the mijâhâdâns [q. v.] and the defterdar [q. v.]s, the Turks must have played the major role, as before. However, such sâlama only made up a part of his bureaucracy, and were unable to interfere in the sultan’s autocratic and independent conduct of state affairs. Mehemmed appears to have been the first Ottoman, perhaps the first Muslim ruler, to codify state laws based on the ruler’s independent law-making power, “wa’d” [q. v.], apparently inspired by a Turkic-Mongol tradition. His two codes [see Kânûn-nâme] dealt with state organisation, penal law, and the relations of the state and the “military” class with the taxing subjects, the ra’âyâ. The latter law code, considered as the basis of a “just rule”, strictly defines the impositions upon the ra’âyâ. Mehemmed’s law codes remained the core and basis of subsequent Ottoman laws to the 19th century.

With the guidance of the great astronomer ‘Ali Kushdî [q. v.], Mehemmed also organised religious teaching (tâdrîs, kâdîf), and the sâlama hierarchy (târîk) in the Ottoman Empire. It was his unprecedented charisma as Abu ‘l-Fâth which enabled him, with the help of a host of talented leaders from East and West, to put into place a centralist bureaucratic empire perhaps never before so perfectly accomplished in Islamic history. His rationalistic and practical education under a legist, Mollâ Khoresh [q. v.], in his faith in the support of God and the inspiration of his shahâd, Aş Şams al-Dîn [q. v.], his espousal of a combination of Islamic and Roman imperial traditions, might explain his extraordinary accomplishments. But no less important in the foundation of the empire appears the fact that the peasant masses, exploited by the local rent-gathering landlords, military and religious, who were operating free from any control in the Balkans and Asia Minor, tacitly or openly welcomed the restoration of a strong centralist power as a guarantee of protection. The sultan’s edicts always professed that the imperial power was with the poor (yoksullar) against “the powerful” (kudretliler). His bureaucratic apparatus, the land surveys [see TAHRIR] and the law codes reveal emphatically the concern to maintain the supremacy of the state and its power, in possession of small farm plots, the so-called khâne bâ çift units. Mehemmed’s “abrogation”, makh, measures with respect to the exploitative wa’âds and mâls, meant more than just a military reform. It also meant the extension of state ownership and a closer protection and control by the state of the peasant producer and labourer against feudal exploitation.

On the other hand, the native urban populations, Greeks and Slavs, and the Orthodox Church, do not seem to have resented the establishment of the autocratic rule of the Ottoman padishah, who was seen as, and called, bâsalı or czaar. But Mehemmed was only following his predecessors, or in fact the Islamic tradition, when he re-installed the Greek Orthodox Church with all its traditional privileges as an integral part of the Ottoman imperial system (Muharram 858/January 1454), while he banned all Latin Catholic organisations, which were under the Roman papacy, from his dominions.

Autocratic principle, which made the sultan’s person the one and only source of authority and legitimation and claimed it as the foundation of both state and society (for this political theory expounded by Mehemmed’s contemporary Tursun Beg, see text, 2-17), found its full expression under Mehemmed II. The urban economy and the conditions of craftsmen and merchants, too, were regulated by the sultan through his establishment of bazaars, bedestân (bazâ-วัณสิน), kapi (kabûns), weighing stations (kânûr), custom houses (gaziâ), and the unrestricted issue of new silver coins, akâ, and prohibition of the use of the old ones, which was tantamount to taxing all cash capital in the hands of individuals, thus making a strong impact on the economy. Turning all rice-growing lands into state-owned properties and organising labour on them under close state control (Inalcik, Rise cultivation, 78-113) well demonstrates his autocratic handling of economic issues (for the basic source on his economic regulations, see Anhgger and Inalcik, Kânûn-nâmâ; also ISTANBUL, at IV, 531-4; Inalcik, Türkiye’nin ikitsadi vaziyeti, 676-84), Mehemmed fully espoused the theory that the monarch’s presuming to organise society and economy as complimentary to the state was based on the ruler’s ultimate duties of ghâzâ, making God’s word, Islam, ruling over the world, and man’s duty to guide and take care of his subjects’ well-being, conduct and salvation in this and the next world. As is repeatedly underlined in the sultan’s edicts, “the ra’âyâ were a trust (wa’dâ’s) of Allah to the ruler.” The Marxist interpretation, however, is that all these superstructural and ideological assumptions were designed to serve the exploitation of the direct producers by the Ottoman “feudal” state and classes (Moutafchieva, Agrarian relations; Wettner, Die Geburt, 273-358).

MEHMEHED II — MEHMEHED III

and his time, in Speculum xxxv (1960), 408-27; idem, art. Mehmed II, in IA, v, 506-35; idem, Fâhîr devrési üzerinde iktikâl ve vezîkarlar, Ankara 1954; idem, Rice cultivation and the Çeçikici-nâ'îm system in the Ottoman Empire, in Turcica, xiv, 69-141; idem, Türkiye’nün iktisadi vaziyeti, in Belleten, xv (1951), 629-90; idem, The rise of the Ottoman Empire, in Camb. hist. of Islam, i, Cambridge 1970, 295-323. (HA Hit Inalcik)

MEHMEHED III, thirteenth Ottoman Sultan (1003-12/1595-1603). He was the son of Murâd III [q.v.] and his Albanian Hâjîzâ, Safiyye [q.v.], born early in the first decade of Dhu ‘l-Ka‘da 973/29 May 1566 in the summer-camp on Bôzdâ near Manisa when his father was sangak-begi of Sarukhân, his birth being announced to his great-grandfather Sulaymân I [q.v.], who named the baby, at Pazarджik as he marched towards Hungary, on 13 Dhu ‘l-Ka‘da 973/1 June 1566 (Selinâki, 22).

After his father’s accession on 8 Ramadân 982/22 December 1574, he lived with his mother and sisters in the New Palace in Istanbul. In 990/1582 his cir-cumcision, to which monarchs of East and West had been invited, was celebrated with feasting and pageants of unrivaled magnificence (splendidly recorded in Topkapı Museum, ms. Hazine 1344), lasting from 6 Dümâdja I-3 Radjab/29 May-24 July, the operation being performed by Djêrâb Mehmed Pasha, the grand vizier, who was, in turn, performed on Terrâme the third day of Dümâdja/28 May.

Murâd’s law of fratricide promulgated by Mehemmed II on 22 Dhu ‘l-Ka‘da 991/7 October 1583 saw the Grand Vizier Damad Ibrahim Pasha reinstated as Grand Vizier at the behest of Safiyye. On 2 Dümâdja I/22 December the sultan entered Istanbul, with great rejoicing. However, the violence of the Djâlânî [q.v. in Supplement], dissatisfied elements who had gathered under Karâ Yaza’dî [q.v.], a rebellious press-gang leader conspiring for the campaign, together with the Firârî, Anatolian ispâhânî who had fled before the battle but thus had been deprived of their timâr, raged until 1603, devastating Anatolia. Peace initiatives were rejected by the Imperialists, who regained Raab on 21 Şâhâbân 1006/29 March 1598. During 1008/1599-1600 the deaths occurred of Sa‘d al-Din and the poet Bâkî [q.v.], and the murder of Safiyye’s Jewish Kira [q.v.].

After the fall of Gardi, the harem. A similar rising in the capital on 23 Radjab 1011/6 January 1603 took as victims two more Palace officials, Ghâdanfer Agha [see Karî Aqâsi] and ‘Othmân Agha. As the crippling war with the Empire dragged on, with the castle of Kaniza [q.v.] surrendering to the Ottomans on 13 Rabl 1009/22 October 1600, in 1012/1603 the Persian Shah ‘Abdâs I [q.v.] launched an offensive in the east, taking Tabriz on 19 Rabl/12/1603. On 27 Dhu ‘l-‘Hidjja 1011/7 June 1603 Mehemmed, in a fit of suspicious rage, ordered the execution of his eldest son Mahmûd; he lies buried, with his mother, in a mausoleum beside the Şeh-zade mosque. Consequently, the child Ahmad was to succeed his father, who died suddenly, probably after a heart-attack, on 17 Radjab 1012/21 December 1603. His mausoleum is beside Aya Sofya. He composed poetry under the name Aydîr. Selântâkl, in Cambridge history of Islam, i, 303.

Murâd’s harem, his dwarfs and jesters, were swept out for Egri [q.v.], which fell after a siege of three weeks on 19 Safar 1005/12 October 1596. On 3 Rabî‘ 1/25 October a great battle was fought on the plain of Mecîr-Keresâtes [q.v.], and the following evening the Ottomans, reinforced by a Tatar army under their Khân Feth Girîyâ, were victorious almost at the very moment of defeat, thanks to the strategy of Çiğhâlê-zêde Sinân Paşâ [q.v.], who was promoted Grand Vizier. The English ambassador Edward Barton was present on the campaign; he, his successor Sir Henry Lello, and the French ambassador François Savary de Brâcq were playing important roles in Ottoman policies.

During his first campaigns in Egypt, 1004–5/1596–7, Mehemmed, influenced by his father’s tutor Khoştâ Sa‘d al-Din Efendi [q.v.] and under pressure from the Janissaries, resolved to lead the army into Hungary, a custom abandoned since the reign of Sulaymân I. On 23 Şawwâl/20 June, with the Grand Vizier Dâmād Ibrahim Paşâ [q.v.], he set out for Egri [q.v.], which fell after a siege of three weeks on 19 Safar 1005/12 October 1596. On 3 Rabî‘ 1/25 October a great battle was fought on the plain of Mecîr-Keresâtes [q.v.], and the following evening the Ottomans, reinforced by a Tatar army under their Khân Feth Girîyâ, were victorious almost at the very moment of defeat, thanks to the strategy of Çiğhâlê-zêde Sinân Paşâ [q.v.], who was promoted Grand Vizier. The English ambassador Edward Barton was present on the campaign; he, his successor Sir Henry Lello, and the French ambassador François Savary de Brâcq were playing important roles in Ottoman policies.


The power in the state was at that time divided between the court, where the old waîide Kösem [q. v.] and Mehemmed's mother, the waîide Târkhân, held the reins, and the rebellious soldiery of the Janissaries and the Sipahis. The lack of stability in the government at this time is shown by the fact, that, until the nomination of the grand vizier Köprüîlû Mehemmed [see köprüülê] in 1066/1656, there were no less than thirteen grand viziers. In 1061/1651 the old waîide Kösem was strangled and at the same time the resistance of the Janissaries was broken; the régime of the court party that followed under the sultan's mother did not improve the situation. The grand vizierate of İshâr Muşafâ Paşa (1064-5/1654-5 [q. v.]), who at first seemed to be the strong man needed, was brought to an early end by his rival Murâd Paşa, and in the meantime the Cretan war against Venice was exhausting the resources of the Empire. In Dümâdâ I 1066/March 1656 a military rebellion forced the sultan to allow the execution of several of his favourite courtiers.

The real strong man proved to be Köprüîlû Mehemmed Paşa (vizier 1066-72/1656-61), who eliminated immediately the influence of the harem on state affairs and became until his death the real ruler of the empire. His régime began with a Turkish maritime defeat by the Venetians at the Dardanelles, but already in the following year he obtained as seizer successes in Transylvania and succeeded at the same time in establishing firmly Turkish authority in the Danube principalities; the collaboration with the Khân of the Crimea [see kânîm] was here of great value.

In 1068/1658 and 1069/1659 he was able to suppress rebellions in Anatolia, and in the Venetian war a great fleet of Venetian ships and other Christian allies did not succeed against the Turkish forces on Crete. After his death (1072/1661), he was succeeded in his office by his son Köprüîlû Ahmed Paşa, who completed the work of his father by carrying through the final conquest of Crete (surrender of Kanâdiyûsul [q. v.]. In Rabî' II 1080/September 1669) followed by peace with Venice. In 1071/1661 the war with Austria had begun again, where Sultan Mehemmed took part in several campaigns, notably that of 1073/1662, where the Austrian commander Czárkó (Zámky) was taken. In 1075/1664 took place the famous battle of St. Gotthard-am-Raab, where the Turks were beaten by an allied army, a part of which was formed by French troops; still, the peace concluded with Austria in 1075/1664 at Vasvár was favourable for Turkey. In 1083/1672 the sultan took part in the campaign against Poland, where the Ottoman army under Mustafa Pasha Merzifonlu [q. v.] overran Hungary and the Austrian main army was driven back to the border of Austrian Hungary (Kamzhe, Istanbul 1290; A. Tietze, Queen Elizabeth and the Levant Company, known as awdji Elizabeth and the Levant Company, ed S. M. Rosedale, Documents from Islamic chanceries, I, after p. 18; portrait, 73. For the circumcision

Mehemmed IV, nineteenth sultan of the Ottoman dynasty in Turkey, known as awdji Elizabeth and the Levant Company, known as awdji Elizabeth and the Levant Company, ed S. M. Rosedale, Documents from Islamic chanceries, I, after p. 18; portrait, 73. For the circumcision
hostilities with Venice had been reopened in the Morea (q.v.) and in the Archipelago.

All these disasters caused a revolt of the troops in the field; they marched on the capital in Di‘a‘u-Ka‘da 1390/September 1677 under Sivyugh Pasha of Aleppo. This time the sultan himself fell a victim to them, and was made to bear the responsibility for the defeats. To satisfy popular demands and to forestall further rebellions, Mehemmed was deposed on 2 Muḥarram 1399/9 November 1677 by the ka‘īm-makām Fādil Muṣṭafā Pasha Kōpūrūlī, the Shaikh al-Islām Dābbāgh-eza Mehemmed Efendi and other religious dignitaries. He was said to have received this decision gracefully, and he retired to his beloved Shaykh al-Fadfl Mustafa Pasha Koprulu, the Islam Muharram 1099/8 November 1687 by the kōrūm-nāme; Silahdēr Mehemmed Agha, Ta‘rīkh ‘Abd ‘Al-‘Azīz, Rawdat al-‘abrūr, Mehemmed Khālīfe, Ta‘rīkh-i Qhīmānī. These, some still in ms., are utilised by M. Cavid Baysun in his Arat. Mehemmed IV.


(M. J. KRAMERS*)

MEHEMMED V RESHĀD, thirty-fifth and penultimate Ottoman Sultan, was born on 2 November 1844, the son of Sultan ‘Abd al-Majid (q.v.). During the reign of his brother ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd II (q.v.) he lived in seclusion: his very existence inspired hopes that even the mention of the name Reshad had to be avoided in his presence (cf. Snouck Hurgronje, Vorbereite Geschriften, ii, 232). He was a man of mild character, who owed his acces-

sion to the throne (27 April 1909) to the victory of the Young Turks (the Committee of Union and Progress [see İttihat ve Terakki Cemiyeti]) over the Reactionaries who had briefly ejected them from power in "the incident of 31 March" (13 April 1909 in the Gregorian calendar), and to their subsequent decision to depose ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd II. Mehemmmed Reshad was a pious man; he felt particular sympathy for the leaders like Enwer Bey and Talat Pasha, whose government signed the peace treaties with Bulgaria (29 September 1913), Greece (14 November) and Serbia (14 March 1914). The Ottoman Empire thus lost all its European possessions west of the Meriç (q.v.) (Maritsa) river, and also the Aegean islands and Crete.

However, it was not the grand vizier, but Unionist Enver Pasha (q.v.) who came to control the destiny of the Empire. Enver’s pro-German views triumphed over the hesitations of the government, which had decided to stay neutral when the First World War broke out. A secret treaty was signed with Germany; the German battleships Goeben and Breslau were given refuge in the Straits (where they were formally handed over to the Ottomans); and finally, the Ottoman fleet under the command of the German admiral Souchon bombarded Russian harbours in the Black Sea (29 and 30 October 1914). This led to the Allied declaration of war, in which Enver Paşa became Deputy Commander-in-Chief (deputising nominally for the Sultan), while Ta‘fat Pasha became grand vizier in February 1917. Initial Ottoman offensives were repelled (Sarıkamış operation against the Russians; Suez operation against the British), but the Turks successfully defended the Dardanelles (the Allied forces which had landed on the Gallipoli peninsula were all withdrawn by January 1916); they were at first successful in I‘rāk (surrender of General Townsend at Kut al-‘Amāra (q.v.), April 1916), and fought also in Palestine, Macedonia and Galicia. Before the end of the war, as Ottoman armies were being gradually worn down and while the country was prey to increasing privations, Mehemmmed V died on 8 November 1918. His last official functions were to welcome the Austr-
Hungarian Emperor Charles on a state visit to Istanbul in May, and, a few days before his death, to visit the Prophet's relics at the Topkapı Palace. He was a sad and ineffective figure: "Is Edirne ours?", he asked after the city had been recaptured; and his comment on the effects of the Great War was "The Palace excelled in two things: prayers and food. Both have gone off" (Görür işıktıklarım, 269, 268).

Bibliography: The events of the reign are related in all standard histories, e.g. S.J. Shaw and Ezel Kural Shaw, History of the Ottoman empire and modern Turkey, ii, Cambridge, 1977; 8:Levels, The emergence of modern Turkey, Oxford 1961, and there are references to Mehemmed V Reshad in many memoirs, especially those of his two Chief Secretaries: Halid Ziya Uşakligil, Saray ve ʻıleti, Istanbul 1965, and Ali Fuad Türkügeli, Görür işıktıkları, Ankara 1951, and of his Chief Chamberlain, Lütfi Simavi, Osmanlı sarayının son günleri, Istanbul n.d. (the edition in modern Turkish of his Sultan Mehemet Resad ve ihanetinin sarayında gördüklerim). The Sultan's decrees appointing grand viziers, as well as biographies and evaluations of the latter, are to be found in Ibnilemin Mahmud Kemal İnal, Osmanlı devrinde son sadrazamlar, Istanbul 1966. See also P. Mansel, Sultans in their splendour: the last years of the Ottoman world, London 1988; IA art. Mehmed Resad (Ertiş Ziya Usukgil, Saray ve ʻıleti, iii, 2054-5).


MEHEMMED VI WAHİD AL-DİN (Wahdeddin), thirty-sixth and last Ottoman Sultan, was born on 14 January 1861. He was the son of Sultan ʻAbd al-Majid [q. v.] and succeeded to the throne on 3 July 1918, after the death of his brother Mehemmed V Reshad [q. v.], the former heir to the throne Yusuf ʻızz al-Din, son of Sultan ʻAbd al-ʻAziz, having died in 1916. In November of the same year, Wahdeddïn, as the new heir, represented the Sultan at the funeral of the Unionist grand vizier Talat Pasha, to reach an accommodation with Mustafa Kemal's nationalists, who moved their headquarters to Ankara on 27 December, came to an end when the Allies placed Istanbul under military occupation on 16 March, and arrested a number of nationalist sympathizers. On 5 April, Wahdeddin re-appointed Dâmid Ferid Pasha as grand vizier, overruling contrary advice with the words "If I so desire, I can appoint the Greek or the Armenian patriarch, or the Chief Rabbi" (Ali Fuad Türkügeli, Gürür işıktıkları, 261). On 11 April the Sultan dissolved parliament, which had itself decided to adjourn. On the same day, the Şeyhülislâm ʻAbd Allâh Dürri-zade issued a number of fatwas outlawing the nationalist resistance in Anatolia (texts in Ibnilemin Mahmud Kemal İnal, Osmanlı devrinde son sadrazamlar, xiii, 2054-5).

Nevertheless, a number of deputies from the dissolved parliament made their way to Ankara and, together with other nationalist representatives, met as the Grand National Assembly (Büyük Millet Meclisi) on 23 April, which selected its own government (İdris ʻIkkililer Heyeti, Committee of Executive Commissioners) from among its own members. However, the Assembly sent a petition to Wahdeddin in which it proclaimed its decision to repudiate by the Grand National Assembly the peace treaty of Sevres on 10 August 1920 was repudiated by the Grand National Assembly. After the first major nationalist victory against the Greeks at the first battle of İnönü, the GNA voted a new constitution on 29 January 1921 which was based on popular sovereignty. Allied moves to establish contact with the Ankara government led to the resignation and departure for Europe of Dâmid Ferid Pasha, drawing from the Sultan the comment "The rascal brought the state to these straits and then left" (Son sadrazamlar, xiii, 2067). Tewfik Pasha, who became grand vizier for the last time (21 October 1920), deferred to the representatives of the Ankara government at the unsuccessful London conference in February-March 1921.

The final success of the nationalists, whose forces defeated the Greeks and entered İzmir on 9 September 1922, brought about the armistice of Mudanya [q. v.] (11 October 1922), to which the Sultan's government was not a party. A nationalist
commissioner, Refet Paşa, arrived in Istanbul and warned the Sultan to confine himself to the palace and receive no visitors, advice which the Sultan disregarded (Son sadrazamlar, xiv, 2097-8). Matters were brought to a head when the Allies invited the Sultan’s government, along with the Ankara government, to send delegates to the peace conference in Lausanne. Rejecting any rival government, the GNA passed a law on 1 November 1922, separating the offices of sultan and caliph, and declaring the Ottoman sultanate abolished from 16 March 1920 (the date of the Allied occupation of Istanbul). Tewfik Paşa resigned accordingly on 4 November. At his last āmūz in 10 November, which was attended by a handful of courtiers, Wahdeddin was given only the title of caliph in the ǧulta. Believing his life to be in danger, he asked the British commander General Sir Charles Harington to arrange his departure abroad. He was smuggled aboard HMS Malay and left Turkey on 17 November 1922. The next day, the GNA divested him of the caliphate, in favour of his uncle ʿAbd al-Majid, son of Sultan ʿAbd al-ʿAziz. Having gone first to Malta, the ex-Sultan proceeded to Mecca as the guest of King Husayn. From here he launched a proclamation to the Islamic world, in the date of the Allied occupation of Istanbul. Tewftik Turkish forms of the name Muhammad in this shariʿa caliphate from the sultanate was contrary to the Abd al-Madjid, son of Sultan Abd al-ʿAziz. Uncle GNA divested him of the caliphate, in favour of his son Mecca as the guest of King Husayn. From here he launched a proclamation to the Islamic world, in which he maintained that the separation of the caliphate from the sultanate was contrary to the ʿshārīa (text in OM, ii, 702-5). This appeal found hardly any response in the Islamic world. The last Ottoman Sultan left Mecca again, and went to live in San Remo, where he died on 16 May 1926. In 1924, he had even recognised King Husayn’s claim to the caliphate. wahdeddin has been described by his courtiers as short-tempered, pious, intelligent, but fearful, hesitant and unwise in his judgments, above all in the trust which he placed in his brother-in-law Damad Ferid Paşa. Throughout his reign he paid lip-service to the Ottoman constitution, while being inspired by a desire to secure the survival of the dynasty. He had not studied Arabic and Persian, but was credited with a knowledge of fikr. He was fond of music, and composed Turkish songs. His failure to grow a beard after his accession was considered a break with tradition. Refet Ersoy (1873-1936), persuaded ʿAkif to compose a stirring Independence March (İstiklal marchi), which was immediately adopted as the Turkish National anthem. He was still concerned, also, with religious affairs, as a member of an Islamic research committee (Tebkât uswet il-īslāmîyye endûrûm) in the Ministry of the ʿshārīa and Ewkef. But as a devout Muslim and convinced Pan-Islamist, he became increasingly concerned about the trend of events after the Nationalist triumph, with the abolition of the caliphate in March 1924, the abolition of the office of ʿshārī of Islam, of the Ministry of the ʿshārīa and Ewkef, and of the ʿshārīa itself, and of the closing of all the madrasas in the spring of 1924. Unlike the ideologist of Pan-Turkism, Diyaʾ (Ziya) Gök Alp [q.v.], ʿAkif was unable to adjust his ideas to the new, secularist Nationalist ideals, for he had still hoped that the new Turkey could be the focus of Pan-Islamic aspirations. In the 1923 elections, he did not get a seat in the GNA, and at the age of 50 was jobless and virtually penniless. Hence in October of that year, he left for Egypt to stay with an old friend, the Egyptian Prince ʿAbbas Halîm (d. 1934), and in 1925 settled there, teaching Turkish in Cairo, but by now, as a disappointed man, producing little of his own literary work. He returned to Istanbul after eleven years, a sick man, and died there on 27 December 1936. Already as a student, ʿAkif had been a voracious reader of the Islamic classics, with a particular love for the poetry of Fudûlî, Ibn Fârid and above all Saʿdî, and also of French Romantic literature. He published Turkish translations of the Persian classics in the Thaer-î Fûnin from 1898 onwards, and his own poetry in the Resimli Gazete from 1896 onwards. After 1904, he seems really to have found his artistic feet, and he began to write Persian and Arabic poems, showing a sympathy with the depressed classes of society,
but was unable to publish these in the period of the Hamidian censorship, until the Revolution of July 1908 opened the floodgates for publication. Akif and his friend Esref Edib began to publish the Şair-i Müstakbal, a conserving journal concentrating on religious and social topics; this periodical soon began to have a wide circulation amongst the Turkish peoples outside the Ottoman lands, including in Russia, and later changed its name to the Şehit-i İstiklal. At the same time as he put forward his ideas of Pan-Islamism, he also acquired an interest in Islamic modernism, studying the works of Muhammed Abduh and of Dżamal al-Dīn al-Afghanī with the professor Lahmet İmam who decided to commission a new translation of and commentary on his first book, the Kur'an. Although Akif was persuaded, with some misgivings connected with his firm belief in the basic untranslatability of the Holy Book, to undertake the actual translation, but after spending several years of his stay in Egypt at the task, retracted what he had written, fearing that his translation might be used as a part of Atatürk's Turkicization plans in religious matters; the eventual fate of his translation remains a mystery to this day.

Mehmed Akif was thus an enthusiastic Muslim but not a fanatic, a conservative in politics who nevertheless openly proclaimed his detestation of the Western modernists, and even Western classical music. From 1911 onwards, he began publishing collections of his poetry as Şafihat ("Phases"), with a total of seven volumes, the last, entitled Gâbler ("Memories") (1915), whose atheistic poem Tarih-i Kadası ("Ancient history") he regarded as corrupting Turkish youth. Akif also engaged in translating the Kur'an into Turkish, and this remains a controversial episode in his life. The successor to the Ministry of Şair-i, the Directorate of Religious Affairs (Diyânî İhtisab Rûûeti) decided to commission a new translation of and commentary on the Kur'an. Akif was persuaded, with some misgivings connected with his firm belief in the basic untranslatability of the Holy Book, to undertake the actual translation, but after spending several years of his stay in Egypt at the task, retracted what he had written, fearing that his translation might be used as a part of Atatürk's Turkicization plans in religious matters; the eventual fate of his translation remains a mystery to this day.

Mehmed Akif was thus an enthusiastic Muslim but not a fanatic, a conservative in politics who nevertheless openly proclaimed his detestation of the Western modernists, and even Western classical music. From 1911 onwards, he began publishing collections of his poetry as Şafihat ("Phases"), with a total of seven volumes, the last, entitled Gâbler ("Memories") (1915), whose atheistic poem Tarih-i Kadası ("Ancient history") he regarded as corrupting Turkish youth. Akif also engaged in translating the Kur'an into Turkish, and this remains a controversial episode in his life. The successor to the Ministry of Şair-i, the Directorate of Religious Affairs (Diyânî İhtisab Rûûeti) decided to commission a new translation of and commentary on the Kur'an. Akif was persuaded, with some misgivings connected with his firm belief in the basic untranslatability of the Holy Book, to undertake the actual translation, but after spending several years of his stay in Egypt at the task, retracted what he had written, fearing that his translation might be used as a part of Atatürk's Turkicization plans in religious matters; the eventual fate of his translation remains a mystery to this day.

Mehmed Emin, who continued his education, as was still possible at that time, by serving, without pay, in the chancery of the office of the grand vizierate (Sadret Eunuk Kalemi). In 1888 he married Müzeyyen Kâşânî, from a notable family of Kahta-Hı bás-ı Şarkî (modern Şebinkarahisar), in north-eastern Anatolia, which he visited several times, sometimes for long periods and where he enriched his observations on the plight of the Anatolian peasantry. In 1889 he registered at the School of Law (Mektebi-ı hukuki) which he abandoned two years later for an opportunity of studying further in America, which he did not eventually materialize. While still a student in the Law School, he published his first book (see below) and sent a copy to the grand vizier Dâewâd Pasha [q.v.], on whose recommendation he was appointed (1890) as a clerk of the secretariat of the Custom’s office (Rüşûmat emnâtesi tahribâtı kalemi). Two years later he became director of the archives (târikh nâmeleri) of the same office, where he remained for 15 years. In 1907, he became a member of the secret revolutionary Committee of Union and Progress (CUP [see İttihat we Terakî] dîevât-yi tawarîh). The same year, he was sent to Erzurum, in Eastern Anatolia, as superintendent of the customs (rüşûmat nâmeleri) which, under the Hamidi regime, amounted to political exile. The Sultan had become suspicious of his choice of subjects in his poems, particularly his insistence on the poor (see below).

After the restoration of the Constitution in July 1908, he was transferred to Trabzon with the same office. After a short service as counsellor at the Ministry of Marine and as governor (waâli) of the Hidây (1909) and Sivas (1910), he resigned and joined in Istanbul the Turkist movement (see B. Lewis, Emergence, 243-52 and Tâhâ Dağlı), and was made president of the Turkish Hearths [see Türk odârû] in 1911. He soon set up another Turkist association, the Türk Yurdu ("Turkish Home"). As he was preparing to publish the organ of the association, with the same name, which later became famous as the organ of the Turkish Hearths (see Türk Yurdu), he was appointed governor of Erzurum. In the meantime, he expressed in many writings, his disappointment with the CUP and his disagreement with its arbitrary and despotic actions of the administration. He was retired from Government service in 1912. Elected deputy for Mawsil (Mosul), he settled in Istanbul and continued his literary and patriotic activities. He witnessed the collapse of the Empire and the occupation of Istanbul by the Allies. He joined the Nationalist government of Ankara in April 1921, which sent him on a special mission to Antalya and Adana where he stayed until the end of the War of Liberation, when he went to İzmir to join Muştafa Kemal Pasha (Atatürk [q.v.]) with whom he returned to Ankara (September 1922). He was elected deputy for Şarkî Karabaşâr. Later, he continued to serve in Parliament as deputy for Urfa and Istanbul. He died in Istanbul on 14 January 1944. During the last years of his life, he had been collaborating with the Turkish Historical Society in Ankara (to which he donated all his personal archives) to prepare a revised and critical edition of his complete works (see Bibl.).

Mehmed Emin who, following the law on surnames, took in 1934 the family name of Yurîdakül ("slave of the fatherland"), was known in his lifetime as Miîli şârî or Türk şârî Mehmed Emin ("Mehmed Emin, the national poet or Turkish poet par excellence"), as he consistently wrote in the spoken Turkish of ordinary people and used exclusively the syllabic metre of folk poems as opposed to the Arabo-Persian prosody (şârîf) of both old and most modern poets of his day [see Bûkûr, Köâa twekîr, in Suppl.] and devoted all his literary work to his country and its people, their plight, their misfortunes and their glory. He completed his personality and private life. He published his first book (a short essay), while a law student in 1308 A.H./1891, Fadîlet we aşılet ("Virtue and nobility"), in which he claims that real virtue and nobility are not necessarily hereditary but are rather obtained by a person’s talent, diligence and spiritual maturity. As was customary at the time, he sent the book to several literary authorities, who all wrote complimentary takrîfs (presentation pieces) which were written with the book. Mehmed Emin’s first published poem Köyde firîna ("Storm in the village") appeared in Reşimî Qâzise of 5 October 1311 A.H./17 October 1895, which was confiscated before distribution (Akâraqoglu Yusuf, Türk yill, Istanbul 1928, 387, where the date is wrongly given as 1903); it was reprinted in Mu'tebes, no. 10, 1317 A.H./1900. This remarkable poem, with its social implications and which contains most of the characteristics of his later poems, with typical language, style and content, was written as the height of the famous westernist Terwet-i Funûn [q.v.] literary movement, which was linguistically conservative to the degree of precisity and which disdained the "finger counting" (parmak-î dîevât-yi fûrûz) metre of the "ignorant bards". Although almost all the sources, including the poet himself, assert otherwise, it seems chronologically probable that the young poet read this particular poem to Dâmil al-Din al-As'îî [q.v.], who recommended him to continue (see below). Several poems of the same type, published in various periodicals, including in the Terwet-i Funûn itself, immediately before and during the April-September 1897 war with Greece, particularly the one called Anadolu'dan bir ses yâhûd dîevat-geden ("A voice from Anatolia, or Going to war") published previously but in the same year in the newspaper Asrî ("Century") in Salonica, made a sensation in Turkey, among the Muslim Turks in Russia and among orientalists abroad (see Bibl.; for a correct text of this poem, see Nizîhether Hâşîn, Millî edebiyeti tarihi, Istanbul, 1920, 737-38). Although there was a long but often ignored tradition of simple, straightforward Turkish prose (see Fahr Ifz, Ottoman and Turkish, in Essays in Islamic civilisation presented to Niyazi Berkes, ed. D. P. Little, Leiden 1976, 118-39), a similar but occasional movement to write simple, pure, common or exclusive Turkish (basî, sâde, kaba, ışîf, yahîsî türkî) verse always existed also (for a detailed discussion of this subject, see Körpûlû-zade Mehmed Fuâd, Millî edebiyeti dîevat-ı hukuki in mîrîbût-ı hukuki ve dîevat-yi şûsî, Istanbul 1928, Roman script edition in Edebiyat arşîmatılar, published by T.T.K., Ankara 1966, 271-315). The Türkîmân writers claimed that simple, everyday Turkish was necessary to communicate with the public, but did not apply their principle except in a few pieces. The revolutionary and journalist Ali Suâwî [q.v.] and the publicist and novelist Ahmed Midhat [q.v.] did write a remarkably simple language, and their associates gave occasional examples of simple Turkish verse. But as the famous lexicographer and writer Şems el-Dîn Sâmî [q.v.], who was the most conscious and advanced of them, admitted in an article, greeting the publication of Mehmed Emin’s first book of poems Türkîde şârîer ("Poems in Turkish") (see below), "...although Türkîmân writers talked and wished to write in simple Turkish, it was Mehmed Emin who carried it out, and
this book was the foundation stone of future Turkish literature" (Sabah, 1 March 1313 Rumi/13 March 1899). The British orientalist E.W. Gibb congratulated Mehmed Emin warmly in a letter in Turkish of 6 June 1899, in which he said "... The Turk has found his natural voice... your predecessors imitated the Persians and the French. You expressed the feeling of your countrymen in their own language. Six centuries have been waiting for you..." (the original letter is in the Mehmed Emin Archives, in the Turkish Historical Society, Ankara). Like the preceding examples in the dictionary of the 19th century poets Nedim [q.v.] and Gahlib Dede [q.v.] and in most of the 19th century poets, there seems to be a latent desire to express themselves occasionally in everyday Turkish and sometimes in syllabic metre. These examples seem to multiply particularly in the works of minor poets during the last decades of the century [see Turks. Literature]. However, as Shems ed-Din Sāmī points out in the above-mentioned article, Mehmed Emin's work was not a random experiment. It was the beginning of a conscientious, systematic and lasting movement. So much so that his colleague and biographer Akchuraoghlu Yusuf [see YUSUF, AKCHURA] says that A voice from Anatolia can be called the manifesto of linguistic Turkish (Akchuraoghlu, op. cit., 391). This current was enriched with the deeply felt lyricism and more inspired poems of Ridda Tewfik (Böhmhojghi), who, during the ensuing violent controversy between the partisans of simple Turkish and those who supported the fashionable Mischsprache of the leading poets and writers, became his most enthusiastic defender (see Nizhet Hāshim, op. cit., 7-10; Akchuraoghlu, op. cit., 387-91). This "simple Turkish" movement spread to the provinces and was supported by several minor writers, including Mehmed Nedjī [see Tahir Alangu, Ömer Seyfettin, Istanbul 1968, passim] who had launched a similar movement independently in İzmir, culminated in April 1911, in Salonica, with the "New language" (Yeni lisan) movement of Ömer Seyf el-Din [q.v.] which Diya'ī (Ziya) Gökalp [q.v.], espoused and propagated among young poets and writers, setting up a new literary current, the "National literature" (millî edebiyyet djereydni) (see Turks. Literature). Mehmed Emin candidly admits his association with Djamal al-Afghānī and the latter's influence on the beginning of a conscientious, systematic and lasting development of his ideas. The standard biographies of the 19th century poets, including Nedjī and Ghalib Dede [q.v.], are usually silent on his unofficial Turkish connections (see, e.g., Nikki R. Keddie, Sayyidjamāl, 1976). Mehmed Emin's other poems, published in various periodicals but not included in his books, have been collected in F.A. Tansel (see Bibliography), while most of them have been published recently in different periodicals. Two of them are taken from the preceding. The majority of the poems dwell upon social problems. Some are inspired by the Pan-Turkist movement of the second decade of the century. The following three works contain patriotic poems written during the First World War:

1. Türkçe şehrleri ("Poems in Turkish") Istanbul 1316 A.H./1918;
2. Türk sazi ("Turkish sazi") Istanbul 1330 rami/1914; contains 191 poems written between 1896 and 1914, most of them published previously in different periodicals. Two of them are taken from the preceding. The majority of the poems dwell upon social problems. Some are inspired by the Pan-Turkist movement of the second decade of the century.

The following two works contain his poems written during the War of Liberation (1919-22):

3. Türk vecw ("Turk, wake up.") Istanbul 1330 rami/1914;
4. Tan seleri ("Voices of dawn") Istanbul 1331 rami/1915;
5. Ordunun destanı ("The epic of the army"). Istanbul 1334 rami/1918.

6. Yassına dagrın ("Towards Turan"), poems written during the last years of the First World War and inspired by Pan-Turanism. The following two works contain his poems written during the War of Liberation (1919-22):

7. Aydın kızları ("The daughters of Aydın"). Ankara 1921, 3rd edn. as Mustafa Kemal, Istanbul 1928; and

Mehmed Emin's other poems, published in various periodicals but not included in his books, have been collected in F.A. Tansel (see Bibliography).

Bibliography: In addition to references given in the article, see Körpüülü-zade Mehmed Fuşad, Mehmed Emin Beg, in Neosol-i Millî, Istanbul 1330 rami/1914, 159-61; Rüştü Eşref, Diyarbakŗ, Istanbul 1918, 157-67 and passim; Ridda Tewfik, Emin Beg see Emin Beg türkçesi, in Türk Yurdu, i/v (1912); Ulûg İlgemîn, Mehmet Emin Yardıcal, in Ayık Anıskloplu, no. 10 (February 1945), 321-3; Ahmet İhsan, Matbuat hatıraları, i, Istanbul 1930, 10 ff.; Kenan Akyüz, Batt testrinde Türk şiiri antolojisi, Ankara
1970, 499-533; Ağâh Sirri Levend, Türk dilinde gelisme ve sadâdesine evelerî Ankara 1972, index; B. Lewis, The emergence of modern Turkey, Oxford 1968; Hilmi Ziya Ulken, Türkîye'de çoğalsız dodge以來 tarihî İstanbul 1979, index; Fevziye Abdullah Tansel, Mehmed Emin Efendi, in: T.K.R.T. Ankara 1969 (based on two files, prepared by the poet himself, in collaboration with Ulûg İğdemir of the Turkish Historical Society; contains M.E.'s collected works in verse with his own corrections and alterations. A promised second volume, which should contain a detailed biography, his prose writings and his translations, has not yet [November 1984] been published); for al-Afghanî's Turkish connections, see Osman Ergin, Türkîye maarrî tarihi, İstanbul 1939, passim; Osman Kesküıoğlu, Çinâledîn Efğânî, in: İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi, x (1962), 91-102; Niayarikes, The development of secularism in Turkey, Montreal 1964, index; for translations from M.E.'s works into foreign languages, see O. Spies, Die moderne türkische Literatur, in: Handbuch der Orientalistik, vi, Leiden 1963, 360 ff. (Faîer 12).

MEHMED ES'AD [see ES'AD EFENDI; GHAİL DEDÊ]

MEHMED GÎRAY, DERWİSH MEHMED GÎRAY b. Mûbarek Giray Çingizî, member of the Crimean Giray [q.v.] dynasty, probably a brother of Khân Murâd Giray (1268-83) and historian. His chronicle, Ta'rihi-i Mehmed Gîray, preserved in the unique ms. H.O. 86, Austrian National Library, Vienna (Flügel, Catologue, ii, 277-8), deals with Ottoman and Crimean history from 1094/1682 to 1115/1703, from Crimean khanate and the Ottoman Empire was at that time still largely a corollary of the relationship between the Grand Prince Vasiliy III (1505-33) had created a new power among the heirs of the Golden Horde. Mehmed Pursued his education under well-known scholars such as Yanyaî Efğad Khodja and Bursâli Ismaîîl Hakkî, received a certificate of competence in calligraphy from Suyoðdju-zâde Nöçî Efendi, author of the Da'âbît al-kâtîbât, spent some fifteen years in Egypt and became an adept of Sezâî Hasan Efendi, founder of the Sezâî branch of the Gullîken mystical order (tarşıfî). Despite having completed a very specialised training, Mehmed decided to forego a career in the theological field and instead filled successive positions as trainee (gîhâfî) in the secretarial bureau of the Grand Vizierate, beginning in 1155/1742 as assistant to the chief at the Arsenal (tersââne), followed in quick succession by posts such as bureau chief in the treasury department of imperial estates (gûcîlar mukaddam) in 1164/1753, chief secretary of the regiment of the armourers (dërebîliler kâtibi) in 1172/1759, chief secretary of the cavalry regiments (sipahiîlî kâtibi) in 1174/1761, and a second appointment as dërebîgîlî kâtibi in 1176/1763. In addition to these secretarial positions in the departments of the treasury, Hâkim was appointed official court chronicler (waq'î-nâwî) from 1 Regêb 1160/4 May 1753, when this position was vacated through the incumbent 'îzî Sûleyâm Efendi's resignation prior to his performing the pilgrimage to Mecca. Hâkim strove to record all the events from the date of his appointment in 1753 until his resignation in mid-1180/October-November 1766. Four years later, on the night of Raghâb 1181/25-6 October 1770, he died and was buried in the cemetery of Ayvîrok Çeçênîsî in Haydar Pâsha (see B. Kellner-Hunkele, Ayrillk Ceshmesi in Haydar Pâsha (see B. Kellner-Hunkele, Ayrillk Ceshmesi in Haydar Pâsha). His other literary works was recognised by his contemporaries (see the lists of his works in Bursâli Mehmed Tâhir, 'Othmânî mûalîfleri, İstanbul 1333, ii, 142, and Kütükoğlu, op. cit., 74-5. See also Rûhî-i Boghâdî tarikî-i bendîne nâzîre, Ist. Univ. Libr. İstanbul 1352, fols. 100b-105a, the Nofat al-da'ât ve Vîşfî, a compendium to the nomadic Nagû [q.v.] tribes of the region. In 1521 he refused Sultan Sülaymân Kânünî's [q.v.] order to join him in a campaign against Hungary, and instead, led a great expedition against Muscovy, which so far had been on friendly terms with the Ottomans.应注意梅赫梅德·吉拉伊的终身斗争，最终没有成功。他被赋予了指挥天课对克里米亚的统治者卡扎恩以及阿斯特拉罕（1523）的干预。被克里米亚的民族，他所被赋予了其无情，不忠诚和放纵的生活，他被暴君和他的努格亚联盟。

Bibliography: The main source for Mehmed Giray I is A. Bennigsen and ali (eds.), Le Khanoat de Crimée dans les Archives du Musée du Palais de Topkapi, Paris 1978, with further references; V. D. Smirnov, Krymskoe khanstvo pod verkhovenstvom otomanskoy porfi do naûla XVIII veka, St. Petersburg 1887; S. M. Solov'ev, Istoriya Rossii s drevneyших vremen, iii, Moscow 1960, sq. Magnut-Gîray, based on N. M. Karamzin's history of the Russian Empire. (B. Kellner-Hunkele)

MEHMED HAKİM EFENDI, 18th century Ottoman literary personality, statesman and official court chronicler (waq'î-nâwî). Born in İstanbul, his father was sayyid Şahî Efendi, known as “Emir Çelebi the knife-maker (biçakçı)”. Mehmed pursued his education under well-known scholars such as Yanyaî Efğad Khodja and Bursâli Ismaîîl Hakkî, received a certificate of competence in calligraphy from Suyoðdju-zâde Nöçî Efendi, author of the Da'âbît al-kâtîbât, spent some fifteen years in Egypt and became an adept of Sezâî Hasan Efendi, founder of the Sezâî branch of the Gullîken mystical order (tarşıfî). Despite having completed a very specialised training, Mehmed decided to forego a career in the theological field and instead filled successive positions as trainee (gîhâfî) in the secretarial bureau of the Grand Vizierate, beginning in 1155/1742 as assistant to the chief at the Arsenal (tersââne), followed in quick succession by posts such as bureau chief in the treasury department of imperial estates (gûcîlar mukaddamî) in 1164/1753, chief secretary of the regiment of the armourers (dërebîgîlî kâtibi) in 1172/1759, chief secretary of the cavalry regiments (sipahiîlî kâtibi) in 1174/1761, and a second appointment as dërebîgîlî kâtibi in 1176/1763. In addition to these secretarial positions in the departments of the treasury, Hâkim was appointed official court chronicler (waq'î-nâwî) from 1 Regêb 1160/4 May 1753, when this position was vacated through the incumbent 'îzî Sûleyâm Efendi's resignation prior to his performing the pilgrimage to Mecca. Hâkim strove to record all the events from the date of his appointment in 1753 until his resignation in mid-1180/October-November 1766. Four years later, on the night of Raghâb 1181/25-6 October 1770, he died and was buried in the cemetery of Ayvîrok Çeçênîsî in Haydar Pâsha (see B. Kellner-Hunkele, Ayrillk Ceshmesi in Haydar Pâsha). His other literary works was recognised by his contemporaries (see the lists of his works in Bursâli Mehmed Tâhir, 'Othmânî mûalîfleri, İstanbul 1333, ii, 142, and Kütükoğlu, op. cit., 74-5. See also Rûhî-i Boghâdî tarikî-i bendîne nâzîre, Ist. Univ. Libr. İstanbul 1352, fols. 100b-105a, the Nofat al-da'ât ve Vîşfî, a compendium to the nomadic Nagû [q.v.]. He also tried to dominate the nomadic Nagû [q.v.] tribes of the region. In 1521 he refused Sultan Sülaymân Kânünî's [q.v.] order to join him in a campaign against Hungary, and instead, led a great expedition against Muscovy, which so far had been on friendly terms with the Ottomans. Mehmed Giray I, who was distracted by his wars against Persia and the Mamlûks. The rising Muscovite state under the Grand Prince Vasily III (1505-33) had created a new power among the heirs of the Golden Horde. Mehmed Giray reacted by alternately allying himself with Poland-Lithuania and Muscovy, and by interfering in the dynastic affairs of Kâzân and Astrakhân [q.v.].
Mehmed Hâkim Efendi — Mehmed Khalife b. Huseyn

Mehmed Hâkim Efendi is best known for a chronicle of the events of the period falling between the last quarter of the 12th century and the first half of the 13th century, containing poetical works and treatises in Hakim's own hand, see ibnulemin, Fatih, tarih 789, fol. 14a; Dâvid Fażî, Khâtîmîl-at-şârî, Istanbul 1271, 52-3.

MEHMEH KHALIFE B. HUSEYN, Ottoman courtier and historian who flourished under the three sultans Murâd IV, İbrahim and Mehemmed IV [q. v.], (regned 1052/1623 to 1099/1687).

From Bosnia, he came to Istanbul in 1043/1633-4 as ıç-şefâr of Köçha Kenân Gurdi Paşa and stayed with him in 1047/1637 appointed to lead an expedition against the prince of Transylvania George Rákóczi [see erdai].

Returning to Istanbul, he probably entered Sultan İbrahim's office for diplomatic missions as a şefîr, and at some unknown date became a khâlîfî at court. He was also a poet, using the tâhîkîsî of Ülîeti, the date of his death is unknown. See Refik, biografm intro. to the Ta'riîkî-i Ghilâmînî edition cited below; Babinger, GÖW, 209-10, no. 180.

Mehmed Khalîfe is best known for a chronicle of his time that he called the Ta'riîkî-i Ghilâmînî because it was written for the personnel of the Inner Palace. In its initial form the work is a disorganised and unsystematic personal memoir which does however reflect the author's own ideas and attitudes and depicts vividly scenes of life in the Ottoman Palace of the 11th/17th century. The first version is represented by an amateurishly-written manuscript that covers the events of the year 1043-7/1633-6; it lacks its final pages (Vienna, Nationalbibliothek, H.O. 82), as a description, see G. Flügel, Die arabischen, persischen und türkischen Handschriften, ii, 271, no. 1068; for a facsimile, see Bugra Atsiz, Das osmanische Reich um die Mitte des 17. Jahrhunderts nach den Chroniken des Vecihi (1637-1660) und des Mehemmed Halîfa (1633-1660), Munich 1977; on the value of this manuscript as an historical source and its comparison with the final recension, see B. Kâmp, Tarih-i Gilâmînî (H. 17-20) redaksyonsuna dâir, in Tarih Dergisi no. 27 [1973], 21-40).

The Ta'riîkî-i Ghilâmînî was given a somewhat more elevated literary form between 1070/1659-60 and 1075/1665 as corrections and additions were made to this first recension; events were arranged in chronological order, the text was divided into sections and subsections (hâhs and faîhs), and occasionally verses and chronograms were inserted. This last recension comprises events from the accession of Murâd IV (1032/1623) until the Treaty of Vassar (1075/1664). Although it does not contain the author's biography and passages that reveal some of his attitudes and concerns which are found in the first recension, this final recension includes an epilogue (âdîgme) dealing with the necessity of mildness in the behaviour of rulers, the special qualities of Sultan Mehmemed IV and the scholars and craftsmen trained in the Enderûn who were contemporaries of the author.

Mehmed Khalîfe's work, which presents the events he experienced from the perspective of a functionary of the inner Palace, was used by Abdi Paşa and Na'imî (see Atsiz, op. cit. pp. CXXVII-CXXVIII).

With its publication by Ahmed Refik (Altinay) as suppl. no. 11 to TOEM, nos. 78-83 = N.S. 1-6 (1340-
MEHMED KHALIFE B. HUSEYN — MEHMED PASHA, BALTADJI

1/1921-2), based on a manuscript of the final recension (Turk Tarih Kurumu Lib., ms. 509) it has also become one of the sources most frequently referred to by recent historians. Finally, Bursa Mehmed Tahir, *Oğlanlı mu'alletleri*, iii, 142, attributes to a Mehmed b. Huseyin of Sultan Ibrahim's time a translation of the Persian history of 'Ali b. Şahih al-Din Hamadani, the *Dhakhtrat al-muluk*, at the command of the governor of Bakhchid, Derwish Mehmed Pasha [q. v.], in 10 bâb, to which he added two further bâbû and called the whole the *Tuhfat al-mahallat*. This history however, nevertheless be by Muşlîl b. al-Din Muştafa b. Şahbân (d. 969/1561-2) (see Kâtip Çelebi (Hadjdi Khalifa), *Kafil al-zunun*, Istanbul 1941, i, 824, and from it, Bur- sa Mehmed Tahir, ii, 226), and this is strengthened by the fact that the *Dhakhtrat al-muluk*, as described in the above two sources, is not a history but a treatise on political ethics (see Storey, i, 946-7 n. 4).

*Bibliography:* In addition to sources mentioned in the article, see IA art. Mehmed Halife (Bekir Kütkökoğlu), (Bekir Kütkökoğlu). *MEHMED LALA PASHA* [see MEHMED PASHA, LALA].

MEHMED LALEZARI [see LALEZARI], MEHMED PASHA, BALTADJI, TEBERDAR (1071-1124/1660-1 to 1712), Ottoman Grand Vizier (1704-1711) (see Katib Celebi (Hadjdi Khalifa), *Beglerbegi ve birun aghas*, secretarial function. By favour and through the patronage of the poet Nabi 'Ali Ağa and other birun ağhas, he entered the service of the Wâlide Sultan Khağâr Târîhân, attaining the rank of *Kâmil* in 1099/1687. The prince Ahmed (the later Ahmed III) appointed Mehmed as apprentice to the corps of the "Baltadjis of the Old Saray", where he became known as the "beautiful muezzin" because of the musical quality of his voice. When in 1695 Habibî 'Ali became Dâr al-Sâ'idâ ağahtist to Sultan Mustafa II [q. v.], Baltadji Mehmed became personal scribe to his protector and was thus admitted to the proximity of the sultan and of Prince Ahmed. At the accession of the latter on 10 Rabî' II 1115/21 August 1703, Mehmed, with 9 years' experience of confidential service and having travelled all over the empire, was promoted to the rank of Mîr Ahkîr, but his appointment as tarihîdâr of Aleppo removed him from the palace service. The Grand Vizier Kalâyîlkoz Ahmed Pasha promoted him to the rank of vizier (8 Rabî' II 1704) with the function of Kapudân Pasha. Already on 27 Şebhân 1116/26 December 1704 he became Grand Vizier (1704-6/1116-18). He had to maintain his position against the rival faction led by Corluî 'Ali Pasha and Newshârihî (Dâmâm) İbrahim Pasha [q. v.]. He made himself indispensable to his monarch by playing upon the latter's constant fear of revolt and deposition. The Grand Vizier managed to free himself from the supervision of financial affairs by means of an intrigue, falsely accusing the Nishândji Hûseyin Pasha of plotting a revolt and consequently sending him into exile at Istanîköy Island (Cos). The Sultan for long tolerated his old familiar companion in spite of his marked lack of ability in financial matters. At last, the Sultan decided to replace Baltadji Mehmed Pasha by Corluî 'Ali Pasha (19 Muhaarram 1118/3 May 1706), his trusted intimate as well as a competent statesman. The ex-Grand Vizier was honourably exiled with the appointment as Beglerbegi of Erzurum. In 1119/1707 he was transferred to Chios (Ott. Sakîz [q. v.]), from which post he went to Aleppo as Beglerbegi. In that city, the poet Nâbi [q. v.] belonged to Baltadji Mehmed Pasha's salon.

On 7/17 September 1120 (O.S. 12 July 1711), Mehmed III decided to appoint his old companion as Grand Vizier again. The latter actually took office in Istanbul by 3 Şebhân/27 September. By this time a "war party," which aimed at a renewal of the war against Russia, had gained the upper hand. The intrigues to that end were assisted by the King of Sweden, "Iron Head" (Demir Bağ) Charles XII, who had found refuge in Ottoman territory since 1709. His Ottoman ally was the Khân of the Crimean Dawlat Giray II [see Giray] (second reign, 1120-5/1708-13) who came to Istanbul in 1122/1710 to further his aims of war against the Russian Tsar Peter. A Council was held in the Sultan's palace (Mesgûvat-ı Azime of 28 Ramazân 1122/21 November 1710) and war was declared on Russia. The new Grand Vizier was to command the army. The so-called Pruth campaign began in the spring of 1123/1711. The Tsar's diplomacy could not curb the Ottoman initiative and the two armies marched towards each other, meeting on 12 Dümâdâm II/28 July 1711 in Moldavia (Ott. Böggân [q. v.]) near Khân Tepesi (= Stanilesti) on the river Pruth, downstream on the road from Jassy (Ott. Yâş [q. v.]). Nobody in the Russian army was aware that Baltadji Mehmed Pasha was already close to the Russian fortresses at Taganrog, Kamenny Zaton and Demir Bash (Head""). The Russian troops were provided with food for their three weeks. The support promised in a secret treaty concluded in view of the Russo-Turkish war by the prince of Moldavia Demetrius Cautemir (1673-1723) was not delivered, for the crops had failed as a result of drought and locusts. On 5 Dümâdâm II/21 July 1711, Baltadji Mehmed's army completely surrounded the Russians and was preparing for the general attack with an artillery barrage. The Tsar Peter, who was with his army, realised that his forces would be annihilated and decided quickly to sue for an armistice and peace. For this move, he found support not only from his Vice-Counsel Peter Shafrov but also from his wife Catherine. This lady's involvement probably gave rise to the historical legend that the corrupt Ottoman Grand Vizier gave in easily to the Russian proposals, as these were accompanied by the offer of the jewelry and the charms of the Tsarina to his person. In any case, lacking insight into the true situation of the two powers, Baltadji Mehmed was too easily content with the Russian proposals. He was already satisfied with the retrocession of Azov (Ott. Azak [q. v.]), the demolition of the newly-built Russian fortresses at Taganrog, Kamenny Zaton and along the Dniepr, the closing of the permanent Russian embassy at the Porte, the evacuation of Polish territory and a guarantee of non-interference in Polish affairs. All Ottoman prisoners were to be set free and the King of Sweden was to be allowed safe passage. The Russian troops were provided with food for their free retreat. A preliminary treaty of peace was hurriedly agreed upon on 6 Dümâdâm II 1123/23 July 1711 (O.S. 12 July), notwithstanding the protests of Dawlat Giray II Khân and the representative of Charles XII, the Polish general Stanislas Poniatowski. Baltadji Mehmed Pasha seems to have been carried away by his own unexpected success. It must be realised, however, that Peter Shafrov had only his own stomach for fighting in this desolate country and that the Sipâhis were always reluctant to face the costs of...
prolonged fighting. Moreover, the Grand Vizier’s distrust of the political pressure group around the Swedish King at Bender may have induced him to continue the battle, which could interfere on the spot.

The news of the victory and the peace was well received at Istanbul at first. The Sultan, however, became suspicious of his Grand Vizier when the latter postponed his return to the capital because of protracted negotiations with the Russians concerning the implementation of the treaty. Indeed, the absence of direct positive results of the peace caused a general dissatisfaction with the Grand Vizier’s policy. The anti-Russian party, joined by the leading dignitaries—if not the only one—who, entrusted with a considerable weight of responsibility, enjoyed the unlimited confidence of the Sultan. Furthermore, the Grand Vizier’s distrusting attitude towards the Grand Vizier also contributed to the distrust of the Sultan. The Grand Vizier was accused of high treason against Islam and the Ottoman state and fulsome praise for a victor.

The Grand Vizier’s political career was probably interceded to save his life, but two main assistants in office, his kadiya and his mektubcu, were condemned to death. Baltadji Mehmed Pasha died on 30 December 1521 at the age of 38. His death was a great loss to the Ottoman state, as he was a typical product of the seraglio culture, and according to A. N. Kurat, was a man of the pen rather than a statesman, an Ottoman gentleman rather than a Turkish warrior.


MEHMED PASHA, BIYIKLI, ("mous-tachioed") Ottoman general and administrator, d. 928/1521.

He seems to have been in the service of the Shahzâd Selim b. Bâyazîd II, at the time when the latter was viceroy of the Eastern province of Persia. There is evidence that he held the post of Chief Equerry (amir-ābâr bâbâli) from the time of the accession of Selim I, and he fought alongside him in battles against the Shahzâd Ahmed b. Bâyazîd: near Bursa, where he commanded the vanguard and his force was routed on 7 Safar 919/14 April 1513; then at the battle of Yeşilheir on 24 April. The following year, he took part in the campaign of Çâlzâhâr [v. v.] and, on his return to Taĥriz, was entrusted with the mission of storming the stronghold of Baybûrûd, which had been unsuccessfully besieged since Qâmûdâd 920/July 1514 by an Ottoman expeditionary force. The conquest of this fortress earned him the title, granted on 25 October, of beg of the sangûks of Baybûrûd, Tobrûzînd, (Shebîn) Kara Hisâr and Dînâk. In the spring of 1515 he was given the task of laying siege to Kemûkh [v. v.], and he maintained a blockade on this Safawîd-held town until the arrival of the sultan, who took it by assault on 5 Rabî‘ II 921/19 May 1515. In the course of the summer, Selim I appointed him commander-in-chief of an army of considerable size (Ottoman troops, volunteers and contingents from the Kurdish principalities) raised for the purpose of conquering western Kurdistan, which was in revolt against the Safawîs and where the diplomatic activity of İdrîs Bîlîsî [v. v.] had ensured that the territory would affirm its loyalty to the Ottoman government. Mehmed Paşa entered Âmid on 10 Shawâbî 921/19 September 1515, was made beglerbeg of Diyar Bâkr on 5 November, and completed the conquest of the country by annihilating in Rabi‘ II 922/1516, at Eski Koç Hisâr, near Mûrûdân, the last Safawî army still claiming by Mehmed Thiûreyya) and was buried at Aktepe, near the Fatih Paşa mosque of which he had laid the foundations.

In spite of the important role which he played and the relatively plentiful documentation concerning him, little research has been so far done on Bîyîkli Mehmed Paşa. In any case, examination of the sources gives the impression that, under Selim I, he was one of the few senior Ottoman dignitaries—yet not the only one—who, entrusted with a considerable weight of responsibility, enjoyed the unlimited con-
fidence of the sultan and, in return, served him with exemplary loyalty. This loyalty continued to be asserted under the reign of Selim I’s successor, when, as is now known, he published documents of the Topkapı Archives, Mehmed Pasha remained, against the advice of Süleyman and his advisers, the last supporter of all-out struggle against Kızılbaș Iran, the primary objective of the foreign policy of Selim I.


MEHMED PASHA, ÇERKEŞ (d. 1034/1625), Ottoman Grand Vizier.

Educated in the palace school or Enderun [q.v.], he reached the rank of sildîdar and left the palace with the appointment of Beglerbeği of Damascus. In 1621 he is mentioned as the fifth Kabbe Wizir (Na’îmî, Ta’hâ, Istanbul 1280, ii, 208). Upon the execution of the Grand Vizier, Kemâneḵâh ‘Ali Paşa [q.v.] (14 Dhu ‘l-Qa’dâ 1104/9 April 1692), Murad IV [q.v.] forced him to accept the appointment of himself as successor. Çerkes Mehmed Paşa thus became vizier-in-chief of the army sent to suppress the revolt of Abâza Mehmed Pasha [see ABÂZA], and to reconquer Bagdad from the Persians. Passing Konya, he failed to take Niğde from the hands of the rebels. On 21 Dhu ‘l-Qa’dâ 1099/23 September 1687, near Kayseri, he found Abâza Mehmed Paşa’s troops in position at the bridge of Karasu. In a bloody battle, the Grand Vizier, thanks to his field artillery, was able to defeat the rebel forces. Katîb Celebi [q.v.], being among the corps of the sildâbdar, witnessed this battle and gives a detailed description (cf. his Fâdîleke, Istanbul 1287, ii, 54 ff.). Pursuing Abâza’s fleeing troops, the Grand Vizier was able to capture Abâza Mehmed Paşa, who was executed by Abâza’s commander from Niğde to Sivas. Having come as far as Tercan, the Grand Vizier was met by a mission from the rebellious Paşa of Erzurum with the request for a pardon. Considering it as being late in the campaigning season, Çerkes Mehmed Paşa accepted this on the condition of a Janissary garrison being placed in the citadel of Erzurum. Following this, the Grand Vizier withdrew the army to Tokat for the winter (December 1624). There he fell ill and died on 17 Rabî’ II 1054/27 January 1625. His last days are reported by the historian Peçevi İbrahim Efendi, who met Çerkes Mehmed in Tokat (cf. Peçevi, Ta’hâ, Istanbul 1283, ii, 401). All Ottoman historians agree on the just and incorruptible character of this old vizier, described as a fâr-i nânâni by Na’îmî (Ta’hâ, ii, 296).

Bibliography: See IA, art. s.v. (by M.C. Bayun, of which the present article is a summary); Von Hammer, HEO, ii, 42-5; SO, iv, 150; A.H. de Groot, The Ottoman Empire and the Dutch Republic, Leiden 1978, 76, 286. (A.H. DE GROOT)

MEHMED PASHA, ELMÂS (1071-1109/1662-97), Ottoman Grand Vizier.

He was born in Hoşalay (formerly Mezed, to the east of Kerempe Burnu) (Kastamonu), the son of a shipmaster. A young man (reputedly beautiful, hence his surname Elmas “Diamond”), he was taken into the service of the state by a chief inspector of the Sultan’s treasury (Baş Bâki Kula), Divriği Mehmed Aga, who was appointed governor of Tripoli in Syria from 1089/1676-7 and therefore of the service of the treasury. Mehmed Pasha Elmas was soon promoted to the palace service, to the Khâṣîs Oda [q.v.] from where he made quick career as Râkîbâdî, Sildîlādîn in 1099/1687-8, Mir-i ‘Alem (Standard-bearer) and Khâsîs Kêtîłîdâlî, leaving the palace service with the rank of Beglerbeği to become Nâṣîrîdî in 1101/1698-90. Soon afterwards he was made a vizier (Kabbe Wizir [q.v.]), Sultan Suleyman II (1104/1695-1703) appointed him Kâ‘îm-makâm at Istanbul on 23 Dışmâdî II 1106/9 February 1695. During the preparations for the campaign against the Emperor in Hungary, the Sultan decided to make him Grand Vizier instead of Süleymi ‘Ali Paşa [q.v.], who was executed (4 Shaywâl 1106/18 May 1695). Mehmed Paşa Elmas joined the three campaigns of Sultan Mustafa II and was seen fighting at times. He distinguished himself during his second campaign when on 27 Muharram 1108/26 August 1696 the Ottoman army defeated the Na’d-Kirân Frederick Augustus, Elector of Saxony, who had laid siege to Temesvár [q.v.], in the battle near the Bega River at Cencei (Buldur Köyü Boghadî). During the campaign of 1697, he was again accompanied by the Sultan. In the council of war held at Belgrade on 27 Muharram 1109/1697, the Grand Vizier and Commander-in-Chief followed the advice of the majority of his commanders who advised with the Vizier Kodja Djafer Paşa, and ordered his army to march north across the Banat instead of following ‘Amûdija-zâde Hüseyîn Koprulî Paşa’s [q.v.] sugges-
tion to go west in the direction of Peterwardein (Waradin [q.v.]). While crossing the Tisa river eastwards, the Grand Vizier’s army was surprised by the Imperial army commanded by Prince Eugene of Savoy, who had reached this spot by a forced march towards nightfall on 11 September. This was near Zenta [q.v.]. A frightful bloodbath was the result of Prince Eugene’s immediate attack. The Turks lost about 20,000 killed and 10,000 drowned. The Sultan, who watched the disaster, fled. The Janissaries broke into a mutiny and killed the Grand Vizier and many officers of his staff.

Elmas Mehmed Paşa was a young and elegant man of the palace (celebi), of a lively character, intelligent and with experience in financial affairs, all of which assets made Mustafa II select him for the highest office. However, it seems that he did not make himself popular with the viziers and the army. He left behind a son, Muşâfa Bey.

Bibliography: See IA, art. s.v. (C. Orhonlu), with a listing in eniextro of ms. sources and literature; Sîldâbdar Findikli Mehmed Aga, Nusret-nâmê, ed. i. Parnakszogolu (in simplified version with defec-
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Of Georgian origin, he served among the white eunuchs of the imperial harem under Sultan Mehmed III [q.v.] (1003-12/1595-1603). He was appointed Khâş-ü-Əstä Başî by Sultan Ahmed I shortly after his accession (2 Şaban 1012/1 January 1604). Around Rabî I 1013/September 1604, Kâdîm Mehmed Agha was given the rank of First Vizier in the Diwan, but as Grand Vizier, on the 27 Rabî I 1012/22 September was appointed beglerbegî of Egypt. He was able to restore order in that province and punished the rebels among the Ottoman regular troops (kul tâ'fîyes). Dismissed around Şafar 1014/June 1605, he left Egypt for Istanbul and was appointed beglerbegî of Bosnia (Ott. Bosna [q.v.]) as well as being put in charge of the military government (mâpdfaza) of Belgrade and the shores of the Danube. In Şafar 1018/May 1609, upon appointment as serdâr-i īkrem (commander-in-chief) of the Grand Vizier Kuyuđî Murâd Pasha [q.v.], he was made kâm-üm-kâkım while still at Belgrade. During the next year’s campaign, Mehmed Paşa Gurdju was again left in charge as kâm-üm-makâm in the capital, in which function he continued till the return from the Persian front of the succeeding Grand Vizier Nasîrî Pasha [q.v.]; I Şâh-i Şân 1021/27 September 1612). During his tenure of this office, he supported the granting of capitulations to successive Grand Viziers. An efficient man, he was able to turn the campaign in Crete in a favourable direction, and could diminish Pasha, the oldest of all viziers at the time, in the next year, holding successive provincial appointments next to that office. He was appointed the old and infirm Grand Vizier on 11 Shawwal 1061/27 September 1664, and was again dismissed twenty-three days later. He was unable to turn the campaign in Crete in a favourable direction, and could not dislodge the Venetian fleet from the Dardanelles. Nor were his diplomatic efforts to reach an armistice with Venice in any way effective. On the other hand, he provided posts for his brothers, son and many

MEHMET PASHA, GÜRDJÜ (II) (d. 1076/1666), Ottoman Grand Vizier. Having been a slave (but not an eunuch) of Koca Sinâm Pasha [q.v.], he entered the palace service, beginning as an apprentice in the kitchen (mâpdfa eminîşî) department. By Djumâddâ 1023/July 1614, he reached the rank of a gâhrî bâhi. While on campaign in an anti-Mehmed Agha [q.v.], in the East, he was appointed mescûr bâhi [q.v.] in Dhu ’l-Ka’dâ 1026/November 1617. In Rabî I 1029/February 1620 he was made kâçûfû, bâhi, in which function he participated in Sultan Ọthmân II’s Khottin campaign of that year. His career was not affected by the political upheavals of those years, and in Rabjâb 1032/May 1623 he became beglerbegî of Rumeli, the first of a long series of provincial government posts in the Asiatic and European parts of the empire. Mehmed Paşa Gürdjü saw a great deal of active military service, both in the successful suppression of revolts and in the Persian wars. Having reached vizieral rank as beglerbegî of Damascus previously, he was made beglerbegî of Diyarbekir in 1035/1626 and member of the Diwan in the next year, holding successive provincial appointments next to that office. He joined Sultan Murâd IV [q.v.] during the Erivan campaign of 1625 and the Baghdad campaign of 1638 in various governmental capacities. After 3 Dhu ’l-Ka’dâ 1049/25 February 1640, he was a kâbegî vezîr once again and fell out with the Grand Vizier Sultanâzîde Semîn Mehmed Pasha [q.v.] (Muharram 1055/March 1645). At the behest of the all-powerful Dâr al-se’âde Ağha Uzun Sîleyman Ağha, Sultan Mehmedreddâ IV [q.v.] appointed the old and debilitated Pasha, the oldest of all viziers at this time, Grand Vizier on 11 Şawwâl 1061/27 September 1651, in which function he lasted eight months and twenty-three days. He was unable to turn the campaign in Crete in a favourable direction, and could not dislodge the Venetian fleet from the Dardanelles. Nor were his diplomatic efforts to reach an armistice with Venice in any way effective. On the other hand, he provided posts for his brothers, son and many

linked with the latter by family, intishâb and târîkât relationships. Gürdjü Mehmed Paşa was one of the favourite targets of the satirical verse of the poet Nefî [q.v.].

Soon the two prisoners were released again, and Mehmed was made kâm-üm-makâm once more by the Grand Vizier Cerkes Mehmed Paşa [q.v.] (April 1624). The lack of success of the seven months’ siege of Bagdaddî by the Grand Vizier (Safr-Şawwâl 1035/November 1625-July 1626) led the Janissary and Sipâhi soldiery at Istanbul to level once more their suspicions of treason or incompetence against Mehmed Paşa Gurdju (I) and Kâdîm (II) 1035/August 1626). This time the probably unfounded accusations led to the execution of the old statesman who, according to some sources, was 90 years old by this time. Three water fountains (räfs) were piously dedicated by Kâdîm Gürdjü Mehmed Paşa in the Kâhihîlîgar, Hürkâ-yi Şerîf and Şehzâde-Başî quarters of Istanbul. His târî is at Eyvûb in the second courtyard of the great mosque.

Bibliography: See IA art. s.v. (F.Ç. Derin), of which the present article is a summary. I: H. Danişmend, İsâhi Ortaşı tarihi kronolojisi; ii, Istanbul 1972, 315, 320, 321, 329; A. H. de Groot, The Ottoman Empire and the Dutch Republic, Leiden-Istanbul 1978, 107, 119-24, 147, 170, 309, 313; M.O. Bayrak, Istanbul’da gümüşhâ meşhur adamlar (1453-1978), Istanbul 1979, 46 (no. 33); IA art. Nefî (A. Karahan), A. H. de Groot, MEHMET PASHA, GÜRDJÜ (II) (d. 1076/1666), Ottoman Grand Vizier. Having been a slave (but not an eunuch) of Koca Sinâm Pasha [q.v.], he entered the palace service, beginning as an apprentice in the kitchen (mâpdfa eminîşî) department. By Djumâddâ 1023/July 1614, he reached the rank of a gâhrî bâhi. While on campaign in an anti-Mehmed Agha [q.v.], in the East, he was appointed mescûr bâhi [q.v.] in Dhu ’l-Ka’dâ 1026/November 1617. In Rabî I 1029/February 1620 he was made kâçûfû, bâhi, in which function he participated in Sultan Ọthmân II’s Khottin campaign of that year. His career was not affected by the political upheavals of those years, and in Rabjâb 1032/May 1623 he became beglerbegî of Rumeli, the first of a long series of provincial government posts in the Asiatic and European parts of the empire. Mehmed Paşa Gürdjü saw a great deal of active military service, both in the successful suppression of revolts and in the Persian wars. Having reached vizieral rank as beglerbegî of Damascus previously, he was made beglerbegî of Diyarbekir in 1035/1626 and member of the Diwan in the next year, holding successive provincial appointments next to that office. He joined Sultan Murâd IV [q.v.] during the Erivan campaign of 1625 and the Baghdad campaign of 1638 in various governmental capacities. After 3 Dhu ’l-Ka’dâ 1049/25 February 1640, he was a kâbegî vezîr once again and fell out with the Grand Vizier Sultanâzîde Semîn Mehmed Pasha [q.v.] (Muharram 1055/March 1645). At the behest of the all-powerful Dâr al-se’âde Ağha Uzun Sîleyman Ağha, Sultan Mehmedreddâ IV [q.v.] appointed the old and debilitated Pasha, the oldest of all viziers at this time, Grand Vizier on 11 Şawwâl 1061/27 September 1651, in which function he lasted eight months and twenty-three days. He was unable to turn the campaign in Crete in a favourable direction, and could not dislodge the Venetian fleet from the Dardanelles. Nor were his diplomatic efforts to reach an armistice with Venice in any way effective. On the other hand, he provided posts for his brothers, son and many
friends and relations. His dismissal followed on 13 Rādjab 1062/20 June 1652. After a short stay in Yedi Kule prison, he was allowed to live in his private residence in the Eyyūb quarter of the capital till he managed again to secure an appointment as provincial governor successively of Teneşâvar and Cyprus (Kutrub [q.v.]) and Buda (Budan [q.v.]). It was probably there that he died of old age before 1 Shawwal 1062/20 June 1652, when the news of his death reached Istanbul, according to the historian ʻAbdī Paşa (Weqāfī-nāme, ms. Beyazid, Umumı 1514 946).

Bibliography: See IA art. s.v. (F. Čerin), of which the present article is a summary, which gives a full indication of Ottoman sources; I.H. Uzun ʻçarşılı, Osmanlı tarihi, vii/2, Istanbul 1954, 402-4; Naʻīma, Taʻrīḫ, Istanbul 1283, v, 168-76, 215-25.

(A. H. DE GROOT)

MEHMED PASHA, ʻĪWAD, ḤADDĪJ (EL-ḤADDĪ) (1085 or 1086-1165/1775-1743), Ottoman Grand Vizier.

He was the son of a descendant of the Eyyūb-i Fāṣāl, one Naṣr Allāh, a ʻāmir holder at Jagodina. Educated for state service (hence ʻīwād), he served with high-placed officials at Belgrade (1100/1689) and at Jiđđada (1107-1696), during which period he made the pilgrimage to Mecca. Having returned to Istanbul just before the Patrona Khalīf rebellion of 1730, he acted as Ǧumruk Emini, Commissioner of the Istanbul customs house, on behalf of Yegen Mehmed Efendi Paşa (Pasha ). Later, he served as Treasury Inspector (Bash-Bēki Kulu). The Grand Vizier Hedjâdji ʻAli Paşa (q.v.) promoted him Cannoğ Bushā (q.v.) (1752).

In 1753 he became a vizier and acted for a short time as kāʿim-mākāṃ at Istanbul, after which he was sent to govern the sandjaks of Niğbolu and Vidin. During the war, for two years successively he defended his area against Austrian attacks. He was able to take the fortresses of Hisorva and Fethulislam (the Yugoslavian Kladovo) as well as Semendire (the Yugoslavian Smederevo), Mehâdiye (the Rumaniyan Mehedia) and Yeji Palanka. Mehmeh Paşa ʻĪwad served as commander-in-chief (serdar) on that front when, at the behest of the powerful Kizlar Ağhası (Dār al-Šārāda Ağhası) Hadjîdji Bashir Ağha, he was also appointed Grand Vizier (12 Dhu ʻl-Hijja 1151/23 March 1739) to replace Yegen Mehmed Paşa, whose policies he continued however along the same lines, on the one hand by opening diplomatic contact with the Austrians, on the other by aiming at the reconquest of Belgrade. He became famous for his splendid defeat of the Austrian army under Field-Marshal Olivier Wallis (56,000 strong plus light cavalry, artillery and irregulars). The Grand Vizier took up a defensive position to the north-west of Grocka (Ott. Hisārđîk) (on 15 Rabār II 1152/22 July 1739) overlooking the road from Belgrade which went through a defile. After fifteen assaults by the Janissaries, Field-Marshal Wallis retreated at nightfall, losing 3,000 killed and 7,000 wounded. Four days later, Belgrade was laid under siege by the Ottomans. Negotiations led to the conclusion of the peace treaty (1-18 September) between the Sultan, the Austrian Vizier and the Tsar at Belgrade, which meant an important restoration of Ottoman power in the Danube area.

In Rabār 1153/June 1740 a local disturbance in the capital formed the pretext for Bashir Ağha and the ẉādīl Sultan to have Mehmeh Paşa ʻĪwad dismissed as Grand Vizier, relegating him to the governorship of Jiđđada, from which place he soon was able to transfer to Canea (Ott. Haniya). During the next three years, he successively served as military governor of Salonica, in Herzegovina (Ott. Hersek), Bosnia, Negroponte (Ott. Egriboz) and in Crete again. He died while acting as military governor of Lepanto (Aynabakhti [q.v.] in Dūmādd 1 I1566/July 1743. His elder son Ibrahim became twice Șeyhül-Islam and his younger son Khalll became Grand Vizier in 1183/1769.


MEHMED PASHA, KARAMANI, Nihat ʻič, (d. 1866/1841), Ottoman Grand Vizier and historian.

A descendant of Djūdal-al-Din Rūmī [q.v.], he grew up in Konya where he received his education as an ʻinām from Muşannaf ʻIbbid, who introduced him into the patronage of Memnūd Paşa [q.v.]. Mehmeh Paşa served as a clerk in the diwan of that Grand Vizier and later became medium in the medrese founded by the same at Istanbul, being at the same time a general adviser to his patron. Thanks to the latter, he became nişābūrī [q.v.] in 869/1465, which high office he kept for about 12 years. From 4 Dhu ʻl-Ka’dā 862/13 September 1458, he already ranked as a vizier. His appointment as Grand Vizier following the dismissal of Gedik Ahmed Paşa [q.v.] dates from Muḥarram 881/May 1476 (cf. Kīwāmī, Fet-nāme-yi Sultān Mehemmed, ed. F. Babiner, Istanbul 1955, 273). In his new position, he became the main author of Sultan Mehemmed II's [q.v.] legislative policy. This statesman, with his years of experience in matters of state and administration, was the real creator of the new state institutions laid down in the kānīn-nāmes [q.v.] of this period (cf. the editions of MOG, i [1922], TOEM [1300/1912] and ʻOzcan [1982]). One of his lasting innovations was the division of the judiciary among two kāsîʾiʾaskers, one for Rumeli and one for Anadolu. A great number of ʿawāf and private landed properties were converted into state property as a base of the timar system, which had to support an increasing amount of military personnel. Mehmeh Paşa's full support of the centralising policy of the Sultan caused his unpopularity among his fellow ʿulāmāʾ and the old-established landowners of the ghāzi aristocracy (cf. ʻAshikpaşağzade, Twārīx-i ʿAl-ī ʿOṯmān, ed. Ç. N. Atsiz, Istanbul 1947, 244).

When Grand Vizier, Mehmeh Paşa Karamanî supported Sultan Mehmed II in furthering the claim to the succession of Prince Ǧiđem [q.v.] against Prince Bâṣâyd. His personal link with the city of Konya must have offered a special opportunity, since Ǧiđem Sultan was governor of Karaman. Bâṣâyd (I) [q.v.] counted Karamanî Mehmeh amongst his enemies henceforth (cf. R.C. Repp, The Miḥf of Istanbul, 21, 72, 144, 199-201). The Grand Vizier accompanied the Sultan at the departure for the campaign of
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886/1481. Thus he assisted his monarch during his last illness in camp at Maltepe (cf. Tursun Beg, Ta’rīkh-i Abu l-Fath, ed. and tr. H. Inalcık and R. Murphy, Minneapolis, etc. 1978, 64, Ay 157 b-158 a). The Grand Vizier, Mehmed Pasha Karamanlı (4 Rabī‘ 1 886/5 May 1481) a secret, but sent the news to both Prince Bâyezîd and Prince Djiem. His aim was for Djiem to arrive first in Istanbul and to make his accession there a fait accompli.

For that purpose, the mortal remains of Mehmed II were secretly brought back to the capital by the court physicians, and then all communication was cut between the two shahs of the Bosnian. Mehmed Karamanlı moved the A’dâm-oghlanı out of town and had the city gates closed, but his enemies intercepted his men and the news of the Sultan’s death spread quickly. The Janissaries managed to cross the water by private Grand Vizier.

Minor poets such as Kabûlî and Hamdî wrote the rise of the Ottoman Empire in the form of works representing a group of sources distinct from the other covering the years 855/1451 to early 885/1541, the building of the Imperial Stables (856/1453). The latter includes 10 chronograms in verses describing his own deeds: 1. the building of Rumeli Hisari (856/1453). 2. the conquest of Albania (871/1466-7). 3. the reconstruction of the wâlî’s castle on the castle hill of Konya (872/1467-8). 4. the building of the “New Seraglio” (Topkapı Sarayı) at Istanbul (873/1468-9). 5. the taking of the fortress of Egbirhob [q. v.] (Negroponte) (874/1469). 6. the victory over Uzun Hasan (875/1470-2). 7. the death of Prince Mustafa (875/1472-3). 8. the taking of Şahrî Karâhisar (875/1472-4). 9. the building of the wall containing the “New Seraglio” (883/1478-9). 10. the building of the Imperial Stables (İstanbul-i sâmiye (883/1478-9). These chronicles seem to be a recasting into Arabic of a simple calendar (lakwim) to which chronograms and ornate passages of artî have been added (cf. Ménage, The beginnings of Ottoman historiography). Karamanlı Mehmed’s text is one of a number of early historical works representing a group of sources distinct from the group of Aşkîpasha-zâde, Uruđî and the anonymous Ta’avârîk. This group contains a different tradition about the origin of the Ottomans which is based on an older source than that used by the other group of histories dating from ca. 1399 (cf. Inalcık, Rîse). Minor poets such as Kabûlî and Hamdî wrote kâdînî and other poetry in praise of the nishâhı and Grand Vizier.

Mehmed Paşa Karamanlı had two wives. His first was Muşînînâfik 4‘Allâ’ al-Dîn ‘Ali b. 135îmâlî’s daughter, who gave him a son Zayn al-Abîdîn 4‘Ali Celebi, who in his turn had a son of some renown, 4‘Allâ’ al-Mawla Mustafa b. ‘Abîdîn 4‘Ali b. 135îmâlî. The Second was 4‘Allâ’ al-‘Adîm 4‘Allâ’ al-Mawla Mustafa b. ‘Abîdîn 4‘Ali b. 135îmâlî. This group contains a different tradition about the origin of the Ottomans which is based on an older source than that used by the other group of histories dating from ca. 1399 (cf. Inalcık, Rîse). Minor poets such as Kabûlî and Hamdî wrote kâdînî and other poetry in praise of the nishâhı and Grand Vizier. Thus he assisted his monarch during his last illness in camp at Maltepe (cf. Tursun Beg, Ta’rīkh-i Abu l-Fath, ed. and tr. H. Inalcık and R. Murphy, Minneapolis, etc. 1978, 64, Ay 157 b-158 a). The Grand Vizier, Mehmed Pasha Karamanlı (4 Rabī‘ 1 886/5 May 1481) a secret, but sent the news to both Prince Bâyezîd and Prince Djiem. His aim was for Djiem to arrive first in Istanbul and to make his accession there a fait accompli. For that purpose, the mortal remains of Mehmed II were secretly brought back to the capital by the court physicians, and then all communication was cut between the two shahs of the Bosnian. Mehmed Karamanlı moved the A’dâm-oghlanı out of town and had the city gates closed, but his enemies intercepted his men and the news of the Sultan’s death spread quickly. The Janissaries managed to cross the water by private Grand Vizier.

Minor poets such as Kabûlî and Hamdî wrote the rise of the Ottoman Empire in the form of works representing a group of sources distinct from the other covering the years 855/1451 to early 885/1541, the building of the Imperial Stables (856/1453). The latter includes 10 chronograms in verses describing his own deeds: 1. the building of Rumeli Hisari (856/1453). 2. the conquest of Albania (871/1466-7). 3. the reconstruction of the wâlî’s castle on the castle hill of Konya (872/1467-8). 4. the building of the “New Seraglio” (Topkapı Sarayı) at Istanbul (873/1468-9). 5. the taking of the fortress of Egbirhob [q. v.] (Negroponte) (874/1469). 6. the victory over Uzun Hasan (875/1470-2). 7. the death of Prince Mustafa (875/1472-3). 8. the taking of Şahrî Karâhisar (875/1472-4). 9. the building of the wall containing the “New Seraglio” (883/1478-9). 10. the building of the Imperial Stables (İstanbul-i sâmiye (883/1478-9). These chronicles seem to be a recasting into Arabic of a simple calendar (lakwim) to which chronograms and ornate passages of artî have been added (cf. Ménage, The beginnings of Ottoman historiography). Karamanlı Mehmed’s text is one of a number of early historical works representing a group of sources distinct from the group of Aşkîpasha-zâde, Uruđî and the anonymous Ta’avârîk. This group contains a different tradition about the origin of the Ottomans which is based on an older source than that used by the other group of histories dating from ca. 1399 (cf. Inalcık, Rîse). Minor poets such as Kabûlî and Hamdî wrote kâdînî and other poetry in praise of the nishâhı and Grand Vizier.
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Esztergom [q.v.] which he had to surrender to the imperial Commander-in-Chief Peter Ernst, Count Mansfeld (1517-1604). The negotiations were conducted on the Ottoman side by inter alio Ibrahim Pasha (1601-1605) and on the imperial side by Peter Ernst. Lala Mehmed Pasha, who had been commander in chief of the Ottoman army during the Russo-Ottoman War (1769-74), surrendered Esztergom on 3 Muharram 1014/12 October 1605 (cf. the eyewitness account of Peçewi, Târîq-ı, 305 f.). The taking of this famous fortress and its surrounding places was followed by the conquest of others: Veszprém and Palota, and Neuhäusel on 9 Radjab 1014/20 November 1605. The Grand Vizier ordered a razzia of Tatar and Hungarian light cavalry into the Austrian lands, Croatia and Styria under the command of his nephew, "Sarhad" Ibrahim Paşa, the Beglerbegi of Kanisa. At Rakos on 7 Dümâdâ II 1014/20 October 1605, Lala Mehmed Paşa held a coronation ceremony for Stephen Bocskai, proclaimed King of Hungary. A crown had been especially made at Istanbul for this ceremony (this is now in the Kunsthistorisches Museum of Vienna, cf. H. Fillitz, Die Schatzkammer in Wien, Vienna 1964, 133, 17). Leaving Murad Paşa in charge, the Grand Vizier departed for Istanbul. It was his intention to exercise the supreme command over both the western and the eastern fronts from there. The Sultan's government, however, insisted on him going in person to the war in the east in the next season. The horse-tails (tâg) [q.v.], were already put out at Úskûdar when the Grand Vizier died suddenly on 15 Safar (or 16 Muharram) 1015/23 June (or 25 May) 1606. Rumours were current at the time that his rival Derwish Mehmed Paşa [q.v.] had made the Sephardic Jewish court physician administer poison. Lala Mehmed Paşa was buried next to the mausoleum of his kinsman Şokollu Mehmed Paşa at Eyyûb.

Bibliography: See IA art. s.v. (M.C. Ş. Tekindâq), on which the present article is largely based. A main source is PecewT's Ta'rikh, whose author personally witnessed the most important years of Lala Mehmed Paşa's career as a trusted official: I.H. Danışmand, Osmanlı tarihi kronolojisi, Istanbul 1971, iii, index; C. Ballingal Finkel, The provisioning of the Ottoman Army during the campaigns of 1593-1606, in Habsburgisch-osmanische Beziehungen, CIEPO Colloque Wien, 26-30 September 1983, ed. A. Tietze, Vienne 1987, 207-23; Von Hamos H. (Ed.), viii, 271 f., viii, 84 f., 97; Othmanzade Ahmed Ta'b, Hadîkat-ul-wüserâ, 53 f. (A. H. DE GROOT)

MEHMED PASHA, MELEK, DÂMAD (1131/1216/1719-1802), Ottoman Grand Vizier under Sultan Selim III [q.v.]

He was the son of Bosnai Khâğıa Süleyman Pasha, Vizier and Kapudan-ı derâî in 1126/1714 and 1130/1718 till his death in 1133/1721. Born in Istanbul, he followed his father's footsteps in a naval career, becoming commander (Derya begi) in 1736, Tersâne kethâdâsi and Kapudan-ı derâî himself in 1165/1752-5. Sultan Mustafa III (1171-87/1757-74) appointed him Nizândî, and married him to the Princess Zeynep AŞIWA Sultan, a daughter of Ahmed III (1757) (cf. A.D. Alderson, The structure of the Ottoman dynasty, no. 1268, Table XL). He was then promoted Vizier and received the title of Sandıklî begi of Yanova. From 1763 onwards, he received appointments as military governor successively of Vidin and Belgrade, Beglerbegi of Anadol, Kâşmî-makâm (1765) Beglerbegi of Aydın, of Rumeli and in 1767-9 Kapudân-panşa again, during which tenure he made one tour through the Archipelago. In 1769 he was made both Muhâsîl of Morea and Kâşmî-makâm at Istanbul, which function he held during the Russo-Ottoman War (1769-74).

After a spell out of office, he was made Kapudân-
Mehmed Pasha was Grand Vizier again till his death on 26 Dümâddâ 1188/8 April 1774. During those three years, Ottoman arms were unsuccessful against the Russians. The Grand Vizier opened peace negotiations again, finally with the Austrians and also with the Russians (Bucharest conference, from November 1772 to February 1773). The Russian demands, including the independence of the Khanate of the Crimea [see Krim] and high war indemnities were not yet acceptable to the Ottomans, and peace was not reached till the Russian army under the Field Marshall Peter A. Rumyantsev encircled the Grand Vizier and Sultan and took Shumen (Bulg. Shumen) and proposed negotiations again.

Mehmed Pasha accepted this proposal immediately. The negotiations between the two delegations, the Ottoman one led by his Subâret-Kethâbâdî (afterwards Nishânîdî) Ahmed Rasmî Efendi [see idem, Kâlûşat Âl-†itâb, cf. GOV, 280, 309-12], were held at the Russian headquarters 17-21 July 1774 and led to the treaty of Kûčîkh Kaynarja [see idem]. The Grand Vizier became ill soon afterwards and withdrew to return to Istanbul. On the way near Karnobat (Tk. Karînâbاد) he died on 26 Dümâddâ 1188/8 April 1774. On the orders of his widow Esma Sultan, he was buried at Eyyûb next to the gate of the great mosque.
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A. H. DE GROOT, Nahih Osmanli tarihi (1020/1612) (cf. A. D. Alderson, The structure of the Ottoman dynasty, Oxford 1956, no. 124, Table XXI), a daughter of Ahmed III. There followed quickly one after another, the appointments as Beglerbeyi of Diyarbekir, Anadolu (at Kütahya) and Bosnia (1760), staying one year with his wife at his palace at Kadîrga (Istanbul), before proceeding to his post. From 1175/1762 he occupied the governorships of Rumeli and Bosnia, twice each, before being called to the Grand Vizierate on 7 Shawwâl 1176/30 March 1765. During his tenure of office, revolts in Arabia, Egypt and Georgia broke out and Russian pressure increased. The Grand Vizier did not think the Empire could sustain a war with that power, but his opinion did not prevail in the Divân.

Mehmed Pasha, Muhsin-zade was born on 23 Rabî‘ II 1182/6 September 1776 and was ordered to reside in Bogdja-Ada (Tenedos [q.v.]) Gallipoli (Gelibolu [q.v.]) and Rhodes (Rodos [q.v.]). In 1182/1776 appointed military governor (Mudâfâ‘) of the Morea, he was able to defeat the Russian-inspired rebellion there in a battle at Tripolitza (Ott. Tripolié). In Dhu l-Hijjâja 1188/April 1770, after which he restored Ottoman authority in the main centres of Patras (Ott. Bâyla Badra [q.v.]), Modon (Ott. Mûtûn [q.v.]), Navarino (Ott. Navarin [q.v.]). In 1185/1771 he went as commander of the Ottoman troops to the Danube front. From Şah-banu November 1771, Muhsin-zade Mehmed Pasha, Mehmed Pasha, Melek — Mehmed Pasha, Öküz
In command of a squadron of 30 galleys, he went out to sea in the 1022/1613 season. His aim was to attack Maltese and Tuscan corsairs who had ravaged the southern shores of Anatolia and had raidied Agha L engineer's factio to office again. Öküz Mehmed Pasha was appointed Commander-in-Chief of the army formed to counter the aggression of Şahş Abdüss I of Persia [q.v.], who had violated the treaty concluded with Naşü Pasha (26 Ramadan 1021/20 November 1612). In Qumâdâ I 1024/June 1613 the Grand Vizier left for Aleppo, too late however for action that year. The army stayed in winter quarters in Marâv. In April 1616 Öküz Mehmed Pasha left Aleppo and marched towards Erwân to confront the Persian Şahş. The Grand Vizier himself went to Kars via Gökstên Yavla and Erzurum, despaching important contingents of his large army in the direction of Erwân and Nişâwan. Having ordered the strengthening of the fortifications of Kars, he marched to Erwân (Ott. Erivan). He detached the Persian forces and laid siege to that fortress. His lack of siege artillery and the strong resistance of the garrison forced him to lift the siege after 60 (or 44?) days, agreeing to a settlement based on the terms of 1021/1612 accepting a reduction by half of the Persian tribute of silk, i.e. to only 100 yâk. The Ottoman main army then returned to Erzurum (27 Shawwâl 1025/7 November 1616). The Grand Vizier wintered at Şoghanlî Yavla. The accusation of neglect of duty levelled at the Grand Vizier after this meagre result of his campaign led the Sultan to dismiss his favourite son-in-law (8 Dhu l-Ka'da 1025/17 November 1616), who nevertheless retained the rank of Second Vizier and was ordered to assist his successor in office, Kâhlîl Paşa, towards the conclusion of a definitive treaty of peace with Şahş Abdüss. Peace was last concluded on 6 Shawwâl 1027/26 September 1618 in the Ottoman camp in the plain of Sarâb (near Ardabîl), deep inside Safavî territory.

Sultan ʿOğlumân II [q.v.] appointed Öküz Mehmed Paşa Grand Vizier again in place of Kâhlîl Paşa (1 Safer 1028/18 January 1619). In his new quality, he sent the Ottoman ratification of the Sarâb treaty to Şahş Abdüss on 13 Shawwâl 1028/25 September 1619 (cf. Qâzâ-ı nâmey-i Khâlîl Paşa, ms. Esâd Efendi 2139, fol. 119b; Ferîdûn, Manzûre, Istanbul 1275, ii, 325). Later in 1029/1619, a conflict broke out between the Grand Vizier and the then favourite of the Sultan, the Kapudân-paşa, the Vizier Gûlêzûl Istanbûlî ʿAli Paşa [q.v.], Mehmed Paşa once again, as in 1021/1612 in his conflict with Kâhlîl Paşa, tried to use the help of the ambassadors of Venice and France against his rival, but to no avail, since the Sultan dismissed him and made ʿAli Paşa Grand Vizier instead (16 Mevâr 1029/23 December 1619). Öküz Mehmed's private property was confiscated and he himself banished from Istanbul with the appointment as Beylerbîegi of Aleppo, and it was in that city that he died not long afterwards.

A türbe was built inside the zâwîya of Şahş Abdüss Abi Bakr (cf. Kârîb Çelebi, Paşâlar, i, 402). Wâlsîs founded by Öküz Mehmed Paşa included a külliye in the Karagümruk quarter of Istanbul where he was born, and a complex including a great ʿâşar and a market at Ulûkışla (in Niğde province on the road to the Cilician Gates [Gûlebek Boğazı], see CILCISA) (cf. A. Gabriel, Monuments turcs d'Anatolie, Paris 1931, iii, 367-70). At Cairo, he built barracks for the Janissary and 'Aqab corps and a zâwîya with a row of shops for the benefit of the Mawlawiya [q.v.] order of dervishes to which he was himself linked. Elsewhere in Egypt and Syria he erected facilities along the main routes to Mecca.


MEHMEladen PASHA RâMî, Ottoman Grand Vizier and poet, was born in 1065/1655 or 1086/1656 in Eyyûb, a suburb of Istanbul, the son of a certain Hasan Agha. He entered the chancellery of the Reş Efendi as a probationer (ubîrgâr), and through the poet Yâsusûf Nâbi [q.v.], he was appointed an assistant to masraf kâiti, i.e. secretary for the expenditure of the palace. In 1095/1684, through the influence of his patron, the newly appointed Kapudân paşa [q.v.] Mustaфа Paşa, he became divân efendi, i.e. chamberlain of the Admiralty. He took part in his chief's journeys and campaigns (against Chios) and on his return to Istanbul became re'si kâsidârî, i.e. pursuereceiver to the Reş Efendi. In 1102/1690 he was promoted to beylikdži, i.e. vice-chancellor, and four years later Re's Efendi in place of Abû Bakr, in which office he was succeeded in 1108/1697 by Kâtiobble Mehmed Çelebi. After the battle of Zenta (12 September 1697), he became Re's Efendi for a second time and was one of the plenipotentiaries at the Peace of Carlowitz (Karlofca [q.v.]), by means of which "he put an end to the ravages of the Ten Years' War but also for ever to the conquering power of the Ottomans" (J. von Hammer). As a reward for his services at the peace negotiations he was appointed kabbe weziîrî with 3 horse tails (tâsh) in 1114/1703 and 6 Ramadan 1114/January 24, 1703, appointed to the highest office in the kingdom in succession to the grand vizier Daftalan Mustaфа Paşa. In this office he devoted particular attention to the thorough reform of the civil administration, by reform of the civil administration, through the abuses in which he saw the security of the state threatened (cf. von Hammer, GOR, vii, 64). "By lessening the burden of fortresses on the frontiers in east and west, by raising militia against the rebel Arabs, by securing the pay of the army from the revenues of certain estates, by making aqueducts, by restoring ruined mosques, by taking measures for the safety of the pilgrim caravans and for the security of Asia Minor, by settling Turkmen tribes, by ordering the Jewish cloth manufacturers in Selânîk and the Greek silk manufacturers in Bursa in future to make in their factories all the stuffs hitherto imported into Turkey from Europe" (von Hammer), he exercised a most beneficent activity, which however soon aroused envy and hatred, and since Mehmed Paşa Râmi was entirely a man of the pen
MEHMED PASHA RAMI — MEHMED PASHA, SULTAN-ZADE

and not of the sword, he was unpopular with the army, particularly the Janissaries, and this was bound to lead to his fall (cf. Gör, vii, 72). In the great rising in Istanbul which lasted four weeks, beginning with the enthronement of Sultan Mustafa II and ending with his deposition (9 Rabii II, 1115/22 August 1703), his career came to an end. He was disgraced, but pardoned in the same year and appointed governor, first of Cyprus, then of Egypt (October 1704). His governorship there terminated unhappily as his grand viziership (cf. Gör, vii, 133, following Râşid and La Motraye). In Dümâdî 1 1108/September 1706, he was dismissed and the Grand Vizier was Mustafa, whereas he died in Dhu 'l-Hijja 1119/March 1707, either under torture or as a result of it (cf. Gör, vii, 134, quoting the internuntius Talman). Mehmed Pasha Rami is regarded as a brilliant stylist, as the two collections of his official documents (insâhi) containing no less than 1,400 pieces, distinguished by their simple clear and elevated style, amply show (cf. the mss. in Vienna, Nat. Bibl. nos. 296 and 297, Scott, G. Flagel, Die arabs., pers. u. türk. Hs., i, 271-2). Mehmed Pasha Rami also left a complete Divan, of which specimens are available in the Tekâhir of his son-in-law Sâlim (cf. F. Babinger, GÖW, 272-3; printed Istanbul 1315). His poetical gifts were inherited by his son 'Abd Allah Re'let (cf. Bursâli Mehmed Tahir, 'Olmânlî müllüfleri, ii, 187).
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(F. Babinger)

MEHMED PASHA, RÜM or RÜMî (d. 883/1478), Ottoman Grand Vizier.

Being of Âlî status, his origins, whether Greek or Albanian, are obscure. Sultan Mehmed II [q.v.] admitted him into his intimate circle after the unsuccessful Albanian campaign of 870/1466 during which Mehmed Pasha became Second Vizier. In 1468/872 he was appointed Governor of Cyprus; he was successful in the campaign against Karaman [see KARAMAN-ISGÜLLAR], during which he manifested his rivalry with the Grand Vizier Mahmut Pasha [q.v.]. Instead of him, Mehmed Pasha was charged with the deportation of selected members of the populations of the cities of Karaman, Konya [q.v.] and Laranda [q.v.], mainly artisans, other professionals and merchants. The older Ottoman chronicles agree with the contemporary sources in which the Átvâr's harsh treatment of the Muslim people in question, giving a picture of this Pasha as if he were effecting an act of revenge for the Istanbul Greek population's fate (cf. Ashikpaşa-zâde, tr. R. F. Kreutel, Fom Hintezitl zur hohen Pfalz, Graz, etc. 1959 (= Osmanische Geschichtsschreiber, 3), 201 f., 238, 240 f., F. Babinger, Mehmed the Conqueror and his time, ed. W.C. Hickman, tr. R. Manheim, Princeton 1978, 254, 292 f., 286 f., 299, 454; I.H. Danişmand, Osmanlı tarihi kronolojisi, Istanbul 1971, i, 266-7, 306-7, 313, 315, 319, 322-3, 337, 354, 377-8 (with different chronology); N. Bekdican, Recherches sur la réforme foncière de Mehmed II, in Acta Historica (Soc. Acad. Ducoromana), iv (1965), 27-39; I.H. Konyalâ, Üskûdâr tarihî, 2 vols., Istanbul 1976, i, 249-52; G. Goodwin, A history of Ottoman architecture, London 1971, 114-15 (with wrong date), 283. (A. H. DE GROOT)

MEHMED PASHA SARI, DEFTERDAR, BÂKÇAL-OGLU [see SARI MEHMED PASHA]

MEHMED PASHA ŞOKULLİ, TAVÜT. [see ŞOKULLİ, ŞOKULLİ]

MEHMED PASHA, SULTAN-ZADE, DHWAN KAPRÎ-BAGHî, SEMİN (1010-56/1602-46), Ottoman Grand Vizier.

He was born in Istanbul as the son of 'Abd al-Rahman Bey (himself a son of Semiz Ahmed Pasha, Grand Vizier 887-8/1579-80, and his son-in-law) and of Humâzâh 'Âşîhe Khanîm Sultan, a daughter of Cîhâlûrân, Sultan of the Istanbul Greeks [q.v.], thus being a grandson of Princess Mih-i Mâh.
Sultan [q. v.}, hence his surname Sultan-zade (cf.
A.D. Alderson, The structure of the Ottoman dynasty,
Oxford 1956, Table XXX, no. 2128). Mehmed Paşa
was educated in the imperial harem and the
ulamd. At the same time, it must be noted, he made
a large number of changes in official appointments
justified Yusuf Pasha in all respects, and he was
return to the capital, the Grand Vizier Kemankesh
[ q. v. ], Sultan Ibrahim's
corps on campaign. In fact, he was denounced by the
in and around Belgrade till 1154/1741, serving on the
mixed Ottoman-Austrian boundary commission with
Kâdî Ebî Sehil Nu'mân Efendi. Later, he was twice
made Yeniери Efendi as well. In 1745 he became
famous in the Ottoman chronology (Kâdî-âddî (q. v.)).
At the same time, he must be noted, he made
the complete restoration and extension of the Imperial
Naval Dockyard at Istanbul after its destruction by
fire. He earned Sultan Mahmud's [ q. v. ] favour and
was promoted to be "General Deputy" (kethîdi =
kapûyeh [q. v.]) of the Sublime Porte). The protection of
the Dor-î-sâîda Ağâh Haji Mustaфа Ağha provided him with a
quick career from Mir Ağâh to vizier andbeglerbegi of
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Istanbul 1971, iii, 354–62, 367–70, 372;
M. I. Kunt, The Sultan's servants, New York 1983,
131–3; 1'Îmân-zade Tâhîc Ahmed, Hadisit dâ'âiere
2’, repr. Freiburg i. B. 1969; Nûsîmî, FâYılıh,
Istanbul 1280/1863–4, 110–19; Von Hammer,
HEO, iv, 184, 213 ff., 219 f., 260–4, 277, 286 ff.,
298 f. (A.H. De Groot)

MEHMED PASHA, TABANIYASSI (997–
1002), Ottoman Grand Vizier.

Of Albanian origin, he was taken from his home at
Tag˘hlija as a devshirme boy and entered the palace
service [see endnote]. The protection of the
Dor-î-sâîda Ağâh Haji MustaFa Ağha provided him with a
quick career from Mir Ağâh to vizier and beglerbegi of
Egypt before becoming Grand Vizier on 28 Shawwât
1041/18 May 1632. He assisted Sultan Murad IV
[ q. v. ] in suppressing opposition forces in the capital,
thus making it possible for the sultan to rule in person.
Mehmed Paşa was educated in the imperial harem and
the centre of power by making him beglerbegi of
Damascus (Radjab 1053/October 1643). It was there
where he received the seal of office and the appointment
as Grand Vizier (21 Dhu 'l-Ka'da 1053/January 1644),
thanks to his collaboration with the faction of
Djindji Khodja [see HUSAYN EFENDI], Sultan Ibrahim's
capera. Outside the Dardanelles, Mehmed Paşa's
powerful influence and activity with Swedish and
Transylvanian diplomacy, whilst only 19 years old, he became
highly critical of the conduct of the
sultan justified Yusuf Paşa in all respects, and he was
dismissed. In Dhu 'l-Ka'da 1055/January 1646 he
was in his turn appointed sadrî of the Cretan
campaign. Outside the Dardanelles, Mehmed Paşa's
fleet of galleys encountered the Venetian sailing
squadron of Tommaso Morosini off Tenedos (Ott.
Bozda Ada [q. v.]) and successfully passed the Venetian
blockade (19 Rabî‘ II 1056/4 June). Arriving at
Crete on 27 Djamâd al-Akhir 1056/10 August 1646, he
decided to lay siege to the fortresses of Suda and
Aprikorno near Canea. Already ill during the voyage
thither, Mehmed Paşa became ill on 8 Djamâd al-Akhir 1056/11-12 August 1646 in camp before Suda. His
body was brought home to be buried next to his
mother 'Aşîhe Khânîm Sultan in the cemetery of the
Karâ of 'Aziz Mahmûd Hâdât at Uskûdar. A son
and grandsons of his are mentioned in SØ, iv, 161 ff.
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Tarihî, Istanbul 1328/1862–3, 110–19; Von Hammer,
HEO, iv, 184, 213 ff., 219 f., 260–4, 277, 286 ff.,
298 f. (A.H. De Groot)
While in power (cf. Süleyman ʿİzzî, Taʿrīḫ, fols. 66a-72a).

During his tenure of office, Ottoman diplomacy saw significant changes. Pejawaz was dismissed by Nâdir Shâh [q.v.] on 17 Şebābân 1150/4 September 1746 (f. 178v), and Nâzîf Mustaṭfa Endî, İyân şerâfatnâmesi, in F. R. Unat, Osmanlı şerifleri ve şerâfatnâmeresi, Ankara 1968, 84 + ill.). In 1160/1747 Mehmed Paşa rejected the French overtures to make an offensive alliance against Austria; the Porte had not forgotten how France refused the Ottoman offer of mediation in 1158/1745 and remained distrustful of French motives (cf. F. de Tassigny, Recueil des traités de la Porte Ottomane, Paris 1864, ii, 178 f.). On the contrary, Mehmed Paşa had the peace confirmed with the new Austrian ruler, the Empress Maria Theresa, on 10 April 1747. This agreement was followed up by a treaty of friendship and commerce with Tuscany on 27 May 1747 (cf. Muʿâṣeret MeÂginâ相比于, Istanbul 1297, iii, 135 ff.; ʿİzzî, op. cit., fols. 114-121).

Sultan Mahmut I (1143-49, 1158-75) dismissed his Grand Vizier before he could leave for Belgrade. The Crimean Khan was his main adviser and later again Commissary of the Customs, leaving that position to Topâl ʿOthmân Paşa, as well. In 1145/1733 he acquired the post of Meşküfât-ı Kürpûlî-zâde Hâфиз Ahmed Paşa. In 1737/1150 he was appointed vizier and got the function of Kâtûn-makâm (23/26) Şebābân 1150/16 (199) December 1737, Şehmân-zâde, Murâb-i tevarîhid, 67, 77-85: 29 Şebābân 1150/22 December 1737). Yegen Mehmed then became Grand Vizier. Preparing for war, he desired at the same time the French ambassador Villeneuve to undertake mediation with the Emperor and with Russia. He left Istanbul as serdar on 15 Dhuʾl-Hijja 1150/5 April 1736 and moved the army via Edirne and Niş to Ada-Kale [q.v.]. After heavy fighting in that area, he was successful in the retaking of Meğdive, Ada-Kale and Semendire (26 Rabî 1151/13 August 1738). Having returned to Istanbul at the end of the campaigning season, preparations of war were mainly directed towards the reconquest of Belgrade. The Crimean Khân was his main adviser on the conduct of the war against Russia at this time. Through the influence of the powerful Dâr al-Salât Ağâlî Bâghir Agha, Sultan Mahmut I [q.v.], dismissed his Grand Vizier before he could leave for the front (12 Dhuʾl-Hijja 1151/23 March 1739).

Mehmed Paşa was now exiled to Chios (Ott. Sâkhî[z] [q.v.]) for one-and-a-half years. On 19 Rabî II 1153/14 July 1740, Yegen Mehmed was made military governor of Candia. Afterwards he received the governorates of Negroponte (Ott. Eghrîboz [q.v.]), Bosnia and (in 1157/1744) Aydîn [q.v.]. At the end of the same year, he was made Beglerbegi of Anadolu and serdar, being sent to Kars and the Persian front with a large army. Thanks to the initiative of the Crimean Khan Selîm Giray II (1743-8) and his Tatar troops, the Ottomans attacked the Persian army in its fortified position near Erivan (12 Rabî` 1158/10 August 1745). After a week of fighting, the Grand Vizier fell ill and could not exercise his command any more. Disorder ensued among the Ottoman Legend [q.v.] troops, and fighting was
MEHMED PASHA, YEGEN — MEHMED Sâid Ghalîb Pasha

broked off. The Grand Vizier died on 21 Radjab 1158/19 August 1745; his body was brought inside the citadel of Kars and buried there.


MEHMED RA'UF, Modern Turkish Mehmet Rauf (1875-1931), Turkish novelist of the late 19th and early 20th century. Born in Istanbul and trained as a naval officer, he entered the navy in 1893, was sent to Crete for further education, served as liaison officer in the launches of Foreign Embassies on the Bosphorus, retiring from the navy in 1908. Apart from publishing various periodicals for ladies and some attempts to carry on trade, he devoted his life to his writing.

Already while a student in the naval college he sent his first literary experiments to Khâlid Dîyâ [q.v.] in İzmir, who published them in the newspaper Khiâyîme. Later, he contributed to the periodical Mekteb and various daily papers. When in 1895, the leading westernising writers formed a group for modern literature [see Türk. Literature] around the periodical Therwet-i Funun [q.v.], he soon joined them and published most of his writings there. Through Khâlid Dîyâ, now in Istanbul, he met most of the Therwet-i Funun school. Most of his novels and collection of short stories, numbering a dozen each, are superficial, over-sentimental narratives with one remarkable exception, Eýül “September” (1900), which is the first example in Turkish literature, of sustained psychological analysis. This novel stands out not only among the works of Mehmed Ra'uf, but it is also one of the most outstanding prose productions of the whole period.

Eýül is the love story of Su'âd, a married woman and Nedjîb, a relative and family friend. It is set among the semi-westernised, lower-middle class families of Istanbul at the turn of the century. Thîreyeyâ is the immature, sporty husband who spends most of his time boating and swimming while his wife tries to find consolation in music and plays the piano for hours on end to escape her boring life. A deep platonic relationship develops between Su'âd and Nedjîb, who shares similar tastes with her. Entire chapters of the novel are devoted to a psychological analysis of the lovers, who, because of their strict upbringing, remain faithful to the bounds of morality. A fire breaks out in the seaside villa (yali) on the Bosphorus where the young married couple live, and Su'âd, together with Nedjîb who tries to save her, both perish in the flames.


MEHMED RE'ÎS, Ian Menezenî, Turkish ship’s captain and cartographer from an Aegean seafaring family, author of an 81 x 58 cm chart of the Aegean Sea, showing also Greece and the western coast of Asia Minor (Museo Correr, Venice). Dated 1197/5 April 1688, the chart is now in the Library of the University of Istanbul, with the corresponding maps of Piri Re'îs [q. v.], although these are not as accurate as the chart. The chart is signed in Italian (probably from the 17th century), the chart shows rhumbs and 199 names of coastal towns or islands noted in Turkish.

Similar to the Aegean sea-chart in the atlas of ‘Ali Maşrur Re’îs’ dating from 1567, the above-mentioned belongs to the portolan tradition. It is more exact than the corresponding maps of Piri Re'îs [q. v.], although some names are different from both in nomenclature. One should note that all Turkish sea-charts of the Aegean not only differ from the European ones in nomenclature but are also not as standardised as these.


MEHMED Sâîd Ghalîb Pasha, Ottoman statesman.

Born in Istanbul in 1177/1763-4, he was the son of Seyyid Ahmed Efendi, bash-khalife of the mektebi office of the Grand Vizier. After the death of his father (1188/1774-5), he entered the same office where he became bash-khalife in 1210/1795. He was appointed âmedji [q. v.] on 15 Ramadan 1213/3 February 1798 and was sent to France (April 1802) to negotiate peace, which had been broken by the French expedition to Egypt (July 1798). He succeeded in signing the Treaty of Paris on 25 June 1802 (for the text of this treaty, see G. Noradounghian, Recueil d’actes internationaux de l’Empire ottoman, Paris 1897-1903, ii, 51-4). Back in Istanbul at the beginning of 1803, he became bûyûk tâdi“In September 1806. He followed the Ottoman army in the campaign against Russia, but when the news of Selim III’s deposition on 29 May 1807 reached him, he took refuge with Musta‘îb Pasha Bayrâkdar [q. v.] at Rusçuk. Meanwhile, a few days later, on 15 Djumâda I 1222/21 July 1807, he was appointed nâbiî and charged with the negotiation of the armistice with the Russians. This resulted in the armistice of Slobosia (24 August). Ghalîb Efendi was nominated re’s ul-kûttab for the second time on 19 Sâfar 1223/15 April 1808. He maintained his position after Muşta‘îb IV’s deposition on 28 July, and remained in charge under Mehmed II up to the middle of 1811. Then he became kâtîhî of the Grand Vizier. He headed the Ottoman mission in the negotiations with the Russians, aiming at ending the war which had been resumed again in October 1808. Thus he concluded the treaty of Bucharest on 28 May 1812 (for the text of this treaty, see Noradounghian, ii, 86-92). He was appointed re’s ul-kûttab for the third time on 30 Muharrem 1229/22 January 1814, but was dismissed during the etvâsî-i Radjâgb/22 June-8 July 1814. Ghalîb Efendi remained for the following nine years out of Istanbul. He was charged, with the rank
of waizir and the title of paşa, with the administration
of different provinces in Anatolia. His banishment
was due to Hâle Efendi [q.v.], a political rival whose
influence had become preponderant at the court.
He was exiled to Konya in Ramadân 1206 (June
1827), and could regain favour only after the accession
of his rival (during the evâkıhir-i Şafar 1238/7-15
November 1822).

Qâlib Pasha was nominated commandant of the
European side of the Bosphorus during the evâkıhir-
i Müharram 1239/17-26 September 1823. He returned
to Istanbul and soon became Grand Vizier (10 Rabî'
II/14 December). The main problem with which he
had to deal was the Greek revolt in the Morea. He
charged the valî of Egypt Muhammad ʻAli Paşa [q.v.]
to crush the revolt by landing troops in the
peninsula. He was dismissed from the Grand
Vizierate on 20 Muḥarram 1240/14 September 1824.
The cause seems to be his reluctance to agree to the
proposal of the Sultan for the abolition of the
askeri of Egypt Muhammad ʻAli Paşa, who died in
the Emir Bukhari Dergah. His banishment
was terminated on 1 Şâbâbân 1160/8 August
1747, after he had completed the customary term.

Mehmed Salih Efendi was appointed commandant of
Qâlibat-i Şāhân 1163/3 November 1750, at the request of the Shaykh
al-İslâm Sayyid Murtaḍâ Efendi, he was additionally
granted the rank (pâyes) of Anadolu by Şâh-i hümâyûn
of Sultan Mahmûd. On 7 Şâbâbân 1167/30 May 1754
he entered into the functions of Anadolu kâdi ʻaskerî,
and held this post until 10 Şâhân 1169/22 May
1755. On the last day of Şâfâr 1171/12 November
1757 he was appointed askeri târîkî of Rûmî, and
having fulfilled the normal term of the appointment,
he was made Shaykh al-İslâm on 16 Qumâdâ 1171/26
January 1758, replacing Dâmâd-zâde Fâlî Âl Efendi.
In this capacity he officiated at the marriage of
Muştafa ʻÎlî's sister Şâli̇ha Sultan to the Grand
Vizier Şâhîrât Râqîb Paşa at the Sultan Şâhî Sultan
Khâsil-sarayî in Eyûb. He was finally removed from
office on 5 Dhu ʻl-Ka‘da 1172/30 June 1759,
and given permission to reside in his villa at Kanûlû.

Mehmed Şâli̇h Efendi died on 1 Şâfâr 1175/25
April 1762, the first day of Şekîr Bayrâmî.
Funeral prayers were held on the following day at the mosque
of Fâth Sultan Mehmedem, and he was buried in the
cemetery of the medrese of Kâdi ʻaskerî Mehmed Efendi.
The cemetery is located in the district of Küçek
Muştafa Paşa, alongside the Petâva-kâme of Haydar Mahallesi,
and opposite the mosque of Sinân Ağa. Mehmed Şâli̇h Efendi
was a man of good character and distinguished
qualities. His son was the Shaykh al-
İslâm Ahmed Efendi.

Bibliography: Şefaret-nâme-i Qâlib Efendi, in Edêbiyyät-i: umûmsîye meqâmîsî, nos. 9-13, 15; Süleyman Fâlîk, Khaṭîfet al-râvâda, Appx. II, 166-
70; Şûrûf-i ʻelîmîn, iii, 615-16; Orhan F. Körprüld, Lâ, s.v.; ʻAşık, Taqâhîk, ii, passim; Şâni̇zi-zâde, Taqâhîk, i, passim;
Lutfi, Taqâhîk, i-ii, passim; Zinkeisen, vii, passim; A. von Prokosch-Osten, Geschichte des Babûlîs der
Griechen, Vienna 1867, i, 226, 240, 302 f., iv, 115 f.; İsmâîl Hakkî (Uzunçarşılı), Karesi meqâmîhî, Istanbul 1339/1925, ii,
137-40; idem, Amed Gâlib Efendînîn marhumâtîsi, in Bellettîn, i, 357-410; idem, Meşhur Romeli ʻeyvanndan, in Aleder Muṣṭafâ Pasha,
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(MEHMEH SAİD QÂLIB PAŞA — MEHMED YIRMISEKIZ)
at Edirne, and his father was Gürdüş (“the Georgian”) Süleyman Ağa, seksondjubashlı, meaning colonel of the 71st regiment of Janissaries. He himself followed a military career, after having, apparently, attended the school for pages of the imperial palace, and he belonged to the 28th regiment, hence the nickname of “Twenty-eight” (Yirmisekiz) which he retained. He rose to the rank of őrbağlı, then to that of Schwiter Ağa. But having also acquired a scholastic education which earned him the title of efendi (and which is illustrated by poems composed under the name of Paşâ, as well as by the Persian verses which he wrote when in Iran), he was assigned to administrative and financial responsibilities in the army: in the role of topkâne nâzir, he was charged with the management of the Arsenal. His diplomatic role began with the negotiations over the Treaty of Passarowitz (1718), where he was deputy plenipotentiary with the title of “receiver of taxes of the third order” (gökk-i thâlûl defendârî). In this role he acquired, according to Bonnac, ambassador in Constantinople (1716-24) “a fine reputation among the ministers of the Christian princes who were present there”. It was as a result of this experience that he was appointed to undertake the mission to France, raised on this occasion to the rank of “chief accountant” (baş bahâne işbâşi). The sending to Paris not of a simple emissary as in previous periods, nor of a permanent representative, but at last of a specially accredited ambassador (efi [g.v.]), represented a diplomatic innovation, for which the initiative belonged entirely to the Grand Vizier, son-in-law of Ahmed III, Newsghiril Ibrahim Pasha. The latter’s ulterior motives were kept secret so as to avoid disturbing foreign powers and perhaps also to avoid friction with conservative elements at home. Officially, the ambassador was entrusted with the task of conveying to the French authorities (King Louis XV, still a minor, and the regent Philippe d’Orléans) the sultan’s authorisation of repairs to the cupola of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, which the French had requested in their role as protectors of the Christians of the East. He was also required to discuss the problem of Maltese piracy and to obtain the release of Ottoman prisoners serving as slaves in the royal galleys. But it is probable that, having experienced the setbacks ratified by the Treaties of Carlowitz (1699 [see Karlovača] and Passarowitz, the Grand Vizier in fact envisaged a strengthening of the Ottoman Empire against the Habsburgs by means of a more or less close alliance with France (though the latter had been engaged in a system of alliances with Austria since 1718), and he also hoped to acquire information regarding the scientific and technical advances taking place in western Europe and especially in France. A passage which is often quoted from the instructions given to Mehmed Efendi, required him “to visit fortresses and factories, to make a detailed study of the means of civilisation and education and to compile a report concerning those which may be applied”. The ambassador’s journey, made in the company of his son Saîd Efendi (himself a future ambassador to Sweden and France, in 1742, and future Grand Vizier) and an entourage of about a hundred persons, lasted a year, from his departure from Istanbul on 7 October 1720 to his return on 8 October 1721. Although dubious at the very principle of his mission, the French authorities received him with respect and considerable pomp, while his public appearances excited much curiosity which he is amply reflected in the writings of the diarists and journalists of the time. Arriving at Toulon on 22 November, he had to spend a period of quarantine at Maguelone, and then reached Paris by a circuitous route through the west of the country, initially following the course of the Canal du Midi, in order to avoid the south-east which was then the scene of an outbreak of plague. Mehmed Efendi arrived in Paris on 8 March 1721. Mehmed Efendi remained in the capital and its immediate surroundings until 3 August. Returning to Sète via the Rhône valley, he began there on 7 September, his return journey, with a stop-over at La Goulette. The Sefîret-name, which is known through numerous editions in Ottoman and modern Turkish and the French (two extended versions by the “jeune de langues”, Julien-Claude Galland (nephew of the translator of the Thousand and one nights), has not yet been the object of a proper critical edition (see Bibl.). It is known that a first draft was composed during the journey itself, and a version presented to the Grand Vizier immediately after his return, followed two years later by a more extended version; from his version, passages regarded as excessively critical of the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, the Archbishop of Cambrai, Dubois, were excited at the behest of the Marquis de Bonnac. The account with which we have to do may not perhaps respond to all possible a priori expectations of this first discovery of France by an educated Ottoman, this spontaneous encounter between two cultures. But it is necessary to take into account the limited type of experience available to an ambassador, as well as the constraints imposed on a report designed simultaneously to be read by senior officials of the state and to be widely available to the general public. Not only has the author not seen everything, but in a more or less deliberate fashion he refrains from mentioning everything which he actually knows. However, his account, such as it is, remains a no less remarkable document, notable for the curiosity, open mindedness, descriptive qualities and aptitude for judgment which it demonstrates and which place it indisputably above the only surviving precedent, the account of Vienna by Kara Mehmed Pasha in 1665; these qualities were to make it the example to be followed by all subsequent sefîret-names. Mehmed Efendi pays little attention to manners, beyond noting the curiosity of the French, the astonishing freedom of movement of their women and the respect accorded to them. He is also somewhat sparing of political information, in the sense of French institutions, the personalities of the rulers and the content of his negotiations, which led Bonnac to remark that this was not the account of an ambassador. On the other hand, he writes enthusiastically and pertinently concerning natural phenomena and especially—corresponding to the object of his mission, as noted above—the military, scientific and technical achievements that he witnessed. He shows equal interest and discernment in the artistic domain. He thus provides detailed and vivid descriptions of the Canal du Midi and its locks, the Invalides (with the organ, the chapel, the veterans’ hospital), military parades and manoeuvres on the field of the Sablons, the collection of city models or city plans in relief preserved at that time in the Tuileries, the royal manufacturers of the Gobelin tapestries and the Saint-Gobain mirrors, the “king’s garden” (the future Museum of Natural History), the Opera, the Paris observatory, the palaces and landscaped gardens of Saint-Cloud, Meudon, Versailles, Marly (with the famous “machine” drawing water from the Seine) and Chantilly. The ambassador never explicitly advocates imitation of the marvels of the France of Louis XIV and of the Regency (the enormous costs of
which he is always at pains to point out), but his role as propagandist is all the more effective in view of his 

The resulting French influence was manifested most of all in architecture in a style known as alfafa (ala franco), especially perceptible in the improvements made to the residence of Ahmed III at the Fresh Waters of Europe, known as Sa'dibâd: the construction of a canal on the model of those of Versailles and Fontainebleau along which the houses of the dignitaries were built contiguously, with the aim of imitating a classical disposition (a procedure called hüsûr-yallâr). Similarly, the two elegant fountains built by way of the Sakarya (cf. A. Wasif, Gulf of Izmir by way of the Sakarya (cf. A. Wasif, Gulf of Izmir by way of the Sakarya (cf. A. Wasif, Gulf of Izmir by way of the Sakarya (cf. A. Wasif, Gulf of Izmir by way of the Sakarya (cf. A. Wasif, Gulf of Izmir by way of the Sakarya (cf. A. Wasif, Gulf of Izmir by way of the Sakarya (cf. A. Wasif, Gulf of Izmir by way of the Sakarya (cf. A. Wasif, Gulf of Izmir by way of the Sakarya (cf. A. Wasif, Gulf of Izmir by way of the Sakarya (cf. A. Wasif, Gulf of Izmir by way of the Sakarya (cf. A. Wasif, Gulf of Izmir by way of the Sakarya (cf. A. Wasif, Gulf of Izmir by way of the Sakarya (cf. A. Wasif, Gulf of Izmir by way of the Sakarya (cf. A. Wasif, Gulf of Izmir by way of the Sakarya (cf. A. Wasif, Gulf of Izmir by way of the Sakarya (cf. A. Wasif, Gulf of Izmir by way of the Sakarya (cf. A. Wasif, Gulf of Izmir by way of the Sakarya (cf. A. Wasif, Gulf of Izmir by way of the Sakarya (cf. A. Wasif, Gulf of Izmir by way of the Sakarya (cf. A. Wasif, Gulf of Izmir by way of the Sakarya (cf. A. Wasif, Gulf of Izmir by way of the Sakarya (cf. A. Wasif), has left no trace behind it. But his role as propagandist is all the more effective in view of his "curiosities" and artistic refinements.

Another marked effect of the diplomatic mission was the establishment, in 1727, of the first printing-press using Arabic characters, at the initiative of İbrahim Müteferrika [q. v.] and Sa'id Efendi, who was impressed by examples of printing seen in Paris, a fact mentioned by Saint-Simon (ed. Boislisle, xxxviii, 201-4) but not recorded in his father's account [see MÜTFERIKA, 2, in Turkey]. The insurrection of 1730 brought a halt—a bit occupational—to this trend which, despite its superficial and even frivolous aspects, represented an important change in attitude towards the West. Affected by the fall of his patrons, Mehmed Efendi was nevertheless entrusted with the task of conveying to Poland the letter proclaiming the accession of Mahmud I (Topkapı Archives, E. 1654). He ended his career as governor of Cyprus, where he died in 1145/1732.


MEHMET ZAİM, Ottoman Turkish historian.

All that we know of his life has been gleaned from his works. He was born in 1539/1532, for he tells us that at the accession of Sultan Murâd III, i.e. in 961/1554, when Sultan Suleyman took the field against the capture of Stuhlweissenburg, was appointed secretary in the service of the governor of Syria, Teki-i zmân, which was sent to the governors of Diyarbakr, Aleppo, and Baghdad. This office, to which he perhaps succeeded on the promotion (978/1570) of the famous Retour de bord du chevalier de Camilly, juillet 1721-mai 1722, in L 'Empire ottoman, la république de Turquie et la France, Paris 1986, 73-86; F. Müge Göçek, East encounters West, France and the Ottoman Empire in the eighteenth century, Oxford 1987. (G. VEINSTEIN)
Muharram 985 (beginning of 21 March 1577) and had completed it in Dhu '1-Hijjah of the same year (beginning of 9 Feb. 1578). The date of his death and the site of his tomb are not known but he is said to have left charitable endowments in Kafraria near Salonika.

He called his book *Humay-yi qimmi* at-tawwarkh and dedicated it to his master Mehemd Sokollu. As his sources, he mentions eleven historians from Firdawsi and al-Tabari down to the anonymous *Tawwarkh-i selatîn-i alî-i Ôhtmân* and gives as his main source the *Behgii at-tawwarkh*, from which, as has been proved, he copied whole pages without a change. The book, which is not yet printed, is divided into a prefix and five large sections (aksâm, subdivided into guruhs and then again into makâlât) and concludes with an epilogue. Rieu and others have given an account of the contents from the manuscripts. In the fourth guruh of the 5th kism he deals with the Ottomans, and here alone do we have statements of any value, when the author describes from his own experience events from 950/1543 onwards. He brought his story down to the time of writing, and the last event that he mentions took place in the month in which the book was finished.

The passages in the book relating to Hungary have been dealt with by Thûry (*Tûrk történetírők*, ii, 364-89), who also collected the above data for his life, the earlier from 1390 to 1476 are given in extracts and the later from 1521 to 1566 translated in full. Of the other less valuable parts of the book, Dietz (*Denkwürdigkeiten von Asien*, i, 212 ff.) has edited a portion of the very early history, dealing with Cain and his descendants, while Von Hammer (*Sur les origines russes*, lxi, 120) edited and translated a portion on the tribal divisions of the Turks, where the *Rûs* appear as the ninth Turkish tribe. Of the later Ottoman historians, Ibrâhîm Pečevi utilised and quoted from the work of Mehemd Za'fîm from the year 949/1542 onwards.

**Bibliography:** Babinger, *GOW*, 20, 98-9, 193, where further references are given; *Istanbul kütiphaneleri tarnh-coğrafya yazmaları kataloğu*, Istanbul 1943, 100 ff.

**MEHTER** (*P*.), a musical ensemble consisting of combinations of double-reed shawms (*zurna*), trumpets (*boru*), double-headed drum (*tabl*), kettle-drums (*nakkahre, kôr*) and metallic percussion instruments. The name (*P*. ‘greater’) apparently denotes ‘the greater orchestra’. Other terms are: Mehterkhâne, Tabl-khâne, Tabl-u *Alem* (‘drum and standard’), Mehtér-i Tabl-u *Alem*, *Djemâ*-ât-i Mehtéran, and Tabl-i Al-i Ôhtmân (‘Drum of the Ottoman House’). The Ottoman mehtér was the analogue of the wind, brass and percussion ensembles used for official, municipal and military purposes in other Islamic states. Traditions current in Ottoman and in earlier Arabic sources (e.g. Ibn Khaldûn) link the *mehtér* to the Turkic and Khurasanian elements in the caliphal armies.

The Ottoman mehtér was outlawed (and physically destroyed) in 1826. Therefore, information about it is derived from written sources, the most important of which is the *Seyyad-nâmé* of Ewlyâh Çelebi (11th/17th century). Prince Cantemir’s history contains a few important passages, and short references are found in a variety of Ottoman and European sources. Another important source lies in Ottoman miniatures which frequently portray the mehtér musicians. The absence of an authentic oral tradition for the mehtér is partly compensated by the notations found in the 11th/17th century *Magâs-yi idâže u sîc* by ‘Ali Ülkî Bey (Alberto Bobowsky) and the *Kîlîb-i idâm al-musîki* ‘alâ neql at-
Ottoman tabī was the ancestor both of the folkloric drum of the same name (called also tapan, kas or hubandž in the Balkans) and of the European military drum, which has however abandoned the bass-treble division during the 19th century.

A secondary percussion instrument was the näkkāre, a medium-sized kettle-drum made of copper. The two parts of the näkkāre were tuned differently to produce bass and treble tones, and were struck with sticks (zahme) of uniform shape. A much larger kettledrum was the kōs, which could measure one-and-a-half metres at the top. It was also made of copper. The kōs was taken on campaigns and played at official occasions.

The drum of the mehter were supported by two types of brass percussion—the hållîs or zîls (cymbals) and the çevgân, a crescent-shaped, jingling rattle with bells. These instruments were played in large groups, with the zurnas and dâwûls in equal numbers, and the other instruments somewhat less numerous. In the early 19th century, Von Hammer reports that a vizier’s or pasha’s mehter consisted of 72 pieces: 16 zurnas, 16 tâbîls, 11 Boris, 8 näkkâres, 7 hållîs and 4 kōs.

The sultan’s mehter (called mehter-khâne-yi hassanî or mehter-khâne-yi hımâyûn) was twice that during campaigns.

The mehter was conducted by the lead zurna-player (zurna-ten bâği), who was therefore termed mehterbâğa. The mehter normally performed in a circular formation. During campaigns or processions (alay), the musicians were mounted on horses or camels; the kōs was taken on a camel or an elephant.

The répertoire of the mehter was termed nevbeet or faâst. Of this répertoire, approximately sixty pieces have survived. This répertoire was related to the instrumental suite (faâst-i sâxandegân) of Ottoman court music. The dominant forms were the pêşrew and the semâ, as well as the improvised laksﬁm. The pêşrews and semâ’s of the mehter form separate genres which employed somewhat simpler rhythmic cycles and larger melodic leaps than the contemporaneous court music. One performance practice associated exclusively with the mehter was the karabatak: alternation of soft passages played by a pair of mehter drummers, with tutti passages. The mehter répertoire is identified in the sources by the names of individual items, e.g. sandâk (“standard”) allâ (“horseman”), alay düzen (“parade order”), elî (“ambassador”), or the term târî (“martial”). During the 18th century, the mehter répertoire was broadened to include instrumental versions of the classical vocal forms (beste, nakhła, semâ’s), as well as folk tunes (egei, torka, kalenderi).

In 1720 the Porte presented the Polish court with a complete mehter ensemble. The gift was very much appreciated, and soon after Russia and then Prussia requested similar ensembles. By the 1770s, many European courts had mehter bands, and some sent their bandmasters to Istanbul to study the mehter. The main musical result of this cross-cultural exchange appears to have been the introduction of several percussion instruments into European military bands and court orchestras, which gradually led to the augmentation of other instrumental sections and hence a change in orchestral texture. Possible influence of the mehter melodies themselves upon European military music of the 18th century has not been adequately researched. In addition, in the South-East European territories under Ottoman domination or influence, the music of the mehter was an important factor in the diffusion of Ottoman-Islamic musical principles.

The destruction of the Janissary Corps in 1826 led to the neglect of the mehter répertoire, which appears to have been completely forgotten by the end of the 19th century. During the First World War, an attempt was made to revive a version of the mehter in accordance with the needs of the modernised Turkish army. Hymns and marches (the latter built on a mixture of Turkish and Western musical ideas) were commissioned from classical composers such as İsmâ‘îl Hâkki (d. 1927), Kâzım Us (d. 1943) and Ali Riza Şengel (d. 1953). Some private mehter ensembles were created during the War of Liberation, but these were not institutionalised during the Republic. In 1952, a new mehterhane was established in conjunction with the Military Museum in Istanbul. The costumes and some of the performance practices of this new mehter are largely authentic, but its répertoire is drawn almost exclusively from the hybrid mehter music of the First World War.

**Bibliography:** Sources for the mehter are few. Almost all Ottoman (but almost no Western) sources for the mehter are treated by Haydar Sanal in Mehter musikisi, Istanbul 1964. Sanal’s book is the major point of reference for any study of the mehter and its music. In contains transcriptions of virtually the entire authentic répertoire of the mehter found in the works of 'Ali Ülê Kathryn and Cememir. Abundant references to Ottoman sources may be found in Sanal’s book. Of these, the most important is Evliyâ Celebi’s Şehlâne-nâm, i.e. Several aspects of the mehter were treated by Zeki Mehmet Pakalh in Orhant’s Tarîh deyimesi ve terimleri sâıcilikü, ii, Istanbul 1971, 444-51. See also H.G. Farmer, Turkish influence in military music, London 1950; K. Signell, Mozart and the Mehter, in The Consort, no. 24 (1967), 310-22. (W. Feldman)

**MEKNÈS [see MIKNÂS].**

**MELILLA** (in modern Arabic: Mîlîya, Berber Tamlit, “the white”; in the Arab geographers, Melîlah), a seaport on the east coast of Morocco on a promontory on the peninsula of Geûtîyya at the end of which is the Cape Tres Forcas or the Three Forks (Râs Hûrk of the Arab geographers, now Râs Werk). Melilla probably corresponds to the Rassadir of the ancients (cf. Rhassad or Rasat), the Russad of the Antonian Itinerary. Later Africanus says that it had belonged for a time to the Goths and that the Arabs took it from them, but in reality we know nothing of the ancient history of the town.

It is only at the beginning of the 4th/10th century that Melilla appears in the Muslim history of Morocco. In 318/930, the Umayyad Caliph of Spain, 'Abd al-Rahmân III al-Nâşir Li-Dîn Allâh, succeeded in detaching from the Fâtîmids the famous Mîknânî chief Mūsâ b. Aﬁf ‘l-’Afiya, who had established his authority over the basin of the Mououya and the district of Taza; having seized Melilla, al-Nâşir built ramparts around it and gave it to his new ally, who thus had at his command a base of defence (mâkit) against the Fâtîmids of Idrîsîyya and a port which made communication with Spain easy. Later on, the descendants of his son, al-Bâri b. Mâsû, rebuilt the town, which remained one of the strongholds of the Mîknânî in Morocco down to the time of the decline of the power of the tribe, who were definitely defeated and scattered by the Almoravid Yusuf b. Tâhîfîn in 462/1070.

But the Mîknânî must have abandoned it before their dynasty was crushed by the Almoravids; for al-Bakiî shows us that by 459/1067 a descendant of the Hammâmîd Idrîsîds of Spain had been summoned to
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Melilla and recognised as ruler by the people of the district.

At the period when al-Bakri wrote (460/1068), Melilla was a town surrounded by a wall of stone; inside was a very strong citadel, a great mosque, a hammam and markets. The inhabitants belonged to the tribe of the Banū Wartād (or B. Wartardā), a branch of the Baṭṭyāya group of the Sāḥḥāḍa. Melilla had a harbour which was accessible only in summer. It was the terminus of a trade route which connected Sīdīlmāsah with the Mediterranean through the valley of the Moulouya and Agarsīf (French Guerci). The trade must have been considerable; the principal exports were no doubt those mentioned by Leo Africanus, sc. iron from the mines of the mountains and honey from the Kabdana country; we may also add pearls which were taken from oysters found in the harbour itself. Al-Bakri notes that by the Banū Wartād (who also occupied the stronghold called ʿKūlī Gāret), the Matmātah, the Aḥh Kahlān, the Mānīsā of the “White Hil” (al-Kudya al-bayyadāt), and the Gḥassāṣa of the massif which ends in Cape Tres Forcas (Qaḥal Ḥurk). All this region was then independent and had no political link with the kingdom of Fās or that of Nakūr.

But in 472/1080 the Almoravid sovereign Yūsuf b. Tāshfm took Melilla and added its territory to the Almoravid empire. In 536/1141-2, in the course of the Tashfm took Melilla and added its territory to the Almoravid empire. In 536/1141-2, in the course of the Almoravid pursuit of the Almohads, a body of the latter set out from Tāmsāmān to lay siege to Melilla, which was taken and plundered. In 671/1272, the Marinid sultan Yaʿkīb took Melilla from the Almohads, and Ibn Khaldūn simply mentions it as a fortified place. It seems in fact that these three captures of the town had destroyed its commercial importance to the advantage of another town on the west coast of the peninsula of the Gelṣyya, sc. Gḥassāṣa, also called al-Kudya al-bayyadāt, the Alcudia of the Portuguese; in the 8th/14th century it is this latter town that appears as the Mediterranean port of Fās and Taza, and it was through it that political and commercial relations with eastern Spain and Italy (Genoa and Venice) were carried on.

Leo Africanus reports that in 895/1490, hearing that an attack on it was planned by the Spaniards, the inhabitants abandoned the town and fled to the mountains of the Baṭṭyāya; to punish them for this the Wazīṣārid sultan had the town burned down; when in Muharram 903/September 1497 the Spaniards arrived, they were thus able to disembark without resistance and occupied the town, abandoned and half-destroyed. The occupation of Melilla enabled the Spaniards to attack the port of Gḥassāṣa by land and it was taken in Dhu l-ʿAḍaʾ 911/April 1506. The Moroccans recaptured it in 940/1533, but the dangerous proximity of Melilla henceforth deprived it of importance. The commercial activity of this region was moved farther west to the port of al-Mazimma [see al-Muṣayma in Suppl.], and the centre of Muslim resistance in this part of Morocco was henceforth the stronghold of Tāzīḡā, which after having been the capital of the Marinid fief of the Banū Waṭās, became that of a practically independent leader of holy war.

After passing into the hands of the Spaniards, Melilla was continuously besieged by the Muslims, mainly by the forces of the leaders of holy war established at Tāzīḡā and at Mīḡlāw (the Meggeo of Leo Africanus). Occupied by the Christians, the town naturally became one of the places in Morocco in which Muslims pretenders and rebels found asylum and support against the central power, especially at the beginning of the Saʿdi dynasty. In 956/1549, it sheltered the dispossessed Waṭāsīd Abū Ḥassān, “king” of Bādis; in 956/1550 it welcomed with his family Mawlay Ṭāmb “king” of Debīl. It was from Melilla that in 1003/1595, the pretender al-Nāṣir b. al-Ghālib bi-līlāh set out against his uncle the sultan Abū al-Māṣūr.

Later, Melilla only appears in history in connection with sieges which it had to suffer: sieges by Mawlay Ismaʿīl in 1098/1687 and 1106/1695; siege in 1188/1774 by Mawlay Muhammad b. ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd, that of the Spanish-Moroccan war of 1893 (Sidi Wārayḥī affair). From 1903 to 1908 the region of Melilla was the scene of struggles between the pretender al-DjāliĪ al-Rūgī, established in the kūba of Selwān, and the troops of the sultan ʿAbd al-ʿAẓīz; defeated and receiving no support, the latter had to take refuge in Spanish territory and be repatriated. Still more recently in 1921, the same district witnessed the sanguinary battles between the Spaniards and the Rifians under ʿAbd al-Karīm (Anwāl disaster) (C.R. Pennell, A country with a government and a flag. The Rif War in Morocco 1921-1926, Wisbech, England 1986, 166-70, 198). Melilla is for Spain a “place of sovereignty” administratively dependent on the province of Malaga, like Ceuta [see SABTA], which itself depends on that of Cadiz. Before the establishment of the French protectorate, Melilla, being the most westerly part, was the landing-place for all the European merchandise (cotton, sugar, tea) intended not only for eastern Morocco but also for the Saharan regions of Morocco and Orania. It has now lost its commercial importance, but its population has considerably increased: 9,000 inhabitants in 1880, and 86,500 on the eve of Moroccan independence. It is also the seat of an important garrison.

Bibliography: Bakri, index; Leo Africanus, Description de l’Afrique, tr. A. Épaulard, 289-90; H. de Castries, Sources inédites de l’histoire du Maroc, Espagne, i, pp. i-xxvii: Melilla au XVe siècle. (G.S. COLIN)

MELLĀḤ [see MALLĀḤ].

MEMDUH SHELCKET ESENDAL [see ESENDAL in Suppl.].

MEMON [see AL-MAYMAN].

MEMON, the name of one of the three well-known Muslim trading communities of Gudjārāt, the other two being the Bohorās and Khōḍājahs [q.v.]. They claim to have embraced Islam around the 6th/12th century. Their name, originally derived from muʿīmīn “believer”, was later corrupted to Memun. They were converted to Islam from the trading Lohana and Kutch Bania castes living in Sindh and Kāčh (Kutch), either by a son or a descendant of ʿAbd al-Kādir al-Dīlān (d. 561/1166 [q.v.]). They are devout Sunnis and follow the Hanafi school of law. Most of them, except those who stayed back in Sindh, speak the Kacchi dialect of Gudjārāt. Following their pre-conversion practice, they do not allow inheritance to their widows and daughters. The most sacred shrine of their pāt, after that of ʿAbd al-Kādir al-Dīlān in Baghdad, is that of Khāṣṣā Muṣān al-Dīn Čiğait [q.v.] in Adjinār (K. B. Faridi, Gazetteer of the Bombay Presidency, i,2, Gujarāt population, Musalmans and Parsees, Bombay 1899, 50-7). They celebrate the first ten days of Rabīʿ II by reciting the life history of ʿAbd al-Kādir al-Dīlān at a religious gathering known as ziyāra maghfīs (S. Edwardes, The Gazetteer of Bombay City and Island, Bombay 1909, i, 192-3).

They were a wealthy community living in Surat during the hey-day of the city’s prosperity. As Surat
sank into insignificance with the rise of Bombay (during the 19th century), they moved to the new city, attracted by its trade and commercial opportunities. After the famine of 1815 in Gudjarat and Ka'ooth, they migrated in large numbers and first began to do business in Bombay by opening tailoring establishments in Lohar Chawl. Their status progressed steadily as Bombay advanced in material prosperity, and they indulged in every kind of trade from shopkeeping, broking and peddling to furniture dealing and timber business and included among their number some of the richest individuals in Bombay (Edwardes, Gazetteer, i, 178). The Memon Chamber of Commerce, established in 1929 with a view to promote and protect the interests and rights of members in matter of inland and foreign trade, transport, industry, banking and shipping, had over one hundred members (Modern Bombay and her patriotic citizens, Bombay 1941, 110-11). With the partition of India in 1947, a considerable number of them migrated to Pakistan, and now some of these are the leading industrialists and the wealthiest merchants of Karachi. They have trade relations with East Africa, the Persian Gulf and the South-East Asia, especially Malaya and Singapore. A conservative, revivalist movement is currently gaining strong support among the Memons of Gudjarat and Bombay.

Bibliography: In addition to the works cited in the text, see S. Edwardes, By-ways of Bombay, Bombay 1912; 82-7, for a description of middle-class Memon daily life; P. and Oliva, Strip, The peoples of Bombay, Bombay 1944; 33-4. (I. POOnAWALA)

MEMPHIS [see MANF].

MENDERES, the name of three rivers of Anatolia which are known in modern Turkish by the name of three rivers of Anatolia which is usually preceded by the pertinent epithet: Büyük ('Big'), Küçük ('Little'), and Eski ('Old'). They are the classical Maiandros, Kaystros and Skamandros.

1. Büyük Menderes. It is part of the geological and hydrological features of western Anatolia that consist of latitudinal mountain chains flanking long valleys, the latter used and enlarged by rivers that flow into the Aegean Sea. These valleys, the mountain slopes along them and the estuaries have in turn been an inviting ground for habitation and economic and cultural development. Büyük Menderes with ancient Miletus, Küçük Menderes with Ephesus, Gediz [q.v.] (ancient Hermos) with Izmır, and Bakır Çayı (ancient Kaykos) with Bergama near their estuaries or courses, are the principal ones.

The exact length of the Büyük Menderes depends on which one of its upper arms should be referred to by this name (up to 529 km; drainage area of some 25,000 km²). The noteworthy fact is that its headwaters reach into the westernmost extension of the inner Anatolian plateau. The stream usually viewed as the beginning of the Büyük Menderes is fed by springs and brooks in the mountainous vicinity of Dinar (ancient Apameia). As it descends from the plateau, this river receives such tributaries as the Kula Çayı, Banaz Çayı and finally the Ğürtük Su (ancient Lykos) near Sarayköy. After Sarayköy, the Büyük Menderes follows the long, widening valley almost due west, at a slower pace, until it is deflected in the vicinity of the ruins of Magnesia-on-the-Maeander by the south-west oriented coastal range of Gümüş Dağ; it then turns south-westward and, avoiding a second obstacle represented by the Samson Dağ, it enters the sea some 10 km south-west of Balat [q.v.] (ancient Milet). The mountains flanking the Büyük Menderes on the south are cut by several longitudinal valleys used by its principal tributaries from that side: the Vandalas Çayı (ancient Morsynos), Ak Çayı (ancient Harpasos), and Ğine Suya (ancient Marsyas). The lower part of the middle course of the Büyük Menderes, roughly between Nazilli and Soke, flows through an alluvial plain marked by a deep and soft soil layer; this and the mild inclination rate with the resulting slowness of the current produces the winding course that has made the term "meander" better known than the river itself. The large amount of silt brought by the Büyük Menderes causes the coastline at its estuary to advance several metres each year. This is illustrated by the fate of ancient Miletos, which in the first millennium before our era was a port on the Latmikos kolpos, a bay to the southeast of the ancient estuary; by the 4th century A.D., the bar created by the silt turned the bay into a lake (the present-day Bafa Gölü is a remnant of this bay) and the port into a town on the river, but several kilometres from the coast (a similar fate threatened the recent centuries the Gulf of Izmır, saved only by a re-routing of the Gediz estuary further north in 1886).

The Büyük Menderes seems to have been little noticed by Islamic geographers. One exception is al-'Umarî (d. 750/1349), whose confusion, however, stresses the unfamiliarity of Islamic scholars with this river; he states that the "Mandaros" flows into the Black Sea and is as large as the "Miletos". The river is briefly mentioned in Fîrî Reis's portolan Kitâb-i bahriyye as "Mendiraz suyi" in the 927/1521 version (Topkapı Sarayi Müzesî, Bağdad Köşkü ms. 337, fol. 22b, text; on the map, 23a, as "Balât suyi"), and as "Ulu Mendirez" in the 932/1526 version (fascim. ed., Istanbul 1935, 209; text; on the map, p. 190, as "Mâi-i Mendirez"). Kâbit Celebi's [q.v.] Dihân-nâmi (in the edition by Abî Bakr b. Bakr, section al-Dînânî, second half of the 11th/17th century) has a map of Anatolia (between pp. 629 and 630) but without any trace of the river; the "Nehr-i Mendirez" is, however, briefly discussed on p. 634 of the text, with more detailed discussions of the general area on pp. 636-8. Ewliya Celebi [q.v.] appears to be the earliest Islamic author who describes the area along the river at some length (Bâdîî, Istanbul 1935, iii, 136-7; Istanbul 1935, iv, 92). He is followed by European travellers and scholars of the 17th to the 20th centuries; the results are perhaps best exemplified by the field trips and publications of A. Philippson (see Bibl.).

The importance of the Büyük Menderes valley, dominated by the warm Mediterranean climate yet also well-watered, has persisted, throughout political and ethnic changes, since antiquity. The fertility of the alluvial plain below and of the higher fringes along the parallel mountains combine to yield abundant as well as varied agricultural, horticultural and medicinal crops and products, such as raisins, figs, olives, cereals and cotton. This productivity is reflected in a dense agricultural as well as urban population, handicrafts and commerce. The towns and settlements are mostly located at a certain distance from the river in the more salubrious foothills, the majority being on the northern side. That side has always functioned as one of the principal avenues of trade and travel linking the Aegean coast with the Anatolian interior. Miletos and Ephesus were the chief maritime outlets in antiquity. In the Middle Ages, Miletos, known as Palatia and Turkicised as Balât, retained some importance, as it could be reached by smaller ships using the Menderes to advance some 10 km south-west of Balat. In the 7th/13th century, it served as the point of departure
for maritime expeditions of the newly-established Beys of Menteshe [see MENTESHE OGHULLARI], but soon trade proved more profitable, and a treaty was concluded with the Venetians by which the latter opened navigation of the valley (by 1555; the treaty was later confirmed by the Ottoman sultans). Venetians and Genoese sold textiles, soap, tin and lead, and bought such products as alum, rags, saffron, sesame, honey and wax, nut-galls, morocco leather, liquorice, dried raisins, wheat, barley and slaves; they also bought fish, in particular eels from the Bafa lake that could be reached by fishermen (this fishing seems to have survived to this day). Trade at Balat still existed although at a diminishing rate, in Ewliya Celebi's time, when the traveller visited the place in 1082/1671-2; he states that "the saccoleva barges, the barges from Gallipoli and Kos, and the frigates from Syme and Nauplia ... sail into the Menderes river and take on merchandise at this town of Balat" (Seyidhatname, ix, 147). Gradually, Balat was abandoned, due to the continuing siltation of the estuary and to the malaria-infested climate. Another reason may have been the rise of Izmir in the modern period, the first railway concession in the modern period became the chief maritime outlet for the area. Thus the first railway concession in Anatolia, granted in 1857 to a British company, resulted in a line linking Izmir with Aydin and the Büyük Menderes valley. The railway has recently been joined by a modern and denser highway network.

The traditional assets of the Büyük Menderes valley are being enhanced by modern hydraulic works such as dams, canals and drainage systems, leading to an elimination of malaria-infested stretches on its lower course, expansion of cultivable areas and creation of hydro-electric power (the latter characteristic also of some of the tributaries, such as the Kemer Baraji on the Ak Çay). The valley, especially on its middle and lower course, it thus one of the most densely populated areas of Turkey.

2. Kütük Menderes. Unlike the Büyük Menderes, this relatively short (145 km; drainage area of 3,140 km²) river does not originate in the Anatolian plateau but among the latitudinal mountain ridges closer to the Aegean sea, near the Bozdag just north of the town of Kula (ancient Koloe). It Flows some 15 km westwards into the valley between the two mountains chains that separate it, on the north, from the valley of the Gediz and, on the south, from that of the Büyük Menderes. There, near the town of Beydağ, it sharply turns west and follows that course until the hills of Alaman Dağa deflect it south-westward. Having crossed the coastal plain, it enters the sea some 5 km west of the town of Selçuk and the ruins of ancient Ephesus. The latter city was one of the principal ports on the Aegean in antiquity, but the river, like the Büyük Menderes in the case of Miletos, brought silt that ultimately made the coast advance to the point of leaving Ephesos as a harbour. As in terms of physical geography, in those of human geography too, the Kütük Menderes displays both analogies with its larger namesake and differences from it. The alluvial plain of the valley, the higher slopes along the mountains and the warm Mediterranean climate accompanied by an adequate water supply, make this area yield an abundance and variety of agricultural products; this has spurred dense habitation since antiquity, the growth of towns and handicrafts, and a commerce facilitated by the maritime outlets, exemplified by Ephesus in antiquity, its successor Ayasoluk [q.v.] and the latter's successful rival Scalannuva (Kuşadası) in the Middle Ages, and Izmir in the modern period. The valley of the Kütük Menderes, however, does not reach deep enough into the Anatolian interior, and today as in antiquity and the Middle Ages, the principal routes in that direction follow the course of the Büyük Menderes or of the Gediz; the modern railway in the Kütük Menderes valley, an offshoot from the Izmir-Selçuk-Aydın line, stops at Odemis near the eastern end of the valley.

3. Eski Menderes. The sources of this short river (about 75 km) are on the northern slopes of the Kaz Dağ (ancient Mount Ida) north of the Gulf of Edremit. It enters the Çanakkale Boğazı [see ÇANAKKALE BOĞAZI] at its south-western end near Kumkale some 7 km north-west of the ruins of ancient Troy.


MENDERES, ADNAN (1899-1961), Turkish statesman. Born and educated in Izmir, he studied at the Ankara University Faculty of Law, following service in the First World War and Turkey's War of Independence. His political activity commenced upon his joining Ali Fethi Oktay's Free Party in 1930, when he became this party's chairman in Aydin. When the party was closed down, he joined the People's Party (later called Republican People's Party, RPP) and was elected repeatedly to the Grand National Assembly (GNA) in Aydin from 1931 onwards. By 1945, he was a prominent parliamentarian. He then presented to the RPP's parliamentary group a a "Four-man Proposal", signed by himself, Celal Bayar, Fuat Köprüülü [q.v.] and Refik Koraltan, requesting liberalisation. Menderes, Köprüülü and Koraltan were ousted from the party and Bayar resigned; together with other breakaways from RPP, they formed the Democrat Party [see unter, ii] on 7 January 1946. The DP won 62 GNA seats in that
The DP won the 1950 electoral campaign by representing itself as an agent of change and Menderes began to carry some of its promises, including: (a) Economics and development: Mechanising agriculture, building roads (largely in rural parts), encouraging industry (chiefly consumer industries), erecting dams (for irrigation and energy production), and reconstructing the larger cities. (b) Social services: Increasing the scope of old-age and life insurance payments, building workers' hospitals and encouraging trade union activities. (c) Cultural: Inaugurating the Aegean University in Izmir, the Middle East Technical University in Ankara and the Ataturk University in Erzurum, and expanding the scope of primary and secondary education. However, Menderes' appeal to private initiative (instead of the RPP's statism) to finance these projects proved only moderately successful. The United States provided tractors and credits, which sufficed only in part; hence, Menderes opted for encouraging foreign investments and loans, which eventually increased Turkey's debt and raised inflation. His foreign policies were moderately successful. The United States provided military credits, which contributed to the American revivification of Islam. In the face of a growing political and economic crisis, Menderes had to withdraw, ironically, from his earlier championship of individual and political liberties: martial law was imposed repeatedly, rival political groups were banned or deterred, the press was muzzled and the military became increasingly politicised in the late 1950s. On 27 May 1960, the military intervened, arresting Menderes and the entire DP leadership. They were tried in Yassada; Menderes was sentenced to death and executed on 17 September 1961. The trials were considered fair, but many Turks thought the sentences too harsh: the Justice Party, set up in 1961 largely as a successor to the banned DP, took its name from a popular demand to rehabilitate Menderes and the other DP leaders. In the late 1980s, Menderes was rehabilitated in Turkey; streets were being named after him in various localities.

Turkey's politics: the transition to a multiparty system, Princeton, N J. 1959, index; Altemur ... land on the Peloponnese and the castle of Vatika, from where the ecclesiastical authorities derived most of their dues in Venetian hands, together with a strip of land on the Peloponnese and the castle of Vatika, from where the ecclesiastical authorities derived most of their dues.
and the inhabitants had much property and where the corn was grown needed to feed the city. The rock itself produced nothing. During the war of Bayezid II with the Signoria (1480 to 1500), the town of Menekshe, which was captured by the last Venetian strongholds on the Peloponnesse, Koron, Modon and Navarino and the coastal strip in front of Menekshe. Only Nauplion and Menekshe held out for some decades and were left to Venice in the treaty of 1502-3. After that, all food had to be imported from the Ottoman-controlled mainland. Vatika, now Ottoman, was maintained as a stronghold. The Venetian register T.D. 367 of 1528 (pp. 171-3) mentions a garrison of 36 men and a Divâdar, all Muslims, and a Greek auxiliary force of 15 men, who were freed from divîye and ispensî and the extraordinary taxes in exchange for their services.

During the treaty of 1540, which ended the Ottoman-Venetian war of the 1530s, the last remaining Venetian bases on the Peloponnesse were ceded to the Ottomans. The Venetian soldiers, the artillery and all inhabitants who wished to leave, left the town on 24 November 1540. On the following day, the Venetian Podesta Antonio Garzoni handed the town over to the Imperial Dragoman Yenus Bey under command of Kasim Pasha, Sandjak Begi of the Morea. The evacuated inhabitants were settled elsewhere on Venetian territory. Scions of the Mamonas family went to Zante-Zakynthos, others were transplanted to Crete. Trade was hard, on a low plateau on the shores of a bay, and the few of them returned and became Ottoman subjects. The acquisition of Menekshe is only briefly mentioned by the Ottoman chroniclers, including Lutfi Pasha, who had a large share in the negotiations of the treaty. After the Ottoman conquest, the town lost its importance as a trading community and outpost of the West. Its population must have been considerably smaller than in the Byzantine-Venetian period, and its importance largely military. The lemal Defter T.D. 565 (pp. 79-88) of the sandjak of Mezistra (Mistra), from 981/1573-4 mentions a force of 104 men under a Divâdar and six gunners under a Serî Topçîyan. The total tax yield of the town, which was an Imperial khabîs, was 28,665 akês, of which 6,000 akês came from harbour dues. Between 1540 and 1570 the town was parceled out in the Byzantine-Venetian period, and after the last-mentioned date was incorporated in the town of Mezistra, with a total population of 2,075 families (including 450 Muslims, 700 non-Muslims as well as 191 bachelors. This brings us, together with the garrison and their families, to a total population of ca. 2,500 people, which is relatively large for the small inhabitable space. Seven local Christians had a special status, delivering gunpowder to the castle in exchange for a tax reduction. Not a single Muslim settler is recorded. The greater part of the tax on economic activities was collected from the harbour dues (7,500) and market dues (5,000) leaving 4,725 akês for all the other activities. The amounts for flax and wine and olive oil tell us something of the importance of these sectors. Grain had almost entirely to be imported from the mainland. The dues on these agricultural products tell us that the town had regained some property on the mainland.

During the Cretan War (1645-69), Venetian forces tried to capture Menekshe but failed (1653). The lower town, on a low plateau on the shore, was one of that occasion surrounded by new walls, those which we can still see today. Ewliyâ Celebi, who visited the town in 1667 on his way to Crete, describes the new walls with some detail, calling them the work of Sultan Mehmed IV. The dangerous situation created by the war is also reflected in the increase of the garrison of the town: 523 men according to the budget of 1079-80/1669-70, with a group of ‘‘New Gunners’’ and soldiers and gunners for the Western and the Eastern Bulwark mentioned explicitly. The yearly expenditure for this large garrison was defrayed by the divîye of the district and the harbour dues of Menekshe itself. The budget also mentions a repair of the walls of the lower town. Ewliyâ has left a detailed description of the town as it was in his time. He mentions 500 houses in the citadel and another 1,600 small stone-built ones in the lower town, which must be a gross exaggeration; the enclosed space measures only 4 hectares. In the citadel on the rock was the Mosque of Sultan Süleyman, or Ferhiye Djamî, a converted church. This is the 13th century Byzantine church of St. Sophia, built by the Byzantine Emperors Andronicus II and still preserved. Besides that one, Ewliyâ mentions the Mosque of Deriş Mehmed Agha. In the lower town were another two domed mosques and two meşîtes, besides two meşîtes, two nekîebes and fifty shops. The meşîtes do not appear on the official and contemporary list of meşîtes in European Turkey and must be a mistake; Islamic life was not very developed in the town.

During the war of 1683-99 with the Christian Powers, the Ottomans lost Menekshe and the entire Morea to Venice. The town surrendered in August 1690 after a fourteen months’ siege, the last stronghold in the Morea to give up. Two thousand Turks came out of the fortress, 300 of them soldiers. During Venetian rule, a large number of churches were built in the town, which still exist today (17 of the 25 preserved churches). The Ottoman buildings were destroyed except the church-mosque on the rock. The Venetian census of 1700 mentions 428 families living in the town of Menekshe, altogether 1,622 souls. According to the same source, the town was the chef-lieu of a district numbering 17 villages and 3 monasteries, with a total population of 2,675 families or 8,366 souls. The Venetians were masters of the Morea in 1715, after the swift campaign of the Grand Vizier Dâmid ‘Ali Paşa. The town surrendered again, although it had two years’ provisions. When in 1128/1716 an Ottoman census commission described the town, it had only three Muslim inhabitants, of whom two were converts, and 144 grown-up non-Muslim males (nefr) (Kuyudu Kadime no. 20, Ankara). The tax account shows that, on the mainland belonging to the town, a considerable quantity of cotton was produced. Wine is no longer mentioned. The town recovered yet again, remaining the chef-lieu of a kada and seat of the Greek archbishopric. When Pouqueville visited it at the beginning of the 19th century, it had 2,000 Turkish and Greek inhabitants. The kada produced a considerable amount of flax and olive oil for export. Martin Leake, who visited the town in the spring of 1805, mentions that there were 300 houses in the (lower) town and 50 in the castle: all, except about six, were Turkish. Before the Russian invasion of the Morea (1770) there were 150 Greek families, but they, as well as the Greek inhabitants of the villages in the districts, fled after that event to Anatolia (the lands of the Dere Beys) or to the islands. During the Greek War of Independence, Menekshe was stormed into submission as early as 1820. It was surrendered on terms. The survivors, some 500 or 700
people, were brought to Asia Minor by ship. After the War and the disappearance of the Muslim community, the town never recovered. Sir Thomas Wyse, British plenipotentiary in Athens, counted during his visit in 1838 no more than a hundred Greek families, half the houses being in ruin. Nowadays, the upper town on the rock is an empty field of ruins, whilst for a long time the lower town was a ghost city in which only a few families lived. The Greek census of 1961 gives only 82 inhabitants. A small fishing village has developed on the mainland, opposite the rock, and eventually also a railroad from Izmir to Manisa and the Anatolian interior, with the coastal road (and passim 1953-56), which was part of the "Tourkoy" had moved into the "Mainenomenu kampsos"; this term is reflected in "Aşağı-Paşa-zade's " [q.v.] history as "Menemen owasi". The Turks, led by the Beys of Sarukhan [q.v.], eventually controlled the area, and Menemen became one of this principality's possessions; the earliest dated building in Menemen would appear to be a mosque erected by the Sarukhan Bey Isâk (Ülu cami or Sinbul Pasa camii, inscription dated 1759/1557-8). Menemen continued to be a possession of the Sarukhan also for some time after the Ottoman conquest effected early in the reign of Murâd I (761/911/1360-89).

The name of Menemen was also pronounced and written as Melemen, whereas that of the district (kadâ) appears in Ottoman documents and Ewliyâ Celebi (1587-1659) and later in the works of the Turkâniyev (see the latter work for the etymology attributed to these names). Ewliyâ Celebi gives a detailed description of Menemen. The kadâ, administered by a voyvodâ, was part of the sandjak of Sihla or Sughlâ; it was a kâhâs of the wilâde sultan (possibly since Süleyman's mother Hafsa Sultan's time), yielding 400 yâses annually; the town had 300 shops and a bezâme; in summer it suffered from a mosquito infestation that became proverbial (Sevbatinme, Istanbul 1935, ix, 84-7). The town also had a Bekrî tekke with the tomb of Bekrî Baba. Prior to the exchanges of the Republican era, the population of both the town and the district was mixed; Greeks predominated in the town itself (4,683 Rûm, 3,606 Muslims), and Muslims in the kadâ as a whole (17,261 Muslims, 7,195 Rûm; there were also smaller numbers of Armenians, Jews, Catholics and "foreigners" (Seybatname, Istanbul 1935, ix, 84-7). The town continued to be a possession of the Sarukhan also for some time after the Ottoman conquest early in the reign of Murâd I (761/911/1360-89).

The name of Menemen was also pronounced and written as Melemen, whereas that of the district (kadâ) appears in Ottoman documents and Ewliyâ Celebi (1587-1659) and later in the works of the Turkâniyev (see the latter work for the etymology attributed to these names). Ewliyâ Celebi gives a detailed description of Menemen. The kadâ, administered by a voyvodâ, was part of the sandjak of Sihla or Sughlâ; it was a kâhâs of the wilâde sultan (possibly since Süleyman's mother Hafsa Sultan's time), yielding 400 yâses annually; the town had 300 shops and a bezâme; in summer it suffered from a mosquito infestation that became proverbial (Sevbatinme, Istanbul 1935, ix, 84-7). The town also had a Bekrî tekke with the tomb of Bekrî Baba. Prior to the exchanges of the Republican era, the population of both the town and the district was mixed; Greeks predominated in the town itself (4,683 Rûm, 3,606 Muslims), and Muslims in the kadâ as a whole (17,261 Muslims, 7,195 Rûm; there were also smaller numbers of Armenians, Jews, Catholics and "foreigners" (Seybatname, Istanbul 1935, ix, 84-7). The town continued to be a possession of the Sarukhan also for some time after the Ottoman conquest early in the reign of Murâd I (761/911/1360-89).

The name of Menemen was also pronounced and written as Melemen, whereas that of the district (kadâ) appears in Ottoman documents and Ewliyâ Celebi (1587-1659) and later in the works of the Turkâniyev (see the latter work for the etymology attributed to these names). Ewliyâ Celebi gives a detailed description of Menemen. The kadâ, administered by a voyvodâ, was part of the sandjak of Sihla or Sughlâ; it was a kâhâs of the wilâde sultan (possibly since Süleyman's mother Hafsa Sultan's time), yielding 400 yâses annually; the town had 300 shops and a bezâme; in summer it suffered from a mosquito infestation that became proverbial (Sevbatinme, Istanbul 1935, ix, 84-7). The town also had a Bekrî tekke with the tomb of Bekrî Baba. Prior to the exchanges of the Republican era, the population of both the town and the district was mixed; Greeks predominated in the town itself (4,683 Rûm, 3,606 Muslims), and Muslims in the kadâ as a whole (17,261 Muslims, 7,195 Rûm; there were also smaller numbers of Armenians, Jews, Catholics and "foreigners" (Seybatname, Istanbul 1935, ix, 84-7). The town continued to be a possession of the Sarukhan also for some time after the Ottoman conquest early in the reign of Murâd I (761/911/1360-89).
road linking İzmir with Bergama, must have been a further factor. Inversely, the scala (port ... of eastern Anatolia, still famed for carpet manufacturing in Marco Polo's time. But after Bahramshah's death, the


(Ş. SOÇEK)

**MENEMENLI-ZADE MEHMET TAHİR,** minor Turkish poet of the *Therwet-i Funun* [q. v.] period (1862-1902). He was born in Adana, into a notable family, the son of Hâşim Habib, director of the telegraphic department in the office of the Grand Vizierate. He was educated in Istanbul and graduated from the school of Political Science in 1883. After serving as Director of Education in Adana, İzmir and Salonica, where he also taught Turkish literature in the local lycées, he became, in Istanbul, director of the secretariat in the Ministry of Education and, at the same time, he taught in the School of Political Science and in the University. He died suddenly at the age of forty. He collected his poems, which follow the language and style of the *Therwet-i Funun* school, in various booklets, the most known of which is *Eliban* ("Melodies") (1885). His *Edêhesiyyet-i edemâyîyye* ("Ottoman literature") is a didactic book on the rules and technical terms of Turkish literature. *Regiyîzâde Mahmed Ekrem* [q. v.], a later Tanzier writer and critic, who had become the leader of young Westernist writers, published in 1886 his *Takdir-i edelâh* ("Appreciation of the melodies") in praise of Menemenli-zâde, where he severely criticised Mu’allim Nâdî [q. v.], the leader of the conservatives, who retorted in his *Demdele* ("Angry talk"), (1887) more violently. This famous controversy made Menemenli-zâde Tahir a well-known poet in the late 1880s.

**Bibliography:** Nejat Birinci, *Menemenli-zade Tahir*, unpubl. thesis in the Library of the Tur-Cologocal Institute, University of Istanbul 1951, with a full bibl. (see alphabetical hand-list of the Institute).

(FAHİR 12)

**MENGLİ GİRAY I,** one of the greatest kâns of the Crimea (Kırım [q. v.]).

As the contemporary sources are controversial, the chronology of his three reigns up to 883/1478-9 cannot be firmly established. On the death of Hâddüji Giray Kâhan I (671/1466 [q. v.]), disputes arose among his numerous sons about the succession. Mengli Giray first succeeded in seizing the throne for several months, but finally had to cede it to his oldest brother Nûr Dewlet. Mengli Giray's second reign probably lasted from 672/1468 to 879/1474-5, when he had to flee to Mangub (Menkiş) or Kafa, while Nûr Dewlet and, later, two other pretenders struggled for primacy. In 833/end of 1478 or beginning of 1479, Mengli Giray regained power and remained kâhan until his death in Dhu'l-Hijjah 920/Feb. 1513. Since the leader of the Şirîn clan, Eminek, in 879/spring 1475 had sought Ottoman intervention in the Crimea for military strife and help against the menacing Great Horde [see BAYRÎ], with the result that the Genoese colonies along the Crimean shores had passed under Ottoman control, the kâhanate was considered as under Ottoman protection. In 889/1484, Mengli Giray participated in Sultan Bayezid II's successful campaign into Moldavia and was recompensed with territorial gains on the Dniepr and Dniestr [see MAGYAR].

No mere Ottoman vassal, Mengli Giray generally sought to stay on good terms with Muscovy, which he considered an ally against the Great Horde; while for Muscovy, the kâhan's friendship meant support against the declining Poland-Lithuania. After Mengli Giray had subjugated the Great Horde in 900/1502, he demanded the traditional tribute from Muscovy and Poland-Lithuania for himself. A Crimean-Russian confrontation, however, broke out only under Mengli Giray's successors. Mengli Giray, who was also a patron of the arts, must be considered as the real founder of the Crimean state. He also played a role in the struggle for the throne of the later Sultan Selim I, his son-in-law (1511-12).


(B. KELLNER-HINKELE)

**MENGÜÇEK** (Manguşçak), a Türkmen chief who was the eponym of a minor dynasty which appears in history with his son Isâk in 512/1118 in eastern Arran, and with the town of Erzînjân [q. v.], but including also Divriği and Koghomia/Colonia-Kara Hisar Şarki.

His territory accordingly lay between that of the Dânîşîmdînis [q. v.] on the west, of the Saltûkids [q. v.] of Erzurum on the east, of the Byzantine province of Trebizond on the north and of the Artukîd principalties [see ARÔKUS] on the south; it thus commanded the traditional highway for invasions from Iran into Anatolia. Hardly anything is known of the history of the Mengüçekids. In 1118, menaced by the Artûkîd Balak, Isâk allied with the military commander of Trebizond, Theodore Gavras; both of these were taken prisoner by the Dânîşîmdînî Khâzî, Isâk's father-in-law, who speedily freed him. In the middle of the 6th/12th century, the Mengüçekid principality was divided between two brothers, the younger one receiving the little town of Divriği [q. v.]. The elder branch acquired some fame under the long reign of Bahramşâh (ca. 555-617/1160-1220). He made Erzînjân a cultural centre, for which evidence is provided by his protégés, the Persian poets Nizâmî and Khâkânî [q. v.], and the Arab scholar 4Abî al-Laîfî al-Bâghdâdidî [q. v.], who spent 12 years there. The town was, however, also the greatest Armenian centre of eastern Anatolia, still famed for carpet manufacturing in Marco Polo's time. But after Bahramşâh's death, the
Menguč kids were drawn into the complex happenings linked with Djalal al-Din MankubirtT's [q.v.] invasion, and the Seljuk KaykubidT I [q.v.] annexed their territory, compensating the Menguč kids with small fiefs. The Diwirgi branch, known through the remarkable mosque constructed by its members, continued there, it seems, till around the time of the Mongol conquest as vassals of the SeljukS. Bibliography: Houtsma, in EP., s.v. and Bibl. there; O. Turan, in Id., s.v.; Van Berchem, CIA, iii, 55 ff., for epigraphy and awakhir; Zambaur, Manuel, 146; Halil Edhem, Dähüm-i İslâmîyâtı, 224-6; C. K. Prüfer, Pre-Ottoman Turkey, London 1968; index; M. Mitchiner, Oriental coins; The world of Islam, 176. (C. Cahen)

MENSÜKHAT ( ), pl. of mensük “annulled”, an expression used in the Ottoman Empire, after the abolition of certain early Ottoman army units (yaşı, mülkemi[.]), in the 11th/17th century, for the fiefs and other grants these units had previously held. These were referred to as “annulled fiefs” (mensükâh[im]). The Ottoman finance department administering these holdings, the “Bureau of the Annulled [grants]” (Mensükhâh kâlemi), allotted them, when needed, as fiefs in return for services. When the Ottoman navy was expanded, such holdings were attached to the Admiralty (Deryâ kâlemi [see DARYA] and assigned by the Kapudan Pasha [q.v.]. Some appointments were submitted to the Grand Vizier (Sâdî-kâlemi [q.v.]) and marked off in the registers of the naval archives. The possessors of these holdings (mensükhâh efendî) formed a unit whose duties were to guard the coasts and serve on ships. They could pay for exemption from duty when they were called to serve.

Bibliography: I. H. Uzunçarşılı, Osmanlı devletin merkezleri bahriyetextbox; Ankara 1948, 19, 240-1, 382, 422; M. Z. Pakalin, Osmanlı tarih deyimleri ve terimleri sistemi, Istanbul 1951, 476, 608-11, 627-8; M. Akağa, Türkçenin ekkidesi ve icimli tarihî, Istanbul 1979, 1, 40; M. Sertgül, Reisimli osmani tarihi ansklopedisi, Istanbul 1958, 206; Gibb and Bowen, i/1, 53-5; Marsigh, Etat militaire de l’Empire Ottoman, i, The Hague 1732, 145, 150-1. (F. Mûse Göçek)

MENTESHE-ELI, a region in the southwestern part of Anatolia. It derived its name from the Turkish Menteshe-oghullari [q.v.] who established a principality there. There are, however, some claims that the name is of pre-Turkish origin. The region corresponds to classical Caria (today centred on the city of Muğla). There is no doubt that, like other western Anatolian districts, Caria was also occupied by the Seljuks towards the end of the 5th/11th century; but later, Byzantine domination was restored there. The Turkmans in the border areas who settled down in Central Anatolia and the western Taurus continued their raids. Moreover, the loss of Rum Seljuk power in Anatolia in the second half of the 7th/13th century after defeats suffered at the hand of Mongols provided a gradually increasing freedom of movement for these tribal groups who gathered in the frontier areas, so that Turkish pressure on the Byzantine defence line was continuously being increased. After 659/1261, the region of Caria which stretches inland from the coastal areas was occupied by the Turks. The Turkmans who founded the principality of Menteşhe and ultimately gave their name to the region first arrived in this region by sea and occupied the shore line. But to maintain their rule in this region it was necessary to cooperate with the Turks who pressed from the interior towards the shore (see P. Wittek, Menteşhe beyliği, Turkish tr. O.S. Gökyay, Ankara 1944, 46). When John, brother of Michael VIII (1259-82), the Emperor of Byzantium, went on a campaign under the command of his son Andronikos, he had settled inland to withdraw to their bases in the mountains; but he never thought of capturing the ports which were held by the Turks in the south-west corner of Caria. It is possible that the founder of the principality of Menteşhe was at that time the ruler of the shore region of the Gulf of Makri (Fethiye). Although in 1278 the Emperor Michael VIII sent an army under the command of his son Andronikos to Anatolia, the regions of Menderes and Caria had already been captured by the Turks. Andronikos’s fortification of Tralles (Aydın) was therefore rendered useless; the Menteşhe Beg who had captured Tralles and Nysa (Sultánhisar) had annexed the territory to his principality. Upon the Karamanids’ siege of Konya, Gaykhatu, the Il-Khanîr ruler, came to Anatolia in 690/1291 and punished the Turkish principalties which had revolted against him. During Gaykhatu’s punitive campaign, the Il-Khanîr army entered Menteşhe-eli (Wilâyet-i Mentešhe) and plundered it (see Tarıkâh-i Al-i Seljük dar Anadolu, ed. F.N. Uzuk, Ankara 1952, 88, Turkish tr. 62). Following the Byzantine Empire’s unsuccessful attempts to reconquer the area in 1296 and 1302, the Turks became the unquestioned masters of Caria. In his description of the principality of Menteşhe, Münedjidîn-bashî says that the principality consisted of many cities, namely Balâî, Bozûyûk, Mîlas, Pedjîn (Badrîn), Mazîn (Mârîn), Çine, Tâwâs, Bûrnâm, Makri, Köyêgïhêz (Köyçegiz) and Muğla, which was the capital (see Münedjidîn-Bashî, Dîmi al-dâwâl, Nurusmaniye Libr. no. 3172, fol. 130b; Wittek, op. cit., 172-3). The Fûke (Fînike) region of Lycia was also included among these names at the beginning of the history of the principality. Ibn Baṭûtâ, who visited this part of Anatolia (Bâlîd al-Rûm) in 732/1333, which he also designated by the name Menteşhe-eli, says that Mîlas [q.v.] was one of the most beautiful cities of Anatolia, and fruit, gardens and water were abundant. At this time, Ibn Baṭûtâ met with Şudjâf al-Dîn Orkânî Beg, the ruler of the principality. He tells us that his residence was at Pedjîn, two miles from Mîlas, and this city, which was rebuilt on a hill, was adorned with beautiful buildings and mosques (see Rûhî, ii, 278-80, Eng. tr. Gibb, ii, 428-30, Turkish tr. M. Sharîf, Istanbul 1333-5, i, 321-3). According to Şîhâb al-Dîn al-’Umarî, there were 50 cities and 200 fortresses under the control of Orkânî Beg (see Masâ'îl al-vâhir, Ayasofya Libr. no. 3146, II, fols. 122a-b). Thus it is clear that Menteşhe-eli extended over a large area. In his account, al-’Umarî says that Orkânî Beg’s country was located between Dâwâz (Tâwâzî), Sakîz and İstânbûk. It is clear, then, that the Fûke region was also in Menteşhe-eli.

Following Baṭyâzî I’s succession to the throne in 791/1399, an alliance was formed against the Ottomans at the instance of the Karamanids, and the Menteşhe Begs also participated in this. Baṭyâzî I had moved into Anatolia, and the regions of Balâï and Muğla, which were under the rule of the Menteşhe principality, soon passed into the hands of the Ottomans. But a line of the dynasty went on to rule in Mîlas and Pedjîn. Following the battle of Ankara (804/1402), the Menteşhe-oghullari regained at the hands of Timür their previous territories. However, this situation did not last. In 827/1424 Murâd II annexed Menteşhe-eli to Ottoman territory; later,
Menteshe-eli came to be one of the sandjaks of the eyalet of Anatolia.  

Bibliography: In addition to the works given in the text, see I. H. Uzunçarşı, Anadolu beylikleri, Ankara 1969, 70-83; idem, art. Menteshe Oğullarî, in IA; Besim Darkot, art. Menteşe, in IA (E. Mercıl).  

Menteshe-ogullari, a Turkish principality founded in the south-west of Anatolia.

The Turkomans who founded this principality came to this region by sea and settled between the shore and Dehîzî. However, it is quite difficult to pin-point the foundation of the principality in the chronology of the early Begs. The Turkomans had captured the Carya (today Mуглa) region after 1261, starting from the shores. Menteshe, the founder of the principality, was perhaps the Beg of the shore regions (Amir al-Sawdî), in the bay of Makrî (Fethiye). There are also difficulties in establishing the genealogy of Menteshe Beg. His father was said to be Amîr al-Sawdî Hâddî Bahâî al-Dîn (Bahâî), who was one of the amirs of the Saljûqs (see Shîkârî, Karaman tarihî, Konya 1946, 11 ff., and Müneveddijim-Bashî, Djâmî al-duwal, Nurusmiyâni no. 3172, fol. 131a). However, in the inscriptions of Ahmed Ghaçî, one of Menteshe’s grandsons, his father is mentioned as Eblîstan and the father of the latter as Kûrî or Kara Beg. This region had been given as an ikiá by the rulers of the Anatolian Seljûks. Later, the Seljûk chronicles speak of the Menteshe Beg. Although in 1278 the Seljûk Emperor Michael VIII sent an army under the command of his son Andronicus and the latter fortified Tralles (Aydin), it was almost useless. In 1282 Menteshe Beg had conquered Tralles and Nyssa (Sulhân şişar) and annexed them to his territory. A coin minted in 690/1291 at Mîlas in the name of the Seljûk sultan Masûd II leads us to the conclusion that the Menteshe-ogullari had at first accepted the protection of the Saljûqs (see İsmâ’llî Ghaçîlî, Takwîm-i maskûkî-i Seljûkuyya, Istanbul 1309, 93). Upon the Karamânî’s siege of Konya, the Il-Khânî ruler Gaykhatu came to Anatolia to punish them in 690/1291, and during this campaign, the Il-Khânî army plundered the Menteshe-eli. When Alexius Philopapos, the Byzantine commander, moved south through Menderes (1296), Menteshe Beg was already dead. After Menteshe Beg, his son Mas’ûd became the head of the principality. But his other son Kirmân (Karmân), following or perhaps opposing his brother, continued to rule in Fûke (Finike). The historical sources do not clearly explain the relationships between these two brothers. Although in 1300 Mas’ûd Beg had seized an important part of Rhodes, later, on 15 August 1308, the Knights Hospitallers recaptured the island (see S. Runciman, A history of the Crusades, London 1965, iii, 435; other scholars give the date as 1310). Mas’ûd Beg’s efforts to regain the island were unsuccessful. His death was probably before 719/1319. Shûdîl al-Dîn Orkhan Beg, who inherited the throne after his father, Mas’ûd Beg, probably secured power by removing a brother whose name may have been İbrahim. Orkhan Beg was unsuccessful in his struggles against the Knights to capture Rhodes after 1320. Ibn Baṭṭûta visited Orkhan Beg in Pedjîn while he was travelling in Anatolia, and has mentioned him as Sultan of Mîlas (see Ribâha, ii, 279-80, Eng. tr. Gibb, ii, 429-30, Turkish tr. M. Şarîfî, Istanbul 1333-5, i, 321-2). Al-‘Umarî, on the other hand, gives information about the cities and the number of the soldiers under Orkhan Beg. He also mentions that the Fûke branch of the Menteshe principalcy was in 1330 subject to the Hâmîdî-ogullari (see Masûlîk al-abîrî, Ayasofya no. 3146, III, fols. 98 a-b and 122 a-b). Orkhan Beg’s death was probably before 1344, and his son İbrahimîm succeeded him. İbrahimîm Beg made preparations to help Umur Beg in regaining Mîlas, which had fallen into the hands of the Latins, but when Umur Beg fell in battle in 1348, this effort came to nought. The Venetians, with their fleet placed in Balât harbour, threatened İbrahimîm Beg, who prepared for a campaign against them, but as a result of an agreement made with the assistance of Marino Morosini, the Count of Crete, between the years 1347-48, they were forced to disband. İbrahimîm Beg died some time before the year 1360. After his death, three of his sons reigned in various parts of the principality. It is believed that Mûsâ Beg ruled in Pedjîn, Balât and Mîlas; Mehmed Beg in Mughla and Cine; and Ahmed Beg ruled, in the south, in Makrî and Marmaris. After Mûsâ Beg’s death (before 1375), Mîlas and Pedjîn also presumably passed into the hands of Ahmed Beg. In 1365, as a result of Ahmed Beg’s attacks against the ships between Rhodes and Cyprus, the fleet of Peter I, King of Cyprus, threatened the shores of Aydin and Menteshe. However, the Venetians, concerned about their people living in Ayasuluk and Balât, intervened, and peace was made. Although Ahmed Beg ruled in Balât for a period, this was not for long. We see that before 1389 Balât and its environs were under the rule of Ghiyâth al-Dîn Mahmoud, the son of Mehmed Beg. However, losing the struggle for sovereignty made against his brother İlyâs Beg, he took refuge with the Ottomans. Following the battle of Kosova (1389), Bâyezîd I ascended the Ottoman throne. With the urging of the Karamânîs, İlyâs Beg and his father Mehmed Beg entered into the alliance arranged against the Ottomans in Anatolia. During Bâyezîd I’s Anatolian campaign against his alliance, Balât and the lands of the Menteshe principality in Mughla were occupied. Mehmed and İlyâs Beg fled to Djiändî-oglu İskandar Beg (in the winter of 1389-90). During this campaign, Ahmed Beg continued to reign in Mîlas and Pedjîn. His survival was perhaps due to the rugged topography and comparatively impregnable position of the region. Tadj al-Dîn Îlyas Beg died in Şabîban 299/July 1391. His territories were later occupied by the Ottomans. Wittet (Menteshe beyliği, 86) accepts that, until the Ottoman occupation, Mehmed Beg ruled in the Menteshe principality, later flecing to Djiändî-oglu Islandîyâr Beg.

Following the battle of Ankara, Timûr, as he did with most of the other principalities, restored İlyâs Beg’s territories (1402). After this restoration of the territory, İlyâs Beg continued for a time as vassal of Timûr. In the quarrel for sovereignty among Bâyezîd’s sons, he made an alliance with the Aydîn-ogullari and the Sarukhân-ogullari, supporting İsâ Celebi against Mehmedem Celebi. Following Mehmedem I’s victory against this alliance, İlyâs Beg was forced to recognise the sovereignty of the latter (1405). Because İlyâs Beg was inflicting losses upon the Latins in the islands through maritime warfare, in 1403 the Venetians made an agreement with him through the aid of Marco Faileri, the Count of Crete. But later, conflicts between the two sides continued, and as a result of the Venetians’ actions, İlyâs Beg was forced to renew the previous agreement with Admiral Ser Pietro Civrano (17 October 1414). In the same year, İlyâs Beg accepted Ottoman rule and in 1415 he had coins minted in the name of Mehmed. Moreover, he was compelled to send his two sons,
Layth and Ahmed, to the Ottoman Palace. After the death in 1421 of Ilyas Beg, his sons managed to flee from Edirne and to take up the rule of the principality in Menteshe-eli. When Sultan Murad II captured the territory of Menteshe, he seized and imprisoned these two brothers, thus putting an end to this principality.

The Menteshe-oghullari embattled their country with many fine buildings. Among these are the Hadiğâl Ilyas Mosque at Mîlas (1330), Ahmed Beg’s Medrese at Peğin (1375), and his Great Mosque at Mîlas (1376) and Ilyas Beg’s Great Mosque at Balâ (1404). The Menteshe-oghullari patronized scholars and men of letters, and under their patronage some works were translated into Turkish. For example, under the patronage of Qiyâqâl al-Dîn Mahmûd, the Bâz-name on falconry was translated from Persian into Turkish. A manuscript of this work, located in Milan, was published by Von Hammer under the name of Falkner-ko ( Pest 1840). In addition to this, there is a short medical book, the Ilyâyî, which was also translated under the patronage of Ilyas Beg.


MÊô, a mixed Indian tribe of largely north-eastern Râdîpôt stock, a branch of whom were converted to Islam in the mid-8th/14th century. Their conversion seems to have been nominal, as they are described as offering animal sacrifices to a mother-goddess, worshipping at shrines of the Hindî god of the homestead Bûmîyû, and following the Pâçpîrya (Pînî Pîr [q.v.]), especially Sâlîr Mûsâ (E. Moschini). This was done in an attempt of their devotion at the išâb-i bardî (eve of 14 Shab‘ân), as well as the Khâyâ‘a Sâhib of Adîmîr (Mûnîn al-Dîn Çîshî [q.v.]); they celebrated Hindî festivals, and followed Hindî practices of exogamous marriage and male inheritance. The Muslim Mêôs are frequently called Mewâtî, both they and the Hindî Mêôs were mostly robbers and freebooters, causing much trouble from the times of the early Dîlîh sultanates until quelled under Bâbur; but there was a resurgence of their turbulence during the decline of the Mughal empire, and in 1857 they were described as “conspicuous for their readiness to take advantage of disorder”. See further Mewât.


J. Burton-Page

MERCENARY [see MAYSH].

MERCIMEK AHMET [see MERDJUMEK].

MERCURY, planet [see 4UTARID].

MERCURY, metal [see ZîBKK].

MERDJUMEK, Ahmed b. Ilyas (Modern Turkish: Merdümek Ahmed), fl. first third of the 9th/15th century, the author of a translation of the Old Ottoman of the Kâbîs-name, a “mirror for princes” composed in Persian prose and occasional verse by Kay Kâûs b. Iskandar [q.v.] in 475/1082.

Merdjumek mentions himself by this name three times in his work (all references are to British Library ms. Or. 3219: introduction (fol. 1b), chapter 11 (fol. 50a) and 31 (fol. 112b). He is not referred to in pre-modern Ottoman biographical or historical works. From his Kâbîs-name translation we can glean very little information (none on how he acquired his strange designation Merdjumek, Persian for “lentil”). He was a servant or courtier of Sultan Murad II (824-55/1421-51), and his writing shows him to have been well versed in the traditional religious and secular learning of his time. We can only deduce that he was moderate in his habits from his remark that Merdjumek never indulged in the “calamitous” practice of morning wine-drinking (fol. 50a).

In Ottoman ezîhî [q.v.] literature, the Kâbîs-name held a special place in the 8th/14th and 9th/15th centuries. No less than five completely independent Old Ottoman prose versions composed in this period have survived, of which the latest and best is Merdjumek’s, completed on 23 Shab‘ân 836/26 April 1432. The translator records that while at Philippopolis in Sultan Murad’s service, he found the sultan reading the Kâbîs-name in Persian. When Murad complained that an existing Turkish version was dull and unclear, Merdjumek immediately undertook a new translation “complete, without omitting a word; to the best of my ability explaining the more difficult words in it by extended comment so that the readers might enjoy its [full meaning]” (fol. 1b-2a), the book has no independent title; ms. of it are marked by such headings as Kâbîs-name-yi Turki or Terdjemî-yi Kâbîs-name.

Merdjumek showed much greater literary skill than his predecessors. Unlike them, he was neither slavishly literal nor given to cavalier omission. He freely added explanatory comments, as he promised, or he paraphrased, when literalism might have concealed the author’s purpose. Occasionally, he further enlivened the text by spontaneously inserting apt Turkish proverbs, or verses of his own composition (e.g. ch. 32, fol. 122a-b), in addition to his usual practice of rendering key Kay Kâûs’s illustrative Persian verses in his own Turkish verse.

At a time when literary Turkish was at a crossroads, with some writers developing a complex and bombastic high inşîhî style, full of Persian literary artifices, and reducing the Turkish lexical material to a minimum in favour of Arabic and Persian loan words, Merdjumek chose a manner which was essentially simple, based on spoken Turkish, and lexically mainly Turkish. In subsequent centuries, a minority of writers continued to favour simple Turkish, but most Ottoman writing became increasingly high flown and Persianised. By the beginning of the 12th/18th century, Merdümek’s simplicity of style and vocabulary had come to be considered archaic and uncouth, and the well-known stylist and historian Nazmî-zade Muradî (not Mustafâ, as in Kay Kâûs‘, iv, 815, col. 2, 13) of Bagdad was commissioned to revise Merdjumek’s Kâbîs-name in accord with contemporary literary taste (1117/1705).

Turkish nationalist currents of the 20th century have enhanced the growing interest in the Turkic elements in Turkey’s national language, and have brought a renewed and still continuing appreciation of Merdümek Ahmed’s work.


The indigenous population of sea nomads, known to Thais as Chao Nam or Chao Lay and to the Malays themselves as Moken, to the Burmese as Salon, to the Chinese as Murat, and to the British as Oran Laut ('boat people'), numbered 868 according to the 1884 Census and were classified as "nature-worshippers" (animistic). Today, they are probably outnumbered by Burmese and Chinese, even on their own islands, and have been partly converted to Theravada Buddhism in the north of the archipelago, whilst Islam is believed to have made some inroads in the south of the archipelago, district of Burma and, under the British, of the Tenasserim Division, extending on the mainland from the boundaries of Tavoy District (13° 28' N.) to the mouth of the Pakchan River (8° 38' N.) and the Inhmun of Kra in the south, and including the Burmese part of the Mergui Archipelago. The region is covered in dense jungle, and its economic wealth rests on tin, coal and gold reserves, as well as on the fisheries industry. The main townships are Mergui, Palaw, Tenasserim, Bokpyin and Malawin. According to the 1921 Census (1924 Mergui District gazetteer), the total urban population of Mergui District was numbered 25,382, of which 11.66%, or 1,679 persons, returned their religion as Muslim. This comparatively low figure, although representative of the position of Islam in the Mergui District during the 20th century, in fact belies the importance of the region as a channel for the spread of Islam to Thailand and northern South-East Asia during earlier centuries.

1. Mergui archipelago. This is a large group of islands (said to number 804), commencing in the north with Tavoy Island (ca. 13° 13' N.), and stretching southwards beyond Point Victoria into Thai waters, terminating beyond Ko Chan in ca. 8° 50' N. The indigenous population of sea nomads, known to themselves as Moken, to the Burmese as Kabun, to the Thais as Chaol Nam or Chaol Lay and to the Malays as Oran Laut ('boat people'), numbered 868 according to the 1884 Mergui District gazetteer, and were classified as "nature-worshippers" (animistic-shamanistic). Today, they are probably outnumbered by Burmese and Chinese, even on their own islands, and have been partly converted to Theravada Buddhism in the north of the archipelago, whilst Islam is believed to have made some inroads in the south (Annandale, 1903; Lebar, 1964).

2. Mergui District. This is the southernmost district of Burma and, under the British, of the Tenasserim Division, extending on the mainland from the boundaries of Tavoy District (13° 28' N.) to the mouth of the Pakchan River (8° 38' N.) and the Inhmun of Kra in the south, and including the Burmese part of the Mergui Archipelago. The region is covered in dense jungle, and its economic wealth rests on tin, coal and gold reserves, as well as on the fisheries industry. The main townships are Mergui, Palaw, Tenasserim, Bokpyin and Malawin. According to the 1921 Census (1924 Mergui District gazetteer), the total urban population of Mergui District was numbered 25,382, of which 11.69%, or 1,679 persons, returned their religion as Muslim. This comparatively low figure, although representative of the position of Islam in the Mergui District during the 20th century, in fact belies the importance of the region as a channel for the spread of Islam to Thailand and northern South-East Asia during earlier centuries.
MERGUI

described by Ibn Sa'id (d. 685/1286) as standing near a large river “which flows down from a mountain in the north” (the Tenasserim River? - Tibbetts, 1979, 95, 128-35). By the time of Sulayman al-Mahri, however, this uncertainty has disappeared, for in his early 10th/16th century Umanda (Tibbetts, 1979, 229), the master navigator identifies Mergui as the main port for Tenasserim, and explains that from this landfill both local people and Arabs travel overland, via Tenasserim, to Shahr-i Naw (the “new city”, or Ayutthaya, capital of the Thai Kingdom of the same name, founded by King Phra Narai Tibbetts in 1539 A.D.).

During the first two centuries of Ayuthayan rule, the Tenasserim trade route—which passed under Thai control in or about 775/1373—was frequented by Muslim and Hindu merchants from South Asia, as well as by Arab and Persian merchants from the Middle East. It seems certain that, after the Portuguese conquest of Malacca in 1511, Muslim usage of the Tenasserim trade route increased in a partly successful attempt to bypass the Portuguese Catholic stranglehold on trade with the Far East. During this period, Muslim traders from Surat, Dabul, and increasing numbers of Arabs, Persians and even Turks, had attained to positions of great power and prestige within Siam. Nor was the Mergui-Tenasserim route used purely for commerce; Muslim emigres from Golconda and Iran (Ibrahim, 43-52), and possibly from Acheh (Penth, passim), are known to have travelled to Ayuthaya by this route, both with the intention of improving trade and, apparently, in the hope of converting the Thai king to Islam (Graham, ii, 294).

By 1679, the South and West Asian Muslim community in Siam had become so numerous and influential that they had their own quarter in Ayuthaya (as distinct from the various Malay Muslim districts), whilst an English factor of the Honourable East India Company was able to report of the Mergui-Tenasserim region: “The Persians and Moors … are now in effect masters of that part of the country as well as the commerce … the colonies they have planted in those parts do almost equal the number of the natives, but far exceed them in wealth and power” (White, IOR E/3/40). During this period, the governors of Mergui, Tenasserim, Phetchaburi and Bangkok were all Muslims of West or South Asian origin, as were the captains of Phra Narai’s merchant vessels trading with Golconda. Indeed, during the first half of the 18th/17th century, Thai trade with the west (that is, with the Bay of Bengal and the Indian Ocean littoral) was almost entirely in Muslim hands, whilst Phra Narai employed a succession of at least three (ostensibly Persian) Muslims as phra klang, or foreign minister (the most powerful position at the Thai Court), and even maintained a squadron of Muslim horse guards (de Choisy, 196).

Islamic influence at Ayuthaya entered into sharp decline during the latter part of Narai’s reign, particularly following the rise in power of the Greek adventurer, Constant Phaulkon, who came to dominate the Thai royal court in ca. 1670-1679 (Hall, 364-74). Phaulkon perceived the “Moors” as political and commercial rivals, and as his belief their position and influence was gradually diminished, whilst that of the Europeans (and particularly of France) was correspondingly increased. During this period, the Muslim merchants dominating the Mergui-Tenasserim region were gradually displaced, and in 1683 an Englishman, Samuel (“Siamese”) White, was appointed gahbandar of Mergui, with disastrous consequences for non-European regional commerce as a whole. Two years later, as a result of Phaulkon’s commercial and political intrigues, war broke out between Siam and Golconda. Shortly thereafter, in 1687, a final blow was dealt to the Mergui-Machilipatanam trade when Golconda succumbed to the advancing armies of the Mughal Emperor Awrangzib [q. v.], and its capital was reduced to the status of a fishing village (Alam, 1959, passim).

The Mergui-Tenasserim trade route never fully recovered from these setbacks, although Indian Muslim merchants continued to trade with Ayuthaya via Mergui throughout the first half of the 18th/17th century. In ca. 1779/1765, however, even this diminished trade was brought to an abrupt end by the Burmese conquest of both Mergui and Tenasserim. Two years later, in 1767, Ayuthaya was itself captured and sacked by the Burmese armies of King Hsinbyushin.

Following the Burmese conquest, the entire Mergui-Tenasserim region as far south as Point Victoria was incorporated within the Burmese empire. The new frontier between Siam and Burma, now much advanced in the latter’s favour, remained sealed to trade (Low, iii, 287, 290); besides, the overland portage route from Mergui to Ayuthaya had become increasingly anachronistic, and regional inter-Asian trade had come to be increasingly dominated by European commerce. With the Burmese conquest of 1765, therefore, Mergui ceased to serve as a channel for Muslim commerce and concepts into Siam, and became instead a Burmese backwater. It still retained a substantial Muslim population, however, and it is interesting to note that indigenous Burmese chronicles possibly dating from the late 12th/18th century describe the rebuilding of Mergui in ca. 1770, and record the allocation of a special area (the Kakauk quarter) to the township’s Muslim population (Kyaw Din, 252-3).


MERIC, THE TURKISH NAME OF A RIVER CALLED HEBROS IN CLASSICAL GREEK AND MARITSA IN BULGARIAN. IT IS THE principal river of the south-eastern Balkans and, under the Ottomans, of the eyalet of the Rumeli. Al-IdnsI (Opus geographicum, Naples 1977, 796 = 4TH (OPUS GEOGRAPHICUM, OF THE RUMELI. EYES, 232, 1978, 766/1364 resulted in a defeat near the left bank of the Meric, during which the fleeing army sought salvation by crossing the river, a pre-dawn rawn remembered by the place-name Sipr Sndli (zakaSel adasi (zakaSel adasi, ed. Giese, 141). BEFORE THE CONQUEST OF CONSTANTINOPLE, EDIRNE WAS THE principal residence of the Ottoman sultans, and, even later, the Meric witnessed some of the pomp of court life. Thus in 981/1456-7 Commandies festivitites of the Meric, during which the fleeing army sought salvation by crossing the river, a pre-dawn rawn remembered by the place-name Sipr Sndli (zakaSel adasi (zakaSel adasi, ed. Giese, 141). THE BROAD FERTILE VALLEY OF THE MERIC was appreciated in Byzantine times as one of the granaries of Constantinople; this role was further increasing during the Ottoman rule after the Turks had introduced there the cultivation of rice in the 9th/15th century. The river itself served as a transportation route for these supplies by boat to Enex, from where they were carried by sea-going craft to Istanbul (this role of the Meric ceased only in the 1870s with the construction of a railway from Istanbul). The economic importance of the Meric valley in the Ottoman period was also demonstrated by the prosperity of Filibe (Psychodi), Enex and Dzrez, and by the creation of Tatar Pazardjik; this town, founded in 890/1485, was settled mainly by Bessarabian Tatars and Ottoman sipahis; its annual fair, held in July, was frequented by merchants from many parts of the empire. The valley represented an age-old route of communications, transportation and troop movements that continued beyond the Meric to Sofia and Belgrade. In the Ottoman postal organisation, the stages along the Meric pertained to the orta kol system. The effectiveness of the route was enhanced by the construction and endowment of kes and bridges; especially remarkable is the 10th/16th century bridge known as Dzir-i Mustafa Pasha, with a kes on either side, in present-day Svilengrad 40 km west of Edine. THE Meric acquired a special political significance in the final years of the Ottoman empire when the question of the Turkish-Bulgarian and Turkish-Greek borders arose. With the successful completion of the War of Independence in Anatolia, the Turkish demands that the British authorities persuade the Greeks to withdraw their forces beyond the Meric were met, and the Treaty of Lausanne (July 1923) established the river as the definitive border between Turkey and Greece.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: IN ADDITION TO REFERENCES GIVEN IN THE TEXT, SEE EYIYA CELEBI, SEYHAT-NAME, ISTANBUL 1314, III, 420-3; Sh. Sarni, Kamlus al-aI-land, ISTANBUL 1898, IV, 4270-1; K. JIRECK, DIE HEERSTRASSE VON BELGRAD NACH CONSTANTINOPLE, PRAGUE 1877; M. TAYYIB YOUNG, XV-XVI ASIRLANDA EDINME VE PAISA ILEVIN, ISTANBUL 1952, INDEX S.V.; D.E. FISCHER, AN HISTORICAL GEOGRAPHY OF THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE, LEIDEN 1972; W.G. BRICE (ED.), AN HISTORICAL ATLAS OF ISLAM, LEIDEN 1981, PS. 30-1; GIRISI NSKOPEDISI, S.V. MERIC, ENSIEN, ENSIEN MIDYE HATTI, ALI TANOGLU, SRRI ERINOL, URSI KÜMMERT, TÜRKEYI KLASSI, IN LEBIRIST 1961, MAP 1A. (S. SOEUEK)

MERIDA [SC MARIDA].

MERINID [SC MARINIDS].

MERKA, THE OFFICIAL SPILLING OF MARKHA (AS IN AL-IDNSI) AS THE SETTLEMENT WHICH LIES IN LAT. 1° N AND 44° E, SOUTH OF MAKDIKG (S.V.) IN THE REPUBLIC OF SOMALIA. IT IS MENTIONED ON 943 A.D. BY AL-MASFUDI.
among places in Africa inhabited by the descendants of Kush [q.v.], but the reading must be considered doubtful because the other places enumerated are in western Africa (cf. Muradi, ed. Pellat, index, s.v. Maranda). At present section 6 mentions no fixes in the north, as associated with the Hausiwi, one of the groups of the Somali; Ibn Sa'īd (apud Abu 'l-Fidā'ī) states that it was their capital, and that it was inhabited by Muslims. In so far as they can be dated by external features, the mosques appear to be of late 18th century date or later. The Friday Mosque, nevertheless, it was their capital, and that it was inhabited by the Somali; Ibn Sa'īd (apud Abu '1-Fida) of the mosque at Uthman to A.D. 1560. The grave and that of Shaykh Siinus, in this structure appears to be older, for it incorporates stonework with a cable pattern that may be compared with that in the mihrāb of the mosque at Kizimkazi [q.v.], Zanzibar, where the inscription in floriate Kufic and other decorations are dated by an inscription equivalent to A.D. 1107.


(G.S.P. Freeman-Grenville)

MERKEZ, SHAYKH MUΣLIH AL-DIN b. Muṣṭafā, the head of an Ottoman Şafi order and saint. Merkez Muṣlih al-Din Muṣṭafā b. Kālībī b. Ḥadżdaj belonged to the village of Şarī Māhmūdī in the Anatolian district of Lādhikīyya. He was at first a pupil of the Mollā Ḩabīd Paşa, son of Ḥabīrī Ḍeg [q.v.], and later of the famous Ṯālāwī Shaykh Sūnbul Siinān Efdīni, founder of the Sūnbulīyya, a branch of the Ḥabīwīyya, head of the monastery of Kōḡa Muṣṭafā Paşa in Istanbul (see Bursali Melik Mēhdī Ṭabīḥ, Ṭabīḥīyā, Muṣṭafīyā, i, 78–9). When the latter died in 936/1529, Merkez Efdīni succeeded him in the dignity of Pir. He held the office of head of a monastery for 23 years and died in the odour of sanctity in 959/1552, aged nearly 90. He was buried in Istanbul in the mosque which bears his name (cf. Ḥadīṯ al-qaawīnī, i, 230–1; J. von Hammer, GOR. i, 95, no. 495) before the Yeşil Kapu. At the tomb of Merkez Efdīni there is a much-venerated holy well, an ayazma, to which one descends by steps. Its reddish water is said to have the miraculous power of healing those sick of a fever (cf. Ewliyâ Celebi, i, 372; von Hammer, Constantinopolis, i, 513; idem, GOR, loc. cit., following the Hadīṯ al-qaawīnī, loc. cit.). Besides it is the cell (zāwa) of Merkez Efdīni, of which miraculous stories still circulate among the people. He had many pupils, including his son Ahmad, famous as the translator of the Kāmī, his son-in-law Muṣlih al-Din (cf. Ewliyâ, loc. cit.), the poet Râmah Efdīni, called Bihbīghi, and many others.

Bibliography: In addition to the references in the text, see Taşkogrūzâde, Şakâ'îk al-mu'inniya, tr. Međđji, 1841, 1842, 522–3; Oṭmānâlī μενελήφτεν, i, 160; Mehmed Thāiriyyā, Siyāṣa-i 'otmānî, iv, 363; F. Babinger, GOW, 44, n. 1; Tahsin Ya'zī, Fehrein soman Istanbul'da 'ilh hâmil şefhâr, in Istanbul Emniyeti Dergisi, ii (1956), 104-13; idem, Muṣlih al-Din, Efdīni. (Fr. Babinger)
tury (cf. V. Guinet, La Turquie d'Asie, Paris 1892, i, 761); the madrasa of Mehmed Celebi (built 817/1414 by one Abü Bekr b. Mehmed, to which an incongruous clock tower was added in the 19th century); and the complex built by Kara Mustafa Pasha, with mosque (built in 1077/1667-7), madrasa and caravanserai (see G. Goodwin, A history of Ottoman architecture, London 1971, 20, 362, 419).

In the 19th century, Merzifün was the centre of American Protestant missionary enterprise in the vilâyet of Sivas (in which Merzifün was in late Ottoman times situated), with the Anatolia College, a theological seminary, schools and charitable institutions, proselytism being aimed mainly at the local Armenians (Guinet numbered the town's population at 13,380 Muslims, 5,820 Armenians and 800 Greeks). There were also Roman Catholic Jesuit and Gregorian Armenian schools. Most of these did not survive the First World War and the Armenian massacres, with the consequent liquidation of that ethnic element from the town, as also the Greeks (the 1927 census enumerated only 11,334 inhabitants of Merzifün), but a small body of American missionaries and a school were still functioning in the late thirties. Modern Merzifün is the chef-lieu of an iles or district of the same name in the il or province of Amasya, and is noted for its cotton textiles. The population of the town was in 1970 28,210 and that of the district 59,777.


(F. Babinger-[C. E. Bosworth])

MESÌF(ÀLE) ("Torch"), a journal published in Turkish, of which eight numbers only appeared between 1 July and 15 October 1928. It had been founded by Djewdet Kudret (Cevdet Kudret Solok), Kenân Khulüsi (Kenan Hulusi Koray), Şabrî Es'ad (Sabri Esat Sıvarygül), Waşfi Mâhîr (Vasfi Mahir Kocatürk), Diâyâ ʿOthmân (Ziya Osman Saba) and Yâyân Nâbi (Yaşar Nabi Nayır) at the unexpected success of an anthology (Yedi mesâle, Istanbul 1928) of the above-mentioned authors plus Muʾammar Lüfî. These young writers, the Mesâleliler (Mesâleleiler), wished to combat the general, unfavourable judgment pronounced upon the literature of the country through the novel expression of a literary production devoid of the expression of the authors' individual feeling. The contrasting influences, whose action they felt, did not reach maturity, but they certainly felt the need of a call to order, more clearly discernible, it was true, in other Western intellectual, in order to give a new response to the confused expectations of their national revolution. Mesâle had the aim of functioning solely in the sphere of literature and art, but its founders were not unaware of social cares, and a few years later, a journal, Kadro (1932-5), was to endeavour to shape, within Kemalism, a new political and ideological milieu. Mesâle lived though the changes and contrasts of the age, even in its external aspect, since in the latter issues, Latin characters began to replace the Arabic ones, and its decorative designs were always in the style of the twenties of the West, the same elegant and objective artistic style desired by the Mesâleliler poets, whilst the prose writer Kenân Khulüsi was closer to Symbolism.

Under the patronage of Yusuf Diyâ (Yusuf Ziya Ortaç), Mesâle provides us with a useful panorama of the Turkish literature of its time, and the foreign authors presented in it confirm the French influence on Turkish culture. That some young people, with the help of writers already well-known, should have endeavoured, by means of journals like Mesâle and Kadro, to bring about a new cultural atmosphere, shows the desire for social action on the part of the Turkish intellectuals. In their literature, it is always nevertheless more essential to search out the elements of continuity and originality which lie beyond external appearances, together with those enduring elements of faithfulness—sometimes not discernible as such—towards tradition.

Bibliography: For the traditional view, see R. Mutluay, Çağdaş Türk edebiyatı (1908-1972), Istanbul 1973; a new interpretation is furnished in C. E. Carretto, Saggi su Mesâle. Un'avanguardia letteraria turca del 1928, Venice 1979, which develops further two articles of 1976 and 1977. See also the special number of Varlık (50. yılinda Yedi Mesale'le özel sayısı), no. 847 (April 1978). On Kadro, see Carretto, Poletti, Mesâle, faszismo e communismo negli anni '30, in Storia contemporanea, viii/3 (1977), 205-12, Turkish tr. in Türk ve Toplum, nos. 17-18 (1985). (C. E. Carretto)
MESIH MEHMED PASHA — MESIH PASHA


MESIH PASHA. Ottoman Grand Vizier in 906/1501. Mesîh and his elder brother Kö hàs Murâd were sons of a brother of Constantine IX Palæologus (Babinger, Eine Verfugung). Apparently Mesîh and Murâd were captured during the conquest of Constantinople and brought up as pages in Mehemmed II's seraglio.

The Greek faction under this Sultan first came to power when he decided to conquer the Greek island of Euboea (Eghriboz) in 875/1470. Mesîh distinguished himself for the first time during this campaign as sanjak beyî of Gelibolu [q.v.] and admiral of the navy. But soon afterwards he offered, as Venetian documents testify, to surrender Gelibolu, the Ottoman naval base, and the fleet to the Venetians in return for 40,000 gold ducats, aspiring to become ruler over the Morea (Babinger, Mehmed, 290). Mesîh appears to have been a vizier in late autumn 1476, or in early 1477 (see discussion in Reindl, 280). Two documents (Gökblign, 138, 148 n. 133) indicate that he was already second vizier in 19 Sha'bân 882/26 November 1477 and also in 883/1478, Mehmed Paşa Kârâmânî [q.v.] being Grand Vizier in both cases. A contemporary source (Donado da Lezze, 112) states that he was a newly-appointed fourth vizier when he was made commander-in-chief of the army and navy against Rhodes in the spring of 995/1480. Having failed at the siege, he was dismissed from the vizierate (Ibn Kemîl, cited by Reindl, 281), but apparently left with the sanjak of Gelibolu as admiral of the navy. During the indecisive period after the death of Mehmed the Conqueror II (5 May 1481), Mesîh, who belonged to the military dewshîrme [q.v.], vigorously opposed the appointment of Gedik Ahmed, appeared as a vizier in the Divân. Bringing Bâyza II to the throne, the military dewshîrme faction had then full control of the government.

While Gedik Ahmed, with the support of the Janissaries, acted too independently, Mesîh won the trust of the Sultan as an opponent of Bâyza [q.v.]: when in early summer 887/1482 Gedik Ahmed, suspected of being pro-Bâyza, was imprisoned in the Seraglio, the Janissaries invaded the palace and threatened the Sultan, who sent a group of dignitaries, including Mesîh, to negotiate. He succeeded in appeasing the soldiery by accepting all their demands including the promise never to appoint viziers outside the dewshîrme (da Lezze, 179-80). This convinced Bâyza that he was completely dependent, for his safety on the throne, on the military faction. Mesîh, closely co-operating with the seraglio, demonstrated his diplomatic ability and loyalty once again when Bâyza took refuge with the Hospitalers of Rhodes. During negotiations, while Gedik Ahmed proved to be uncompromising, Mesîh achieved an agreement to the satisfaction of Bâyza, thus becoming the architect of Bâyza's policy in respect of the Divân question. Now members of the military dewshîrme (Dâwid, Mesîh and Hersek-oghlu Ahmed) dominated the Divân, while Bâyza sent to the most sensitive governorships his eunuch köfî-aghas from the seraglio (Yâyâ, Ya'kûb, 'Ali, Khallil and Pirzû). Supported by the seraglio, Mesîh managed to survive Bâyza's bold decision to reinstate Gedik Ahmed, whom he believed to be a threat to his throne. After his execution (18 November 1482), a new era, that of the seraglio's direct control of government, began. Mesîh was second vizier in the Divân in 888/beg. 9 February 1483 (Anonymous chronicle, B.N. Paris, suppl. 1047, fol. 93a; also Ya'kûb Paşa’s awdîyya dated awâl Maharrâm 888/aed-February 1483, Epstein, 285, 322). He had already replaced in this post Djem, the then Grand Vizier Kâsun Pasha, a bureaucrat famous as “the founder of the Ottoman bureaucratic tradition”. When Ishâk Paşa, Grand Vizier and supporter of Gedik Ahmed, had to leave the Divân (in the summer or early autumn 888/1483, see Reindl, 171, 236, 283), Dâwid Paşa, who was already second vizier in 867/beg. 20 February 1492, and apparently favoured by the seraglio faction, became Grand Vizier. It is suggested that Mesîh succeeded Ishâk in the grand vizierate (Reindl, 171, 236, 283, on the authority of the contemporary historian Ibn Kemîl), and kept the position until 890/1485. But Mesîh is shown in the Anonymous chronicle, fol. 93b, as second vizier and Dâwid as Grand Vizier in 889/beg. 30 January 1484.

In 890/beg. 18 January 1485, Mesîh was suddenly dismissed from the vizierate by Sultan Ishâk and was infatiuated at something which we cannot determine (Ibn Kemîl, cited by Reindl, 283). He was first banished to Filibe as its sâbâhi, and then was transferred to Kafà [q.v.] as its sanjak beyî in 892/1487 (Kafà, like Salonica, had become an exile for demoted viziers). The customs register of Kafà dated 892/1487 shows that Mesîh then owned a ship which was active in the traffic between Istanbul and Kafà and at that time his kettîkâdî took for him slaves at Azak. Mesîh apparently left Kafà when Prince Mehemmed was sent as its governor toward the end of 895/1489 (Reindl, 284). Next we find him in our sources as sanjak beyî of Akkerman (Akkerme) in Rabî‘ II 903/beg. 27 November 1497. According to the Anonymous chronicle, fols. 118b-121a, he played a major role in stopping a Polish army which invaded Moldavia 1496-7, in cooperation with the Moldavian Vovode Stephen. Mesîh took advantage of this achievement to gain the sultan’s favour, sending him 29 standards and enslaved Polish nobles. The news was welcomed in Istanbul, and Venice was informed as a warning (Sanuto, I Diarii, i, 845; Fisher, 56). Mesîh's pilgrimage in the summer of 904/1499 seems to be a calculated move to go to Istanbul and exploit his recent success in Moldavia. Actually, considering his experience in naval affairs, his knowledge of western politics and his family connections with Venice (Reindl, 279), he was a man who would be most useful in the war against Venice, which began in June 1499. Shortly after his return from Mecca he was appointed a vizier (basî in Sanuto, quoted by Reindl 285, does not mean necessarily Grand Vizier). In fact, in Radjab 905/February 1500, the Grand Vizier was Ya'kûb Paşa, Bâyza II’s first Grand Vizier of palace eunuchs, who came to this post following the death of Candarlı İbrahim Pasha at the end of Muhammar 905/August 1499. Mesîh entered the Divân as second vizier while his friend Hersek-oghlu occupied the post of third vizier (Anonymous chronicle, fols. 124a). Eunuchs (jawshî) were never welcomed by the bureaucratic and military factions, but they estab-
lished supreme authority over government affairs and were particularly favoured by Bayezid II. In Muham-ram 906/July-August 1500, Mesih was still mentioned as second vizier (Reindl, 221-2, 354, believes Mesih was made Grand Vizier immediately after İbrahim’s death in 1499), and in Ramadan 906/March-April 1501 he left Istanbul for Taşlîli in Karaman to quell the rebellion of the Warsak tribes which were supporting a Karamanid pretender by the name of Mustafa. There is no doubt that in the spring of 1501 Mesih was appointed Grand Vizier for the first time to lead this important campaign (details in İdris Bilici, *Hükümet, TKP Library, Hazine 1855*).

Combining the skills of a general and diplomat, Mesih was able to persuade the tribal chieftains not to give their support to the Karamanid pretender. Soon after his return to Istanbul, a joint Franco-Venetian invasion of the island of Mytilene (Midilli [q.v.]) infuriated the sultan, who struck his Grand Vizier (see Reindl, 142, no. 799). For the *askâf* for his mosque and *madrasa* in Gelibolu, see Gölbğin, 439. Its *waqfiyya* is dated 888/1487. The names of his three sons: Ali Beg, Mahmûd Çelebi and Bali Beg, are known. The latter was sângâb beg of Vukorün in Rabl 1 909/August-September 1503.


**Hâli Ilkeç**

MESIHI, an important Ottoman poet of Bayezid II’s time (886-910/1481-1512), who died after 912/1512, possibly even after 924/1518 (see V.L. Ménage, *An Ottoman manual of provincial correspondence*, in WZKM, lviii [1976], 3-45, and idem, art. on Gûl-i sâd-berg in Osmanî, Amâsrâlman, forthcoming). His given name was ğisâ. Born in Pristina, he came in his youth to Istanbul, where he became a medrese student and also soon distinguished himself as a calligrapher. He was able to find favour with the Grand Vizier Khâdîm ‘Ali Paşa, whose divân secretary he became, and through his patron he had no cause to be annoyed with him because of his undisciplined, pleasure-oriented life and his lack of conscientiousness in the performance of his official duties, and is reported to have spoken of him as a *shehr əghlânî* ("street Arab"). He nevertheless held this position until Khâdîm ‘Ali Paşa fell in 917/1511 fighting the Şhi’i rebels under Əlı Kull. Mesih composed a deeply-felt elegy on his death but, having need of a new protector, ended with a mention of ənhem ağaşı Yûnus Paşa (cf. I. Morina, Mesihî ‘in Hâmid Ali Paşa’ya yazdıdı meti, in *Qevren*, viii [1981], no. 31, 53-63). Based on the information given by ‘Aşkî Çelebi, it was formerly accepted that Mesihî did not succeed in gaining the protection of either Yûnus Paşa or the Nişâbûrî Tâdžî-zâde Dâfer Çelebi, that he had to be content with a small fief in Bosnia and that his attempts to gain the patronage of Selim I failed likewise. This assumption should now be revised insofar as Selim’s statement that Mesihî was in the service of Yûnus Paşa has been shown by Ménage to be the more reliable.

Mesihî’s place in Ottoman divan poetry is that of a highly gifted and original poet without an extensive oeuvre. His language is relatively plain and clear, his manner devoid of affectation. Some poems and passages of his captivity through their lyricism. There is wealth of charming new images, associations and ideas. A touch of Rumelian dialect here and there is of linguistic interest.

Mesihî’s life/work comprises: (1) His not especially voluminous *Divân* has not yet been printed. Critical editions in typescript form exist, however: Mine Ozoğlu, *The Divan of the 15th century Ottoman poet Mesihî*, Ph. D. thesis, Edinburgh University 1969, and S. Jaber, Mesihî ‘in hayâtı ve dîvânını tekrârî metni, Ph. D. thesis, Istanbul 1953. Best known in Europe is his *murâhâb* on spring which Sir William Jones published with a Latin translation in *Persus Asiae*, commentarium libri sex, Leipzig 1774, and which was thereafter repeatedly translated into German, French, Italian, Russian and Serbian (cf. F. Bayrak, Mesihî ‘in dîvânı dâyetâyına yer alan “Bahariye’i”, *in Istanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Türk Dili ve Edebiyat Dergisi*, xxii [1974-6], 213-9; i. Eren, “Bahariye’i’nin Fransızça, Rusça ve Sırpça çevirileri, in ibid., 221-7. (2) The *mehnewî* *Shehr-əghlânî* ("rouser of the city") is Mesihî’s most original work. It is a humorous description of the handsome youths of Edirne, all of whom have Muslim names and are of the lower middle class, with mention of their or their father’s profession. (Except for four of the total of 47, two verses are dedicated to each youth.) Cf. on the text, i. Morina, XV y.y. büyük Türk sanı Prîstînî ‘îmsîhî* (1481-1512) [sa], in *Qevren*, viii [1981], no. 30, 39-56. Its language is plain, unpretentious and easily understandable. Mesihî’s *Shehr-əghlânî* became popular and he had numerous followers in this poetic genre.

It is generally but not unanimously accepted that the *şehr-əghlânî* by Dâfer would appear to date from just about the same time, and that it had no Persian model (cf. Mine Mengi, Mesihî ‘in hayâtı, sairîzeti ve ezetleri, *in Türkiye Dergisi*, vi [1974], no. 1, 109-19; A. S. Levend, Türk edebiyatında şehr-əghlânî ve şehr-əghlânî zâde Istanbul, Istanbul 1958; and M. İzzet, *Türkoloji Dergisi*, vi [1974], no. 1, 109-19; A. S. Levend, Türk edebiyatında şehr-əghlânî ve şehr-əghlânî zâde Istanbul, Istanbul 1958). (3) *Gûl-i sâd-berg* ("the many-petalled rose") is an *inîhâb* collection of elegant stylistic samples not without historic interest. Only a very few ms. of this have been reported to exist (cf. the article by Ménage cited above).

became warriors (sc. to the death); the king crushed the fort, and Čítaw₁ became Islām; he may not be historically accurate (Padmānāt, ed. V. S. Agrawal, verse 651), for Anīr Khushraw [q.v.], who was present with 'Alā’ al-Dīn; but with a sincere spirit, the mass self-illusion of the womenfolk. Čítaw₁ fell in 702/1303, by what seems to have been peaceful surrender (epidemic or famine in the garrison have been suggested as the reasons). Ratansen delivering himself personally to 'Alā’ al-Dīn; Čítaw₁ was then renamed Khidrābād and assigned to the young heir-apparent Khidr Khān, although the administration lay in the charge of a Čítaw₁ in 'Alā’ al-Dīn’s service who was connected by marriage to the Guhillōt house. Ratansen was dethroned and the succession passed to a cadet branch of the Guhillōts, the Sisodiyas, several princes of whom died in attempting to regain Čítaw₁. After Maladeva’s death in 721/1321, the sequence of events is not clear, as the bardic chronicles present a garbled account, often confounding events of the 8th/14th and 10th/16th centuries in a romantic medley. The ruler who emerged was Hammīr, in whose reign Sisodiyas rule was restored at Čítaw₁ (probably profiting from either the dynastic change at Dihlī from Khaḍījī to Tughlūkis, or from the dispositions ca. 739/1338 under Muhammad b. Tughlūk’s rule); his heroism and chivalry are much extolled, but the Čítaw₁ traditions are so much at variance with one another, none of them being compatible with either the few inscriptions or the exiguous references in the Muslim historians, that the chronology of Mēwār until ca. 823/1420 must be regarded as obscure; but certainly Hammīr’s successor Kghetrisingh successfully withstood an attack by the Mālwā [q.v.] ruler Dilāwar Khān Ghirār. Early in the 9th/15th century, the discovery of silver and lead mines increased Mēwār’s prosperity, and many defensive works were constructed. The long reign of Rana Kumbha, 836-73/1433-68, saw a state at first weakened by interference from the Rāthōfs of Mēwār in Mēwār affairs (although chronologies are again doubtful, since the bardic accounts of Mēwār do not tally with one another), and by a conflict between Rana Kumbha and his brother Khēm (Khēmā) Karan; nevertheless, some border territories were brought under tribute and garrisoned. Some of these lands had previously acknowledged the suzerainty of Mālwā, which had grown to considerable strength under Mahmūd Khaḍījī I, and which had long annoyed Mēwār by harbouring disaffected Mēwār chieftains and courtiers; but Mēwār had similarly given refuge to 'Umar Khān, the pretender to Mahmūd’s throne. Conflict between Mēwār and Mālwā was inevitable, and Mālwā forces (often joined by Khēm Karan with an army of Čítaw₁ followers) invaded Mēwār on many occasions with varying success (the assertion, however, that Mahmūd’s forces were routed in a battle at Sārangpur [q.v. in 840/1437, and that he himself was taken prisoner to Čítaw₁, does not bear examination), each state erecting a column in token of victory over the other. The Čítaw₁ Kīrttanśā inscription, however, seems to refer more to the campaigns against Kūbt al-Dīn Ahmad Shāh of Gudjārat; these were occasioned both by border disputes and by Mēwār attacks on Nāgawār [q.v.], a pre-conquest site of Islamic learning, for long under the Dīhlī sultanate but by now under the rule of the descendants of Shams al-Dīn Dandānī, brother of the first sultan of Gudjārat. Mālwā and Gudjārat acted jointly against Mēwār in 861/1457, but without pronounced success; the Rāthōfs of Mēwār, and Khēm Karan, added to
Mewaf’s difficulties by campaigning against Kumbha at the same time. Further forays by the Muslim armies took place over the next few years, with some regions being overrun and laid waste, but little more, and there were no major incursions until after Kumbha’s death.

Kumbha was succeeded by the pattride Udaya, who was poorly supported in the state and hence tried to curry favour with his Muslim neighbours by ceding certain border territories; then, less popular than ever, having apparently disorganised the whole state, he was deposed in favour of his younger brother Raj Bakla, 878/1473-1509, who was faced with the task of reorganisation while continuing with civil war (a renewed attempt by Khém Karan to come to power), further attacks by Málwà, now under Ghilwán al-Dín Kháldí, and an insurrection by certain aboriginal tribes. The Málwà army was worsted, and Málwà invaded in its turn, Mewaf occupying the Khérwafà district. A quarrel between Ráyamál’s sons developed into a war of succession, resolved by the eventual acquisition of the capable and ambitious Ráñg Sángra [q. v.], 915-35/1509-28. In his first 15 years of rule he consolidated the state; in this time the ascendency in Málwà of Médíni Ráñ [q. v.], a son of Múzaffar II of Gudjarát, who moved to support and reinstate Mámúd Kháldí II. The latter attacked Mewaf in 925/1519, but was badly defeated, taken prisoner to Gíawéd, and released only after the payment of a large indemnity and the surrender of a son as hostage to the Mewaf court. Next an incident at Idrá [q. v.] drew Mewaf into war with Gudjarát; but Sángá, strengthened by having secured the support of Málwà by releasing the royal hostage, was apparently able to come to some conciliatory agreement with Gudjarát.

This left him free to pursue his ambitions against the sultanate of Marwaf and Amber. His ambitions towards the conquest of the Díllí sultanate led him to propose to the Mughal Bábúr a simultaneous attack on Ibráhím Lódí. Bábúr, of course, carried out his part of the undertaking by its defeat of Ibráhím Lódí at Pánípat in 932/1526, but, contrary to Sángas’s expectation, showed every sign of remaining in India. Sángá, by managing to secure the Gudjarát throne for the exiled prince Bahuní, drove a wedge between Díllí and Gudjarát, and it was accordingly against Sangá that Bábúrs efforts were now directed, culminating in the battle of Khánú’á in 935/1527 in which Sangá with a confederated Rájput army was completely routed. Mewaf as an independently acting kingdom thus lost its power; the subsequent activities of the region are described in the bibliography. Bibliography: The difficulty of reconciling the various bardic accounts has been mentioned in the text; of the many kháyatí texts of Múhanotí, in Hindi translation and ed. G.H. Ójha, Banaras 1982, is perhaps the most acceptable. J. Tod, *Annuals and antiquities of Rajasthan*, 3 vols., ed. W. Crooke, Oxford 1920, gives the Mewaf traditions in extenso but uncritically. A failure to assess the Mewaf histories *vis-à-vis* the Muslim chronicles appears even in G. H. Ójha, *Rájputání kí tiháh [in Hindi]*, Ajmír 1936-7, and in H.B. Sánda’s *Máhánáná Sángrá, Ajmír 1918*, and *Máhánáná Kumbha, Ajmír 1932*. For the Muslim sources, see *Biblia* to GUDJARAT and MÁLWA; also to RIDÁR and MEDÍNÍ RÁÑ. See also BÁBUR and RÁSHTÁN.

MEWÁT, a generally imprecisely defined region of India to the south and southeast of Delhi, the broken country around Alwar, Tidjára, Bharatpur, Díg, RÉWÁRÍ, Mathúra and GúrGaón, “land of the MÉWÁ” [q. v.], robbers, marauders and cattle thieves. Punitive excursions under Itútmish, ca. 660/1220, and Balbán as nábí of Násir al-Dín Mámúd in 646/1249 and 658/1260, had only a temporary effect, and Mewaf was not effectively pacified and controlled until Balbán’s first regent year as sultan, 653/1257 (full account in Díyá al-Dín Baráni, *Ta’rik-í Fírúz Sháhí*, ed. Bibl. Ind., 56 ff.). In the following century, a branch of the MÉWÁ were converted to Islam, and their leader Bahádúr Náháí, from his strong Kótí near Tidjára, came to be recognised as a powerful noble in the Díllí court; he supported Abú Bakr, a grandson of Fírúz Sháh, in the succession struggles after that sultan’s death, and was treated as a rebel by later Tuglukid sultans, although when in 789/1385-6 Khídhr Khán took refuge with him in Mewaf he is described as the nakúJTá. Bahádúr Náháí later opposed Khídhr when he became suzerain after Tímúrs invasion, and Mewaf under him and his successors (now usually known as Khán-zádás) again became a rebel area. The “Sayyíd” ruler Múhrárák Sháh made attempts to subdue revolt in Mewaf in 929/1522 and 931/1528 under the twin grandsons of Bahádúr, Djalál Khán and ʿAbd al-Kadr Khán ("Djalíl" and "Kaddú"); Kaddú was captured and executed for complicity with the Shártí forces of Díwanpur [q. v.], but Djalíl, after again harrying the Díllí forces, was eventually compelled to submit and render tribute the following year; a similar sequence of events followed in 936/1432, and on both occasions the Mewafús pursued a “wrenched earth” policy (fullest account of this period in Yahyá b. Abdmal Sirhdí, *Ta’rik-í Múhrárák Sháhí*, ed. Bibl. Ind., 148-230 passim). Bahúl Lódí [q. v.] was similarly troubled by Ahmad Khán Mewaf in both during his struggle to rise to power and after his accession to the Díllí throne; Ahmad, compelled to submit, was deprived of seven parganas of his kádrí and compelled to send his uncle Múhrárák Khán to Díllí. In 784/1379 Múhrárák took refuge with him in Mewaf, and in 793/1385-6 he deserted the Bahádúr and allied himself with Husán Sháh Shártí of Díwanpur, although Mewaf itself remained virtually independent of both sultanes. It remained peaceful for some years thereafter and ʿAlam Khán Mewafís served happily under Sikandar Lódí, even in 903/1502 leading forces against Dholepur in Sikandar’s campaign against Gwlíyár, although Mewaf was not counted as part of the Díllí sultanate; but in Ibráhím Lódí’s reign (923-32/1517-26), when many of his own nobles were in rebellion against him and the hand of the Mughal Bábúr was about to fall upon the Díllí sultanate, Hasan Khán of Mewaf declared his independence. He joined Ráñá Sángá of Cítawr against Bábúrs advance (the Bábúr-námá, tr. Beveridge, 523) refers to Hasan Khán as an “impious mannikin” and the sole leader of the “tribal and mischief”], and was killed in the battle of Khánú’tá in 935/1527; after this Bábúr reduced Mewaf and entered Alwar; some parganas were assigned to Náháí Khán, Hasan’s son, who swore allegiance to Bábúr, after which Mewaf seems to have had no further power as a political force, and the strong forts of Alwar and Tidjára were controlled by Mughal officers. There is no account of Mewafís insurrection even at the time of Humáyún’s dispossession by Shérf Sháh; the latter struck coin at Alwar.
Mewat seems to have remained quiet under Mughal rule in the 11th/17th century. Humayun ... Osmanh devletinin ilmiye teskilati, Ankara 1965, 38, 46-8, 57, 85-91, 96-102, 110, 117, 263-5, 276-80; M.Z. Ghanem which was responsible for the collection of the kalemi was annexed to the bureau handling treasury duties paid by bakers in Istanbul; (iii) Khalifesi, emin vacant fiefs and other grants, and from fief holders mewkufdcl sandjak [q.v.], was assigned by the Alwar and Tidjara, the tomb of Fath Djang in Alwar (A^m-i Akbari festin-i agrd). Ghanem which managed the relay service; and (iv) (kalemiyye) from farmed-out lands; (ii) Nawul (i) Kalemiyye dd^iresi, issues, [see ASHAM]. Eshdm muhdsebesi kalemi Mewkufdt who went from village to village agents, Khan-zadas. Of their few monuments in and around soldiers in military campaigns, and provided money expense allocations, and from vacant fiefs and other grants. The bureau under him also confiscated land finance department. His main task was to manage the revenues'' (Mewkufdt kalemi] to the Judicial districts of the Two Holy Cities, Mecca and Medina; (iii) Bahri kddi in khamse kalemiyyetleri, judicial districts of the Five Cities, Edirne, Bursa, Damascus, Egypt and Filiibe; (iv) Bilad-i :shere meyleviyyetleri, judicial districts of the Ten Cities, to which an eleventh was later added: Jerusalem, Aleppo, Tîhrâl Yenishchei, Galata, Izmir, Salonika, Eyub, Uşkûdar, Sofia, Crete and Trebizond. (v) Devezvey meyleviyyetleri, judicial districts held in rotation by kddi of Marshah, Baghdad, Bousia, Belgrade, Anitoch, Kutahya, Beirut, Adana, Van, Rusçuk, Sivas and Cankiri. For a meyleviyyet appointment, an applicant was required to graduate from a madrasa [q.v.], and obtain a license, idjaz-name [see IDJAZA]. He could then either teach through all madrasa grades or become a kddi in the smallest judicial unit, kadif [q.v.], rise to the larger judicial unit of a sangid [q.v.], and then go back and teach through the highest madrasa grades. He would then become a candidate for bilad-i 'ashere meyleviyyetleri, which were also called makhreli meyleviyyetleri [see MAHKRELI], judicial districts whose scholars just 'going out' from teaching at madrasas were appointed. Appointments were usually for a year. Meyleviyyet appointments were proposed to the Sultan by the Grand Vizier, sadr-i a'lam [q.v.]. Before the 10th/16th century, the kddi 'usker supplied names of candidates to the Grand Vizier; after then, the shaykh al-islâm provided the list of names. After the 10th/16th century, the term of the appointment was extended when the number of candidates began to exceed that of available posts in the empire. The title was therefore separated from the post itself. A candidate held the title of meyleviyyet pâyins for a year before he was appointed to the post itself, meyleviyyet manjili. Some who were assigned these posts preferred to reside in the capital, and sent deputies, na'ib, to represent them. During later centuries, titles given without appointments, assignments to sons and to household members of influential families who had not been through the educational system, together with the sale of licenses, brought about a deterioration in meyleviyyet appointments. Bibliography: 1. I. H. Uzuncarsih, Osmanh devletinin ilmiye teskilati, Ankara 1948, 10, 19, 124, 336-48, 353-7, 372, 382; M. Sertoglu, Resmi osmanl sc tartar ancklpenesi, Istanbul 1958, 112, 159, 208-10, 221-2; M.Z. Pakalim, Osmanl tarihinde iktisadi cem padişahlar zamanlari sicilisi, Istanbul 1951, 497, 8; M. d’Ohsson, Tableau general de l’Empire Ottoman, iv, Paris 1791, 267-8; Gibb and Bowen i/1, 51, 130-1, 151, 248; M. Akg, Türkiye’nin kâtipi ve eylmiyat tarihi, Istanbul 1979, ii, 78, 337-8, 385-6, 490-1. (F. MOGE GÜRK) MEWLÂNA KHNâKIR [see MELVânA KHNKâR] MEWLEVIYYET or MOLLÂLI, title given to certain judicial districts in the Ottoman Empire. I.H. Uzuncarsih located the earliest reference in the 9th/15th century, when kddi [q.v.] posts with the highest fee of 500 akces [q.v.] were defined as bagîyiz meyleviyyetleri. These posts consisted of Istanbul, Edirne, Bursa, Filibe, Salonika and Sofia. Until the late 9th/15th and early 10th/16th centuries, these meyleviyyets were not ranked. This practice was introduced in the late 10th/16th century after the shaykh al-islâm [q.v.] formally became the head of the Ottoman religious hierarchy. The kddi of Istanbul came fourth in rank after the shaykh al-islâm and the Anadolu and Rumeli judges of the army, kddi ’usker [q.v.]. The other meyleviyyets were unranked. During the 10th/16th and 11th/17th centuries, as the empire expanded, many new meyleviyyets were formed. With minor exceptions, their relative ranks did not change after the 12th/18th century. Uzun- carsi lists five ranks of meyleviyyets in decreasing importance: (i) Istanbul kddi, the judicial district of Istanbul; (ii) Hazemeyn meyleviyyetleri, judicial districts of the two Holy Cities, Mecca and Medina; (iii) Balkar mewkufd in khamse meyleviyyetleri, judicial districts of the Five Cities, Edirne, Bursa, Damascus, Egypt and Filiibe; (iv) Bilad-i ‘ashere meyleviyyetleri, judicial districts of the Ten Cities, (v) the Judicial districts in the Ten Cities, to which an eleventh was later added: Jerusalem, Aleppo, Tirâh Yenişchei, Galata, Izmir, Salonika, Eyûb, Usküdar, Sofia, Crete and Trebizond. (v) Devrezvey meyleviyyetleri, judicial districts held in rotation by kâddî of Marşâh, Bagdad, Bouia, Belgrade, Antioch, Kutahya, Beirut, Adana, Van, Rusçuk, Sivas and Cankiri. For a meyleviyyet appointment, an applicant was required to graduate from a madrasa [q.v.], and obtain a license, idjaz-name [see IDJAZA]. He could then either teach through all madrasa grades or become a kâddî in the smallest judicial unit, kadif [q.v.], rise to the larger judicial unit of a sangîl [q.v.], and then go back and teach through the highest madrasa grades. He would then become a candidate for bilad-i ‘ashere meyleviyyetleri, which were also called makhreli meyleviyyetleri [see MAHKRELI], judicial districts whose scholars just ‘going out’ from teaching at madrasas were appointed. Appointments were usually for a year. Meyleviyyet appointments were proposed to the Sultan by the Grand Vizier, sadr-i a’lam [q.v.]. Before the 10th/16th century, the kâddî ‘usker supplied names of candidates to the Grand Vizier; after then, the shaykh al-islâm provided the list of names. After the 10th/16th century, the term of the appointment was extended when the number of candidates began to exceed that of available posts in the empire. The title was therefore separated from the post itself. A candidate held the title of meyleviyyet pâyins for a year before he was appointed to the post itself, meyleviyyet manjili. Some who were assigned these posts preferred to reside in the capital, and sent deputies, na’ib, to represent them. During later centuries, titles given without appointments, assignments to sons and to household members of influential families who had not been through the educational system, together with the sale of licenses, brought about a deterioration in meyleviyyet appointments. Bibliography: I. I. H. Uzuncarsih, Osmanh devletinin ilmiye teskilati, Ankara 1965, 38, 46-8, 57, 85-91, 96-102, 110, 117, 263-5, 276-80; M.Z. (J. BURTON-PAGE) MEWATI [see MÔDÔ] MEWUKÂFATCI or MEWUKÂFAT, title given to the director of the ‘‘Bureau of Retained Revenues’’ (Mewkufat kâlemi) in the Ottoman finance department. His main task was to manage the mewkuf aristocracy, money accruing from unused state expense allocations, and from vacant fiefs and other grants. The bureau under him also confiscated land not registered in land surveys, allocated depots for state purchases, kept records of contribution units (‘‘awarîd-kânîe’’ [see ‘‘AWARID’’], registered relay stations, maintained military depots at all frontiers, allotted food and forage, straw and hay rations to soldiers in military campaigns, and provided money to civil servants accompanying the army. In the 12th/18th century, this bureau had four departments: (i) Kalemiyye dîrîresi, which collected a 10% registration fee (kalemiyye) from farmed-out lands; (ii) Nawul Kâfillisi, which kept the books of food depots and of duties paid by bakers in Istanbul; (iii) Mencci Stjualfisi, which managed the relay service; and (iv) Oshenm kstaâbî which was responsible for the collection of the sheep-tax (kâdet-i aghnam). The Mewkufet emini, a commissioner from the bureau in each sanliuk [q.v.], was assigned by the mewkufet to gather the yearly revenues accruing from vacant fiefs and other grants, and from fief holders who did not join military campaigns. The emin had agents, mewkufcüs, who went from village to village collecting these revenues. In 1838, after the establishment of the Ottoman finance ministry, the Mewkufat kâlemi was annexed to the bureau handling treasury issues, Eshdî mâhâmî kâlemi [see ASHAM]. Bibliography: I. I. H. Uzuncarsih, Osmanh devletinin merkez ve bahriye teskilati, Istanbul 1948, 10, 19, 124, 336-48, 353-7, 372, 382; M. Sertoglu, Resmi osmanl sc tartar ancklpenesi, Istanbul 1958, 112, 159, 208-10, 221-2; M.Z. Pakalim, Osmanl tarihinde iktisadi cem padişahlar zamanlari sicilisi, Istanbul 1951, 497, 8; M. d’Ohsson, Tableau general de l’Empire Ottoman, iv, Paris 1791, 267-8; Gibb and Bowen i/1, 51, 130-
The first detailed article on the battle was written by Andras Komaromy, A Horthy és a harmincezések (Chief Justice). Contemporary evidence tends to show that there were two appellate courts in the metropolitan city of Agra: the first was presided over by the ważir, while the second, being the supreme court, functioned under the personal supervision of the sultan. Generally, the appellant moved to the Supreme Court, if he was not satisfied with the judgment given by Mi‘ān Bhu‘ā. The anecdotes contained in the Wādikī-i Mushtakī and Tabakī-i Akbarī cast light on the interest that the wāzir and the sultan took in dispensing justice, irrespective of creed, or birth and status of people.

Mi‘ān Bhu‘ā encouraged, in his capacity of sādr, the scholars and intellectuals who came from abroad to settle in Agra and Dihlī on a permanent basis and made land-grants to them for their maintenance. Himself interested in learning, he also gathered a fairly large sprinkling of these scholars in his own service and thus emulated his master Sultan Sikandar Shāh. They undertook at his instance the compilation of works on various themes, literary as well as scientific. The Arabic and Sanskrit classics were collected and transcribed by expert calligraphists and then translated into Persian by capable scholars with the help of Brahmans. Of these translations, the Mādān al-ṣafarī‘-i Sikandar Shāh, based on Sanskrit classics such as Sarvat, Jā Deo kart, Rās Ratnakā, Śuṅgadhār, etc., is considered an important work on medicine, compiled by Mi‘ān Bhu‘ā himself. The terms and names of the herbs and plants were translated into Persian and, if the equivalent of any term was not found in the Persian language, it was simply transliterated with the necessary explanation. Indirectly emphasising the importance of his work, the Mi‘ān says in the preface that the medical science imported from the Muslim countries did not suit the constitution of the Indians, due to climatic dif-
ferences, and he had undertaken the compilation of the work with royal permission, for the Indian system of medicine had been found more effective.

Unfortunately, other books, with the exception of the (LA, s.v. Ma'mar bin Farhad), were compiled by Mi'ān Bhu'a, a Persian translation of Sanskrit classics and one dealing with Indian medicine, produced by different scholars employed by Mi'ān Bhu'a, have not survived.

Mi'ān Bhu'a, as a pious Muslim, constructed mosques and made endowments for the benefit of public: the beautiful mosque in Dihlī, popularly known as al-mu'tadī, was constructed at his cost and is known for its attractive features. The shape and proportion of the five main arches of the façade and the domes, the design and grandeur of the doorway and projecting balconies at the sides show that a talented group of craftsmen was employed for its completion. The evidence of the Maktubāt-i kuddāsī reveals that its ample facilities included arrangements for students, travellers, teachers and Sufi saints, all of whom got food from the kitchen maintained with the money endowed by Mi'ān Bhu'a.

The followers of Mi'ān Bhu'a also enjoyed prestige in the city. The newly-recruited soldier, no matter whether he was a suwa'r or a foot-soldier, could approach any saraf or money changer and borrow money from him for one or two years, after showing him the parasea or letter of appointment. According to the custom, he was assigned agricultural land in lieu of a cash salary. Mi'ān Bhu'a is said to have had villages and pargāns of his maintenance iḥād scattered in different sarkārs around Dihlī and Agra, so that it was possible for him to assign to his retainer maintenance-land in the village of the last one's choice.

Mi'ān Bhu'a retained his position after the death of Sultan Sikandar Lodi, but subsequently failed to enjoy the confidence of the new Sultan Ibrahim Lodi (923-32/1517-26), who ordered him to be put under arrest and handed over to Malik Adam Kākār, one of the confidants of the last Sultan and friend of Mi'ān Bhu'a; this was a mild punishment for the aged ważir, for many of his companions were subjected to torture on account of the royal displeasure. Of the mediaeval writers, Shaykh Kabīr Bāținī says that the ważir was punished because he did not comply with the royal farās, which was the grant of money to a royal favourite, the Rā'ī of Gwālīor. It may be that, owing to old age, he had become negligent of his duties and the Sultan had become doubtful of his loyalty. This seems to be near the truth, because Mucātikī's reference to Mi'ān Bhu'a's imprisonment implies that it occurred before the annexation of Gwalior to the Lodī empire. On his dismissal, the 'adwār was separated from the ważarat; Mi'ān Bhu'a's eldest son, Dilwār Khān, was assigned the ważarat, while Shaykh Farād Būkhārī, an 'allim and the Sultan's teacher, took over as 'adrār.


MICDAD, the common Arabic word, together with its synonym hbr, for ink. Derived from the root m-d-d, it originally meant ‘anything that is added to a thing, because of its utility’, and therefore one of its more specific meanings is ‘that with which one writes’ (Lane, Lexicon, s.v.), or ‘that with which the writer is provided’ (LA, s.v.). There is a single Kur'ānic mention of middd: ‘If the sea were ink for the Words of my Lord, the sea would be spent before the Words of my Lord are spent’ (XVIII, 109). Tradition has it that on the Day of Judgment, the ink of scholars will be measured with the blood of martyrs, and that both scales of the balance will then be in equilibrium (al-Kalkashandī, Subh, ii, 461).

In Middle Eastern manuscripts, two types of black ink were generally used, both of which date from pre-Islamic times. One was prepared on the basis of carbon and oil, and the other one from galluts and ferrous compounds. The former originally being designated as middd, the latter as hbr. Later, the two words were used as synonyms (Grohmann, Arabische Paläographie, i, 127). A considerable number of recipes for ink have survived from mediaeval times, many devised by scribes for their personal use and improved for their purpose by trial and error. Numerous recipes have been transmitted by al-Mu'izz b. Bādis (d. 453/1061) in his Umudat al-kutub, especially in chs. 2-10. Grohmann (i, 127-131) mentions some from other sources as well. For coloured inks and inks used in secret writings, a whole range of natural ingredients was used, but it is often difficult exactly to identify these ingredients from the literary sources.

As Middle Eastern manuscripts continued to be made till well into the 19th century, it may be assumed that in more recent times imported ink, like imported paper, was used as well. The rise of polychrome manuscripts in the Maghrib in the second half of the 19th century may be explained from such imports. A systematical chemical analysis of the inks used in Middle Eastern manuscripts, both in mediaeval and recent times, has not been undertaken so far. An account of the survival of mediaeval practices in bookmaking, including the handling of ink, in recent times, albeit in a Christian environment, has been given by H.S. Sergew (see Bibl.).


MIDHANA [see MANARA].

MIDHATH PASHA (1822-84), Ottoman provincial governor, twice grand vizier, and father of the 1876 constitution. Midhat was born in Istanbul in 1230/October-November 1812, the son of Rusçuklu Hadži Ali Efendi-zade Hadži Häfiz Mehmed
Eshref Efendi. He was named Ahmed Sheftik. Having memorised the Kur'an at 10, he was then called Hafiz Sheftik. In 1833 he moved with his family to Vidin, where his father was an assistant judge. When his family returned to Istanbul the next year, he became an apprentice in the secretariat of the imperial divan. His talent earned him the name Midhat, which thereafter replaced his given names. In 1835-6 Midhat was in Loфa, where his father held another judicial post, before returning to Istanbul in 1836-7. Midhat had already begun to study Arabic; he now began Persian and attended courses at the Fatih mosque while again working in the secretariat. In 1840 he was transferred to the grand vizier’s office.

The bureaucratic career on which Midhat was now launched falls into four phases: 1840-61, increasingly responsible posts as staff member of commissions and councils and as special investigator; 1861-72, three provincial governorships; 1872-7, two grand vizierates and constitution-making; 1877-84, exile, two grand vizierates,triangle, exile and death. The second and third phases of his Midhat at the secretariat.

In 1842-4 Midhat held a secretarial post in Damascus. Thereafter he was secretary to one of the "commissions of improvement" sent out to the provinces in 1845-7, first in Konya, then Kaставумону, under Sаmi Bakir Pашa. During this period, he came on the payroll of the protocol office (madhaba adad) of the madjlis-i wilâyet-i ahkam-i "ulule, the influential Supreme Council of Judicial Ordinances, and remained in its employ to 1859, even while undertaking special assignments. In 1848 he married. He became chief clerk in the protocol office in 1851. For six months, probably in 1852, Midhat was in Damascus as commissioner to investigate a dispute between two pashas over the farm of customs revenues, and to look into alleged misconduct by Kibrисli Mehdjed Pашa, commander of the army of Arabia. Midhat settled the revenue question advantageously to the Treasury. He found misdeeds by Kibrисli Mehdjed in relation to the Druze that led to the commander’s removal from his post. When the Supreme Council’s paperwork was split in two, Midhat became second secretary of the Anatolian session.

During the Crimean War, in 1854-5, Midhat was sent as investigator to the Rumeli wilâyet. Kibrисli Mehdjed, now grand vizier, may have sent him thither to get his revenge by putting Midhat in a difficult situation. But Midhat, working out of Edirне, successfully curbed depredations by башы-безакs and brigands. On return to Istanbul, Midhat gave the new grand vizier Reхdi Pашa [q.e.] a memorandum containing his ideas on provincial reform. Again in 1855 Midhat was sent out, this time to Bursа on earthquake relief. In 1856-7, after successfully defending himself against a false charge of illegal participation in the farm of Istanbul fishmarkets, Midhat was despatched to investigate administration by the walis of Silistre and Vidin. His vigorous actions in those wilâyets led to dismissals of officials, whose friends in the palace got a new investigator appointed. Midhat, in protest, asked for leave, which was granted by the grand vizier 4Pашa. He then spent six months of 1858 in Paris, London, Brussels and Vienna, improving the French he had recently begun to study, and finally gaining some first-hand knowledge of western Europe. In September 1859 Midhat became chief secretary of the Supreme Council itself. While in this post he served on the commission to investigate the Kületi affair, an abortive conspiracy in Istanbul against Тanсимса [q.e.] westernisation.

Midhat entered on the second phase of his career when he was promoted to vizier and appointed walis of the wilâyet of Nish on 29 January 1861. During his three years in Nish, Midhat displayed the energy, the briskness, the secular-mindedness, the egalitarian attitude, the Ottoman patriotism and the honesty that caracterised his activity in all posts thereafter. His programme of action was also characteristic. He sought the cooperation of local notables of all creeds. He created a gendarmerie, curbed banditry, and tried also to curb nascent nationalism among the Bulgars. He deferred collection of some onerous taxes. He built barracks, in part by requiring several days of unpaid labour from peasants in the locality. He built schools, in part with convict labour. He started schools. Because of his success, the Porte joined the Prizren wilâyet to Nish for Midhat to administer. The success also led the grand vizier Fuгd и Pашa [q.e.] to bring Midhat back to Istanbul in 1864 to draft, with him, a new plan for provincial organisation. The wilâyet system, modelled somewhat on French practice, was embodied in a law promulgated on 8 November 1864. It was to be tested in one sizable wilâyet, named tuna (Danube), newly formed of the old wilâyet of Silistre, Vidin and Nish. Midhat was appointed its governor on 13 October 1864, even before the new system was official.

Midhat organised the seven sanjakсs and 46 kodis of the tuna wilâyet, including the local mevlevis, each containing some non-Muslims; at each administrative level [see BULGARIA]. He embarked on a public works programme, which in his three years produced 3,000 km. of roads and 1,400 bridges by his count; various public buildings, including schools, model farms with imported European machinery, industrial arts training schools for the poor and service on the Danube, and harbour works at the port of Rusчuk, the seat of wilâyet government. Tatar and Circassian refugees from Russia were successfully settled in the wilâyet, though not without some problems. A modest economic development was aided by such measures, as well as by the increased security which Midhat established through a gendarmerie and occasional use of regular troops. Midhat started a few small factories. He wore homespun clothes to boost local products. He measured with the longest lasting consequence was his creation of agricultural credit cooperatives, menэfi sanдiklари, to lend to peasants at low interest rates. Modern Turkey’s Ziraat Bankasi is a descendant. Midhat also created the first official provincial newspaper in the Empire, the Tuna, published in Turkish and Bulgarian and beginning on 10 Шаввâl 1201/8 March 1865; Ahmed Midhat [q.e.] soon became its editor. Midhat hoped to win the Bulgarians to Ottomanism through just administration and mixed schools, but the developing Bulgarian nationalism was barely blunted. Midhat dealt severely with rebels; in 1866 he repressed a premature Russian-financed Bulgarian revolutionary rising. On the whole, the wilâyet system had proved workable. In 1867 it was extended to most of the Empire, Midhat again being brought to Istanbul to consult on revising the regulations.

When in 1868 the Supreme Council was replaced by a Council of State (Шаръ-и Девлет) and a Judicial Council, Midhat was appointed, on 5 March, to head the former. Its function was to discuss and draft laws. Under Midhat it elaborated regulations on adoption of the metric system, on nationality, on mining and on a real estate credit bank for small employers. Friction arose between Midhat and the grand vizier 5Ali Pашa on both legislative and personal levels. The
result was Midhat’s transfer on 27 February 1869 out of his first high national office to the wild yetcy of Baghdad. He had already in the autumn of 1868 been sent back to Bulgaria by the sultan on an interim 20-day mission to subdue another rebellion.

In Irak, Midhat’s activity, although similar in many ways to that in Bulgaria, was circumscribed by the local tribalism. Midhat, however, was not only wild but also, extraordinarily, commander of the Sixth Army. He used military force when needed to subdue tribes, to collect taxes and to impose conscription. Success was partial. Midhat tried to induce tribes to settle. At least one shaikh exchanged that title for the new one, under the wilayet plan, of mutasarrif of a sanjak. Settling tribes was also part of Midhat’s process for bringing land under state control. He applied the Ottoman land code of 1858, furnishing tara deeds that gave freehold right to the cultivator; most such deeds, however, came into the possession of tribal shaikhs, city merchants or former tax-farmers rather than of ordinary tribesmen or peasants. The marshlands of southern Irak, and date-palm culture, became more prosperous with pacification and settlement. Ottoman control was even extended over Kuyayvat and, precariously, into al-Hasa and part of Najd.

Midhat organised the councils of the wilayet system, and appointed the provincial ministers. For Baghdad, Midhat named a good many Irakis to government offices. He tore down some of the old Baghdad walls to allow city expansion, introduced some paving and street lights, procured fire engines, started a water supply system, and built the only bridge the city possessed before the 20th century. He started wool and cotton mills and an army clothing factory. He established schools, including a military school and a craft training school for orphans, a savings bank, a hospital, and a tramway utilising horse cars to the Kazimayn suburb. He promoted regular steamer service on the Euphrates and shipping in the Gulf. The first newspaper in Irak, the official Zaora, in Turkish and Arabic, appeared on 16 June 1869 and semi-weekly thereafter. Midhat also eased relations with Iran concerning border tribes and currency circulation.

After Midhat’s resignation as justice minister, for Baghdad, Midhat vied with the new grand vizier, Mahmud Nedim Pasha, for control of the grand vizierate. On 9 March 1876, a “Manifesto of the Muslim Patriots”, probably by Midhat or his adviser Odian Efendi, went out to European statesmen and was circulated privately in Istanbul; it called for a constitutional government, an elected representative, consultative assembly.

As public discontent mounted in 1876, Midhat became convinced that the present assembly was not a majority of political change. He may have helped to spark demonstrations in Istanbul by sofis or religious students on 10 and 11 May which resulted in the dismissal of Mahmud Nedim and appointment of Medjdum Mehmed Rûhdû Pasha as grand vizier. On 19 May, Midhat was made minister without portfolio. Along with the minister of war Hüseyin Âwni Pasha and the military academy director Süleyman Pasha, Midhat plotted the deposition of the erratic and spendthrift Abd al-Âzîz. It was effected, bloodlessly, on 30 May, and Murad V received the oath of homage. Immediately, Midhat, who on 5 June again became president of the Council of State, began pressing for the elaboration of a constitution. Hüseyin Âwni and others opposed him. Serious impediments arose also from unsettling events: the suicide of the ex-sultan Abd al-Âzîz on 4 June; the murder by a Circassian officer of Hüseyin Âwni and the foreign minister Râcid at a meeting at Midhat’s house on 15 June, the expanding war against Serbia and Montenegro, and, above all, the nervous breakdown of Murad V, who was never girded. Despite discussions of a constitutional draft by ministers and a mejdî-i 4umâmî, progress was minimal. The ministers finally decided that Murad V would have to be replaced by his younger brother, Abd al-Hamid, and, on 27 August 1876, Abd al-Hamid took the oath of allegiance.

The new sultan was, however, slow to redeem his promise. On 8 October he approved a constitutional commission of leading Muslim and Christian officials, with Midhat as chairman. The commission considered many models and drafts, including one by Midhat himself. The draft submitted to Abd al-Hamid in late November incorporated Midhat’s proposal for a prime minister instead of a grand vizier. The sultan was enthusiastic, and his objections were supported by other ministers and officials, including Ahmed Dëwet [v.s.]. Finally, on 6 December 1876 the new sultan approved a revised draft by the commission, which enlarged the sultan’s powers and restored the office of grand vizier.
al-Hamîd accepted the constitution when a clause empowering the sultan to exile dangerous individuals was added. Mehmed Rûşhdû then resigned, the sultan appointed Midhat grand vizier on 19 December, and the constitution was ceremoniously promulgated on 23 December 1876.

Midhat hoped that the act of promulgation might induce the great-power conference on plans for restructuring Ottoman administration in the Balkans, then meeting in Istanbul, to agree that the new constitutional régime should do it instead. He wanted the powers not only to accept but also to guarantee the constitution, and sent Othân secretly to London to ask for support. But the powers treated the constitution as if it were a sham. The conference went ahead to propose drastic changes. Because the election process for the chamber of deputies was not nearly completed, Midhat convened on 18 January 1877 an unusually large medîls-i umumi, which with patriotic emotion rejected the Constantinople Conference scheme.

Midhat has been blamed for pursuing a hard line with the powers that eventuated in a Russian invasion in late April 1877. But Midhat sought further negotiation, not war; had he remained in office, he might have avoided war, but he was grand vizier for only 49 days. From the start he and Abd al-Hamîd were on a collision course. The sultan rejected proposals by Midhat; Midhat failed to carry out orders of the sultan, one of which was to send his constitutionalist friends Nâmîk Kêmîl [q.e.] and Diyâ out of the capital. Those two and others started recruiting a volunteer guard unit that worried the sultan. But basically, 1Abd al-Hamîd feared Midhat as one who had deposed two sultans and who might try it again. Further, Midhat conducted himself as if he were a prime minister answerable more to the nation than to the monarch. The sultan also was answerable to the nation, Midhat believed, and this view was incorporated in the famous letter of 30 January 1877 which Midhat is said to have written to the sultan, although its authenticity is debated. The sultan may even have believed charges that Midhat leaned to republicanism. Hence on 5 February, Midhat was abruptly dismissed and sent in exile to Brindisi on the imperial yacht.

Midhat visited Naples, Rome, Marseilles, Andalusia Paris, Plombières, London, Vienna and Scotland. He wrote memoranda to European statesmen, especially British ones, supporting the Ottoman cause in the Russian war of 1877-8. He collected funds for the relief of Muslim refugees from the Balkans. He courted European opinion with a pamphlet defending Ottoman reforms and attacking Russian subversion. Because Midhat was so popular in Europe, and because of British pressure, 1Abd al-Hamîd allowed his return to forced residence. Midhat arrived in Crete on 26 September 1878, going to live with his family in Halepa, outside Hanya (Canea).

In his nearly two years as governor of the Syrian wilâyet [see Dimashk], Midhat acted much as in Tuna and Baghêdad. He started schools, including a vocational school, built roads, built a tramway from Tripoli to its port, created a stronger gendarmerie and appointed some Christians to it, appointed some Syrians to the bureaucracy, founded a theatre and a public library, etc. He was less successful in setting tribes and quieting rebellions. With the Druze, he achieved a standoff; he made the Djabal Durûz into a new kada, with its own Druze kâmaks. Midhat felt that he needed authority over the military and the courts, as well as over the bureaucracy and finance, to be effective. But his requests for broader powers and approval of extensive reforms were refused by the sultan. Twice Midhat resigned, on 23 October 1879 and 30 May 1880, but the sultan refused consent.

1Abd al-Hamîd was, however, receiving zurnâls from informers stating that Midhat sought to be ruler or khedive in an autonomous Syria and was currying local favour to that end. Midhat in fact opposed any Arab or Syrian separation, but he may have counthey his anti-Ottoman position and persuaded 1Abd al-Hamîd that he needed broader powers. The sultan evidently decided that Midhat might be a danger in Damascus, and so ordered his transfer to İzmir on 4 August 1880. Midhat left Syria on 31 August, and again was not allowed a visit to Istanbul.

Midhat's governorship of İzmir lasted less than a year. It was unremarkable, except for warnings which he received from friends in Istanbul that he might be charged with complicity in the alleged murder of the ex-sultan 1Abd al-âzîz. Midhat declined, however, to flee to Europe. At about 2 a.m. on 17 May 1881, troops entered his house to arrest him. Midhat escaped through a garden gate to the French consulate. The next day, the Paris government refused asylum, and Midhat agreed to arrest provided that his trial were public, and such an assurance was given. Midhat was taken by ship to Istanbul and interrogated on board by Dewdat Pasha, the justice minister, who willingly undertook this mission to apprehend his opponent. Midhat was confined in the Malta Kiosk in the Yıldız Palace grounds.

The Yıldız trial, though semi-public, was a travesty of justice. The case against Midhat and nine others was built on weak testimony, presumably obtained through torture, bribery and sycopancy. The trial of the ten began on 27 June 1881. On 28 June, all of them, including Midhat were found guilty. On 29 June, Midhat and seven others were sentenced to death. An appeals court, obviously under Palace influence, reversed the sentenced. But widespread Ottoman and European opinion urged leniency, as did a minority of a special medîls convened for review. 1Abd al-Hamîd thereupon converted Midhat's sentence to life banishment. On 28 July 1881 Midhat and others were hustled aboard the yacht 1Izz ad-Dîn without even a change of clothing, transported to Djidda, and thence to imprisonment in a fort in al-Djâbâl. There, Midhat suffered increasingly harsh treatment, and in the early hours of 8 May 1884, he was strangled by soldiers, evidently acting on 1Abd al-Hamîd's orders. His death was reported as due to a carbuncle and other abscesses. He left two widows, three daughters and a son, 1Ali Haydar. In 1951 his bones were repatriated to Turkey.

Midhat Pasha had proved to be one of the ablest Ottoman administrators of the 19th century. His energy and creativity were most effective in provincial governorships where he had wide authority, although some of his measures were obviously hastily and some were superficial. His forthrightness and arrogance hampered him as grand vizier, especially in dealings with the palace. For his day, he was a liberal; he shared many views with the Yeffî 1Oğmânîlar or Young Turks, especially on the desirability of a parliament. Without Midhat, the constitution of 1876 would not have come into existence. Although ambitious for himself, Midhat fundamentally acted on
his belief that the task of a government official was to serve the people and the fatherland.
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**MIDILLI** (Turkish form of Muradiye, Mystilene, the Greek name of its capital), the island of Lesbos in the eastern Aegean alongside the Turkish coast near the entrance to the Gulf of Eredrim [q.v.] and the town of Ayvalık (Aywâlk [q.v.]); the straits of Mystilene and Mystilene that separate it from Turkey on the north and east average 10 and 16 km in width. With an area of 1614 km², Lesbos is the third largest Greek island after Crete and Euboea, and the seventh largest of the Mediterranean. It has a roughly triangular shape, its broad base, ca. 70 km long, running from east-south-east to west-north-west, while the line from its apex in the north to the middle of this base measures 47 km. The relatively straight lines of its coast are interrupted by two gulfs on the south and south-east, that of Kallonis (also known by its classical name of Pyrrha), 21 km long, and that of Yeras, 14 km long. The island is earthquake-prone; it contains many springs, some hot with beneficial mineral content; several of the latter have been valued since antiquity. The dense oak and pine forests that once grew on Lesbos had dwindled to scattered remnants already in Hellenistic times. Classical Lesbos was famous for its ideal climate and fertile soil; these assets, combined with an advantageous position near strategic commercial and maritime routes and an enterprising population, led to a remarkable prosperity and to political and cultural achievements (for the island's long and rich classical history, see Pauly-Wissowa, xii, 1925, 2107-33, s.v.; *Der Kleine Pauly-Wissowa*, iii, 1969, 583-87, s.v.; *A. Philippsen, Die Griechischen Landschaften*, iv, 1959, 233-44, I.D. Kontes, *Lesbos kai he Mikrasiatike tes perihsis*, Athens 1978) The principal city and port of Lesbos, Mytilene (a name of probably pre-Greek origin), first developed on an islet connected with the island's eastern coast by a possibly man-made isthmus. The city spread to this connecting neck and eventually also to the adjacent coast (see the engraving facing p. 390 of J. Pitton de Tournefort, *Relation d'un voyage du Levant*, 1, Amsterdam 1718). In the Middle Ages, Lesbos came to be known by the name of its capital as the island of Mytilene or, through a metathesis, Meliten; this sometimes caused its confusion with the island of Malta or Melita (as shown by the association of the legend about St. Paul and the island among the Aegean on either of al-Idrisi's maps. In the other hand, St. Paul's letters [21:8-20; 22:1-21; 27:1-24] raied the island as part of his mission to the eastern Aegean alongside the Turkish coast.
MIDILLI

of his forays throughout the Aegean all the way to the Propontis (the Sea of Marmara, Marmara Denizi [q.v.]) to the point of making the inhabitants of Erexis (legendary home of the poetess Sappho) abandon their city and move to Mount Athos (A.A. Vasilev, Vizantija i Arabi, St. Petersburg 1910, ii, 46-7; French tr. Byzance et les Arabes, Brussels 1968, ii/1, 53).

Lesbos came under Muslim rule for the first time in or soon after 1089 and remained so until 1093 as part of the brilliant but short-lived successes of the Turkish amir Caka (reconstructed from the Greek Tzaschos), who founded the earliest Turkish maritime power from his base at Izmir. This Turkish threat was the principal cause of a renaissance of the Byzantine navy, rebuilt by Alexis I Comnenos; Caka himself, however, fell victim to Byzantine diplomacy that convinced his assassination in league with the emperor’s relative, the Saljuk sultan Khayr al-Din, in 1093 (H. Ahweler, Byzance et la mer, Paris 1966, 184-9; S. Vryonis, The decline of medieval Hellenism in Asia Minor, Berkeley 1971, 115; A.N. Kurat, Caka, Istanbul 1936).

By the time that the Aydin bag Umur (1334-48; see P. Lemerie, L’empire d’Aydin, Paris 1957; I. Melikoff-Sayar, LeDestan d’Umut Pacha, Paris 1954; and soyulmogultu) repeated and surpassed Caka’s exploits (without, however, occupying Lesbos), the growth of Turkish and Latin power in the area made Byzantine hold on the island, among other places, precarious. Thus in 1355 the emperor John V Paleologus gave Lesbos, his sister Mary’s dowry, in an act of gratitude and as a practical solution, to his brother-in-law, the Genoese Francesco Gattilusio. This family then ruled Lesbos until its conquest by the Ottomans in 1462 (W. Miller, Essays on the Latin Orient, Cambridge 1921, 313-53, ch. “The Gattilusio of Lesbos”; W. Heyd, Histoire du commerce du Levant, Leipzig 1885, i, 510-12; E. Armao, Il giro per il Mar Egeo con Vincenzo Cornellesi, Florence 1951, 110-11). The rule of the Gattilusios was characterized by the pragmatic, commerce-minded goals of Latin, mainly Italian, possessions in the Aegean. When Timur [q.v.] occupied Izmir in 1403, the Gattilusios hastened, like the Genoese company of the Mahone on Chios, to send presents and proclaim their loyalty. On the other hand, these Catholic overlords do not seem to have been fully accepted by the mainly Greek Orthodox population, a circumstance that may have facilitated the gradual spread of the Turkish dominance.

After the conquest of Constantinople by Mehmed II, Dorino Gattilusio (1426-55) managed to conserve his possession by means of a tribute of 3,000 ducats (a sum raised at the accession of Dorino’s son Domenico in 1455 to 7,000 ducats). In 1458 Domenico was imprisoned and subsequently murdered by his brother Niccolo. This, as well as irritation at the refuge which both Domenico and Niccolo gave to Catalan corsairs, is often cited as the cause of Mehmed’s displeasure and eventual conquest, but a more decisive factor may have been the island’s economic and strategic importance. Thus in the context of the conquest of 1462, a Turkish fleet under Mahmut Pasha [q.v.] anchored off Mytilene, while the sultan set up camp on the mainland near Aywali. Niccolo refused to surrender, but did so after a siege of three weeks. The richer inhabitants were then moved to Istanbul, a number of boys and girls were encouraged to settle in the island (Miller, op. cit.; F. Babinger, Mehemd el Conqueror and his time, Princeton 1978, 210-12, and passim; Aşiklî, Vakif ve Hâkim, ed. Nature, Kalenderhane, Istanbul 1976, 162, lists representatives (mostly vice-consuls acting for their consulates at Izmir) of Great Britain, Austria-Hungary, the United States, Sweden-Norway, Belgium, Greece, Holland, Iran, Spain, France, Italy and Germany. Their presence was due both to the economic importance of the island and to its position on crucial shipping routes. The port of
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Mytilene, the busiest of the archipelago, consisted, as in antiquity, of two harbours separated by the isthmus, a northern and a southern one; the northern harbour, protected by a bay, was the principal one. In 1305/March 1889-Febr. 1890 3,462 ships called there (V. Cuinet, *La Turquie d’Aire* Paris 1894, i, 469). The ratio of the Greek to the Turkish population on the island was about 4 : 1, the sănâname, no. 10 for 1310/March 1894-Febr. 1895, 241, lists 98,882 Ottoman subjects besides a small number of foreigners; of the Ottoman ones, 85,328 were Greek Orthodox and 13,524 were Muslims. In the capital itself, the Turks were, according to Newton, “a decaying and decreasing population” (i, 57); there were, according to him, no very rich Turks except for the Pağha and his son, for the wealthy Lesbots were the rich landowners of the Greek bourgeoisie. Other sources mention also Greek merchants and bankers. The island’s principal source of wealth and article of export were, throughout its history, olives and olive oil, although the fertility of its soil could have yielded an abundance of cereals as well; olive growing was favoured, according to Pococke, because it required little labour, which in turn could be done by women and children, and grain had thus to be imported. Nevertheless, the cultivation of wheat, famous in antiquity, again expanded in the final decades of the Ottoman period in view of the increasing demand for the Mediterranean. Equally favoured, but of more difficult access, was the gulf of Kalloni. The harbours of Mytilene, a Greek one with 97 students and a Turkish one with 40 students, with the fragrance of its Mediterranean vegetation, and the climate was salubrious. The only serious ailment was tuberculosis, chiefly limited to the wives, sequestered in their women’s quarters, of the more opulent Greek and Turkish inhabitants (Cuinet, i, 451).

In the final decades of the Ottoman period, the vålet of Dziçazâr-i Bahri-i Safid (which had by then lost any connection with the office of the commander of the Ottoman navy) consisted of four sandşaks: Rodos ([q.e.], Chiós (Sakiz [q.e.]), Lesbos and Lennos (Limmîn [q.e.]). That of Lesbos was divided into four kadâ’s: of Midilli, Molyvo (Methymna), Pîlmar (Plomari) and Yunda; the last-named, known in Greek as Monoektos or Kekatonesía, consisted of a group of small islets dominated by the larger Alibay Adası facing Ayvalik; this kadâ was the only part of the sandşak that remained Turkish at the conclusion of the Balkan War. The title of the sandşak’s governor was mutasarrîf, while the kadâ’s were administered by kaymakâmâns, and the nahiyes by müdîrs. Lists of government officials in the sănânames show that majority were Turks, but that Greeks also participated in the administration.

Ottoman rule on Lesbos ended in December 1912, when a Greek fleet landed troops on the island and took control of it (Ali Haydar Emir [Alpagur], *Balkan harbinde Türk filosu*, Istanbul 1932, 249-53). Greek annexation was ratified by the London Conference in May 1913. The Turkish inhabitants left Lesbos as part of the population exchange between the two countries in the 1920s.

MIDRAR (Banu) or MIDRARIDS, minor Berber dynasty which was established in Sidjilmâs(a) [q.v.] and which enjoyed relative independence until its final absorption in 366/976-7. The history of this dynasty can be briefly outlined, thanks to al-Bakrî [q.v.], who lived in the 5th/11th century and thus possessed quite recent information in order to write the chapter that he devotes to it (Mughrib, 148 ff., Fr. tr. 282 ff.), before Ibn Idhârî (7th-8th/13th-14th century [q.v.]). Ibn Khaldûn (8th/14th century [q.v.]) and several historians of the Maghrib and Maqrîzî were able to take their turn at tackling this; but a number of important episodes of this period were recorded in the works of the kâdî al-Nu'mân [q.v.] available today, in particular the Ittihâd al-da'wâ wa 'l-musayyarár, sometimes also in the Autobiography of the chamberlain Djâfar b. 'Abbâs [see Bibl.], although the latter sources, contemporaneous with the events which they relate, express the often biased point of view of the Fatimids.

From the start, it is difficult to date the birth of the dynasty which, despite appearances, does not seem to coincide with the foundation of Sidjilmâs, itself not well established. One tradition links the foundation with a member of the tribe of Mikhânâ [q.v.], Abu 'l-Kâsim Samghû/Samghûn (i.e. Samgû or Samgûn) b. Wâsâl al-Mikhânî, who had adopted the doctrine of the Sufî [q.v.] Khârijî; this man is said to have gathered hadîth, in Ifrîkiya, from 'Ikrima [q.v.], the famous nauâlî of Ibn 'Abbâs, whom legend depicts as the propagator of Khârijism in the Maghrib, a region where he probably never set foot. The Samghû/Samgûn in question, who, it is said, pastured his flocks on the site of the future town of Sidjilmâs, gathered around him some Sufis, and, as soon as the group numbered 40, set out, in 140757-8, to build houses; the small community surprisingly chose as its chief a negro by the name of 'Isâ b. Mazyad (rather than Yazîd) al-Aswâd, whose father had been converted to Islam, but his conduct so offended those he governed that they tied him to a tree and left him to die in 155772; he had reigned 15 years (al-Bakrî, 148/286; Berbères, i, 261). According to the sources, his successor was the first-mentioned personage, Abu 'l-Kâsim Samghû/Samghûn, who reigned 147778-83. This tradition, which traces back the foundation of the town and, consequently, of the dynasty, if not of the family, to 140757-8, is preferred by our first informant, al-Bakrî (149/284); Ibn Idhârî (i, 157) and Ibn Khaldûn (Berbères, i, 261) only know of it, while the Mášâbír al-Barbar [q.v.] (48) reports on the authority of 'Arîb b. Sa'd [q.v.] that Abu 'l-Kâsim Samghû ruled over Sidjilmâs, founded in 140 by his grandfather (sic) 'Isâ b. Yazîd. Al-Bakrî reproduces in any case a second tradition, according to which a smith from Cordova called Midrâr, who had taken part in the Revolt of the suburb (in 202/818 [see KURTUBA]) and was consequently a Rabâdi, was able to escape and came to settle near the market whose site was to be occupied by the capital of the Midrarîs; while suggesting that the first of the two accounts is "more in conformity with the truth", this author nevertheless asserts (149/285) that the rulers of Sidjilmâs are descendants of the smith Midrâr, since "they were subjected to satirical insults on this subject." The Ittihâd (204), for its part, draws on the two traditions, which it moreover mixes; it calls Midrâr b. 'Abd Allah the alleged disciple of 'Ikrima, and says that the Midrâr who escaped from Cordova was black, a fact which earned for his descendants gibes or epigrams. As for E. Lévi-Provençal, he admits the Cordovan origin of the founder of Sidjilmâs (Hist. Esp. mus., i, 170, n. 1).

This latter tradition, which appears seductive in the form in which it is presented by al-Bakrî, does not, however, pose the problem of chronology which is imposed, for the impression is given that the town existed as early as the end of the 2nd/8th century. In fact, after 168784-5, al-Bakrî (150/286) and Ibn Khâlidun (i, 262) have a son of Samghû/Samgûn mentioned as reigning by the name of Abu 'l-Wazîr al-Yâsî b. Abî 'l-Kâsim, who was dethroned in 174790-1 (the date of 170 mentioned by Ibn Idhârî is to be corrected) by his brother Abu 'l-Muntasîr (sometimes called Abî 'l-Manṣûr, but probably wrongly) al-Yâsî, who remained on the throne until his death in 208823-4. This long reign was to be quite brilliant and beneficial, for al-Yâsî, who is said to have been of a particularly violent and despotic character, subjugated all the Berbers of the region who resisted him, levied the fifth on the mines of Darâ [q.v.] and had built in 199814-15 (al-Bakrî, 148/282-3); Jacques-Meunîé, i, 201) the town wall with 12 gates in it, of which eight were covered in iron so that the enemy could not set fire to them. It is stated that this wall, the lower part in stone and the upper in unfired brick (Ibn 'Idhârî, i, 157), was undertaken entirely at his own expense, and that the work force cost him 1,000 measures of grain (al-dâm) a day. He also adorned the town with a certain number of palaces and public buildings, notably the Friday mosque (al-Bakrî, 148/283; Berbères, i, 262; Jacques-Meunîé, i, 201).

Given, on the one hand, that the total duration of the dynasty is reckoned at 160 years (al-Bakrî, 149/284; Ibn Idhârî, i, 157; Ibn al-Abbar, Hulla, i, 191-2) and that, on the other hand, disregarding the Rabâdî mentioned above, the first Midrâr cited is the son of al-Yâsî, al-Muntasîr, who ascended the throne in 208823-4 (al-Bakrî, 150/286; Berbères, i, 262), it is perhaps from this year that we have to date the birth of the Middâerd line, in spite of the fact that, in general, the eponym of dynasties may be the father of the first of their members, that Ibn Idhârî (i, 157) clearly states that it came to an end in 296 after approximately 160 years of rule, that Ibn Khâlidun (i, 260) goes so far as to mention the name of Banû Wâsâl, which would also take it back to the year 140, and that G.-S. Colin, in the article Sidjilmâs in Ep. makes "the Mikhânî dynasty of the Banû Midrâr" begin in 155771-2, i.e. with the immediate successor of the first ruler of the town, which is in conformity with al-Bakrî’s opinion and calculation, but completely disregards the figure of 160 years and the absence of a person called Midrâr before 208823-4. For this reason, we will begin arbitrarily with:

I. Abu Mâlik al-Muntasîr b. al-Yâsî, whose surname Mîdâr (— one who produces much milk or pours forth abundant rain, etc.), which had no doubt been given him as a title of good omen, served to designate the ruling family whom al-Mas’dî (Marûq, iv, 39 = § 1367) further named as the Banû 'l-Muntasîr, which justifies the decision taken. This author estimates the extent of the amîr’s dominions—one would wish to know on what basis— at 400 farâbghâs by 20 (400 farâbghâs by 20), and makes one Ahmad b. al-Muntasîr the ruler of the land of Astûlâ (?) which measured, according to him, 400 farâbghâs by 250. According to Ibn Khurraḍî (ed. and Fr. tr. M. Hadji-Sadok, 9), the territory of the Banû Midrâr included the Darâ, where a silver mine was located, and the town of Ziz, i.e. it probably extended present-day Tafillaût.

Midrâr, a nominal vassal of the 'Abbâsids (in
Tentative genealogy of the Midrarids

(1) Samqu b. Wasul (d. 168/784-5)

(2) Abū '1-WazIr (regn. 168-74/784-90)

(3) Abū '1-Muntasir al-Yasa' (d. 208/283-4)

(i) MIDRAR (d. 253/867)

(ii) Ibn Thakiyya Ibn al-Rustumiyya (d. 263/876-7)

(iii) Muhammad (d. 270/882)

(iv) al-Yasa' (d. 296/909)

(v) Wāsūl (d. 300/913)

(vi) Ahmad (d. 309/921)

(vii) al-Mu'tazz (d. 321/933-4)

(viii) Abū '1-Muntasir (d. 331/942-3)

(ix) Abū Muhammad (or 'Abd Allah) (d. 366/976-7)

(x) Ibn Wāsūl (regn. 331-47/942-58)

(i) MIDRAR (d. 253/867)

(ii) Ibn Thakiyya Ibn al-Rustumiyya (d. 263/876-7)

(iii) Muhammad (d. 270/882)

(iv) al-Yasa' (d. 296/909)

(v) Wāsūl (d. 300/913)

(vi) Ahmad (d. 309/921)

(vii) al-Mu'tazz (d. 321/933-4)

(viii) Abū '1-Muntasir (d. 331/942-3)

(ix) Abū Muhammad (or 'Abd Allah) (d. 366/976-7)

(x) Ibn Wāsūl (regn. 331-47/942-58)

whose name the kharit had been pronounced, at least in the time of the caliphs al-Mansur and al-Mahdi, i.e. from 140 to 169/758-85, if we are to believe Ibn Khaldûn, i, 262) may have acknowledged a certain dependence on Cordova, but no doubt one much less strict, as E. Lévy-Provençal says (Hist. Esp. Mus., i, 281-2), than that of the Rustamids of Tâhârt [q.v.], with whom he had moreover some affinities, since, like them, he was a Khâridjite; he had even married Arwa bint Abd al-Rahman b. Rustam (al-Bakn, 150/287; Berbères, i, 262; G. Marçais, 103-4; Jacques-Meunie, ii, 201). It so happens that his reign was troubled by the rivalry of his two sons, both of them with the first name of Maymûn, born to him by the Rustumiyya and another woman by the name of Thakiyya (?) Bakiyya in Ibn 'Idhârî, i, 157). After having ended three years of dispute, Midrâr, who was inclined to favour the former, banished the latter, but was himself dispossessed by the son to whom he had given preference. The population of the town then rebelled, offered the throne to the son of Thakiyya, who refused it and gave it to Midrâr, who made the mistake of appearing firm in his intention to entrust it to Maymûn Ibn al-Rustumiyya. This time, the inhabitants of Sidjilmasa besieged their sovereign in his palace and gave their allegiance as chief to ii. Maymûn b. Thakiyya, called al-Amîr. The deposed dynast died in 253/867, while his son ruled until his death, in 263/876-7, and was succeeded by iii. his son MUHAMMAD, who died in Safar 270/August-September 884 (al-Bakrî, 150/287; Berbères, i, 263; cf. Ibn 'Idhârî, who does not follow exactly the same order).

It was not long before the principality of Sidjilmâsa, whose tranquility until then appears to have been disturbed only by some purely internal dissensions, entered into the general history of the Maghrib and Islam, at the same time losing the autonomy that it had preserved vis-à-vis the Aghlabids [q.v.] of Kairwân and the 'Abbasids of Baghdâd, of whom the Midrarids were still nominal vassals, as is proved by the letter sent, at the time when the Mahdi 'Abd Allah was being sought after, most likely not by al-Mu'tadid (279-89/892-902), as is stated by Ibn Khaldûn (Mukaddima, i, 30; Fr. tr. de Slane, i, 40-1) and the author of the Istibâr (204), but more probably by his successor al-Mukarrif (289-95/902-8), to the following anîr, iv. al-Yasa' (sometimes erroneously: 'Tsâ) b. al-Muntasîr (or b. Midrar), son of the no. 1 above, who occupied the throne from 270 to 296/882-909.

In fact, on 1 Shawwâl 292/July 905 (see Autobiography, 297), following a prediction according to which the awaited Mahdi [q.v.] is to appear in Sidjilmâsa, the future founder of the Fâtimid dynasty, al-Mahdi 'Abd Allâh [q.v.] set out in the direction of this small capital with his young son al-Kâsim (Istibâr, 204; Berbères, i, 263; Terrasse, i, 140; Jacques-Meunie, ii, 202). He rented a house there, the Dâr Abî Habashâ (Autobiography, 302), succeeded in concealing his identity for almost four years and received good treatment from al-Yasa' b. al-Muntasîr, possibly owing to the presents that he had given him. Besides, he had no doubt been able to make friends among the flourishing 'Irâkî colony resident in the town (cf. Dachroui, Califat, 122, 311). The circumstances in which his true identity was revealed are differently reported by the sources. According to the Autobiography of Dja'far b. Abî (303-4), his son miraculously caused a spring to gush forth in a garden next to his house, and the secret was thus divulged. According to the Istibâr (204), however, he had been
denounced by a Jew, while Dachraoui (Califat, 123) asserts that al-Yasa‘i was informed of his presence by a letter from Ziyādat Allāh [see MULQABIDS]. According to Ibn Khaldūn (Mukaddamā, i, 30, 35-4; Fr. tr. de Slane, i, 40-1, 45), the letter from Baghīdād mentioned above was addressed to the Aghlabids of Kayrawān and the Midrārids of Sidjīlmāsa ordering them to close their land to ‘Ubayd Allāh and his son (whose genealogy, in the opinion of Ibn Khaldūn, was by this act recognised as authentic); al-Yasa‘i then discovered the truth and had the two fugitives imprisoned. Whatever the facts of the matter, at one time or another, the Midrārid put ‘Ubayd Allāh, if not in prison, (Istībār, 202), at least under house arrest in his sister’s house and separated him from his son, with whom he could, however, communicate through an intermediary, a young eunuch originally from Aleppo called Sandal, whom he had bought locally (Autobiogr., 307 and n. 3). Acting through a Shi‘i from Kayrawān in whose company he had travelled (Autobiogr., 305) and who had been authorised to return to Kayrawān, he was able to inform of his situation the dā‘ī Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Shī‘i, who had just seized Rakkāda [q.e.] (Istībār, 262). This dā‘ī was eager to recruit supporters, hence set out for the West, subdued on his way the Rustamids of Tāhurt and arrived before Sidjīlmāsa on 6 Dhū ’l-Hijjah 298/August-September 910 the end of the reign of al-Yasa‘i, i.e. there is a difference of a whole year from the date given by the contemporary Shi‘i sources, which is perhaps more reliable; for him (150/288) and for Ibn Khaldūn (i, 263), it was in Rābi‘i 1 298/November-December 910 that the rebellious population put on the throne

vi. WĀṢĪL, i.e. al-Fāṭih in Ibn ‘Idhārī, i, 206), son of (ii) Maymūn al-‘Amr, who died in Rabī‘a 300/February-March 913 and was succeeded by his brother

vii. AḤMAD, killed in Muharram 309/May-June 921, by the governor of Tāhurt on behalf of the Mahdi, Masāla b. Ḥabīb, who came to besiege Sidjīlmāsa, seized it and installed on the throne a Midrārid prince who was totally devoted to his cause, 

vi. ‘AL-MUṢṬAṢẓ, Muhammad b. Sā‘ūr (?) b. Midrād (al-Bakrī, 151/288; Berbères, i, 264; Ibn ‘Idhārī, i, 179, 183; Dachraoui, Califat, 151). On his death (321/933-4), his son

viii. Abū ‘UṣMIṬAṢ (al-Maṣrīn in Ibn ‘Idhārī, i, 206) Muhammad succeeded him and spent the rest of his life in power; he died in 331/942-3 (cf. Berbères, i, 264) and his sons

ix. Abū ‘UṣMĀṬ b. (ii) Sāmũ g. (viii) Muhammad, who was only 13 years old, took his place, but entrusted state affairs to his grandmother, who administered the state for only two months, for a son of (v) Wāṣīl, 

x. MUḥAMMAD b. (v) al-Fāṭīm Wāṣūl (ii) Maymūn al-‘Amr, seized power by force and put the incumbent ruler in prison (MadāṣÌ, 389).

The new master of Sidjīlmāsa had apparently developed fairly close ties with the Umayyads of Cordova, since he was present in the midst of their troops on 11 Shawwāl 327/1 August 939 at the Battle of Simancas (Lévi-Provençal, Hist. Esp. mus., ii, 58). Thus it is not astonishing that he had repudiated the Sufi Khārījīs to which his ancestors adhered, so as to be converted to the Mālik Sunnism in force in al-Andalus (al-Bakrī, 151/288). This decision was bound to disappoint his Fātimid suzerain, who endured the Khārījīs for circumstances and possibly also accepted, however dubious this may be, that the kubba should be pronounced in the name of the ‘Abbasids (Berbères, i, 264), but was unable to award a more or less declared allegiance to the Umayyad régime. It is said that he was nevertheless able to govern his principality and to exercise justice there; however, from the testimony of Ibn Hawkal (83/ Fr. tr. 79), who was present in Sidjīlmāsa in 340/951 and had some dealings with him, “while he called for war [...], he was unable to obtain from the Berbers what he wanted, because those whom he invited to join him on campaign were disinclined to do so, fearing a trick to harm them". There is no mention of whether it was the Fātimids against whom he was directing his attack, but it is known that the rulers of Ifrīkiya grew very angry in 342/953-4, when he had the audacity to proclaim himself caliph, take the title of Amīr al-Muṣṭaṣ, the Ahwāz and the ruling name of al-Shākir li-l-lah (Berbères, i, 264; Jacques-Meunier, i, 203) and to mint coins (the madhākh shākiriyah cited by Ibn Ḥazm, Nāṣr al-sā‘ūr, 76; see Colín, in Hespéris [1936], 122; Brēthes, 96, no. 773; Jacques-Meunier, i, 226). The Fātimid Caliph al-Muṣṭaṣ li-din Allāh, unable to bear such a mark of insubordination, ordered the general Dāwwar [q.e.] to go and force the recalcitrant prince to see reason. According to the Shi‘i tradition (MadāṣÌ, 338), Dāwwar, on arriving near Sidjīlmāsa,
wrote to the population asking them to surrender Ibn Wâsûl, but they refused. This attitude did nothing to relieve the anxiety of the amîr, who hastened to leave the town with his family, his treasures and supporters to go to seek refuge in the neighbouring fortress of Tastegeldt (?). Dîwâr then entered the Midrârîd's capital, where he had coined money to replace the mablûkût shâ’âriyya (Dachraoui, Califat, 232, 344). Ibn Wâsûl, having left his refuge to find out what was happening in the town, was recognised by some members of the Maghâra [q.v.] tribe, who gave him up to Dîwâr (on these events, see al-Bakrî, 151/289; Berbîrî, i, 264; Jacques-Meunier, i, 203). Contrary to what is said in the text, gjawhâr, Ibn Wâsûl was not put to death, but made a prisoner (Mafdkhir al-Barbar, 4) and brought to al-Mansûrîyya, together with the amîr of Fâs, Aḥmad b. Bakrî, captured in the same period, and some sons of notable of Sidjelmasa (Magdâlîs, 483) taken as hostages. The attack on the town and the capture of Ibn Wâsûl took place in Rajab, 193/September-October, 358 (al-Bakrî, 151/289). The arrival at al-Mansûrîyya is dated by the kâdid al-Nu’âmân (Magdâlîs, 458) to the end of Sha’âban [348?] /November 959, but the dates mentioned by this author do not always appear to be exact. In any case, we are quite well informed on the prisoner's stay with the Fatimid caliph, on his internment in a part of the castle (mâkîf al-kâbî), on the ignominious treatment that he experienced when he was taken around in a cage, and also on the kâdit's attempts to convert him, as well as on the tenor of the conversations that took place between al-Mu’tizz and Ibn Wâsûl (see Magdâlîs, 411-12, 434-5, 458, 460; Ibn ‘Idhârî, i, 222; Berbîrî, i, 263; Ibn al-Âthlr, vi, 354; Dachraoui, Captivité).

Before leaving Sidjelmasa, Dîwâr had appointed a governor there, but the population were not slow to rebel again and to restore to the throne ix (for the second time). Al-Muntasir b. lâlîh b. (viii) Muhammad b. (vii) al-Mu’tazz, whose father and grandfather had not been appointed by the Fâtimid caliph, as al-Nu’âmân (Magdâlîs, 388) claims, but put in power by Maśâla (see above). According to the same author (Magdâlîs, 389-93), the population, who had killed the governor imposed by Dîwâr, made their excuses to al-Mu’tizz, but he did not accept them at all and summoned al-Muntasir, who made his way to him with 200 men. After a severe reprimand, the caliph nevertheless sent him to govern his town. In 352/963, al-Muntsar was dethroned and, according to Ibn Hawkâl (107/194), put to death, with the help of a group of twelve men, by his brother xi. Aḥî Muhammad ˚Ard Allâh (?) b. (viii) Muhammad b. (vii) al-Mu’tâzz, who recognised the suzerainty of the Fâtitmid caliph. This situation lasted until the year 366/976-7, when the chief of the Maghrâwâ, Khazru’un b. Falêfûl [see Maghrâwâ], who fought on behalf of Cordova, put an end to the dynasty of the Banû Midrâr, the last prince still in power fell on the battlefield, and his head was sent to Cordova (Berbîrî, i, 264-5; Terrasse, i, 169; Jacques-Meunier, i, 206). Lêvi Provincial (Histo. Egl. mus., ii, 261), this place is event in 369/980, which corresponds to the total of 160 years proposed by al-Bakrî for the duration of the dynasty.

The descendants of Khazru’un were to be put under the suzerainty of Cordova, to remain then at the head of an independent principality in Arcos [see Arakbî] until its annexion by Sevilla.

We have seen that one observer interested in the social and economic situation of the land through which he travelled, Ibn Hawkâl, was in 340/951 in Sidjelmasa, and it is probable that he kept in touch with the course of events that then took place. He states (99-100/98; cf. Jacques-Meunier, i, 203) that in the period when (vii) al-Mu’tazz reigned over the principality, he "leased caravans to the country of the Blacks, as well as the tithe, the land tax and some ancient taxes on the sale and purchase of camels, sheep, cattle, in addition to duties on all merchandise being exported to or imported from Ifrikia, Fâs, Spain, Sûs and Aghmâ, and finally other revenues dependent on the administration of the estate. All this amounted to about 40,000 dinars for the capital and the province". According to this author, the revenue from the town and its province, an area of five days' journey by three, was equal to half of that of the whole Maghrib, and one can understand the interest that the great powers of the period took in the principality. The importance that Ibn Hawkâl attributes to the town itself is further reflected by the fact that he calculates the distances from it to other places (91-3-92). He poses very favourable judgment on the inhabitants, upon whose commercial activity and wealth he remarks (99-100/97-8), and he is astonished to see "a recognition of debt by which a merchant of Awdaghust admitted himself in debt to an inhabitant of Sidjelmasa for a sum of 42,000 dinars" (cf. 61/58, where this observation is already mentioned). Reckoning on this sum, he would weigh 170,520 kg (Jacques-Meunier, i, 224). One can deduce from the comments of Ibn Hawkâl that Sidjelmasa was, under the Midrâris, the most important caravan centre on the route passing round the desert through the West; the ruler of Egypt, Ibn Tulûn (249/649-863/957 [q.v.]) having forbidden caravans and single travellers to follow the routes which led directly to the western Sudan, the eastern merchants passed by Sidjelmasa, which also benefited from the advantages of eastern and western civilisation, without however leaving behind, at least in this period, the recollection of a really intense cultural activity.

which was directed against the Arab governor of the Maghrib, Umar b. Hafs. Among the Berber groups taking part in this revolt, one of the most important was that of Abū Kūra al-Ḥarrānī, at the head of 40,000 Sufris belonging, for the most part, to the Zanātī tribe of the Banū Ḥarrān. The last-named inhabited the western part of Algeria. Originating from the same region were the 6,000 Ibadīs commanded by 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Rustam of Tāhert (Ṭieret) who were among the groups fighting Umar b. Hafs. Also belonging to these troops were Al-Mawār b. Hānī, another Ibadī chieftain with a force of 6,000 Sufris, and 'Abd al-Malīk b. Saqādīd al-Sanāḥādī, who brought his 2,000 Sufris into this coalition. All these detachments laid siege to Umar b. Hafs at his headquarters in the town of Tūbān. Joining the Berber rebels at a later stage was Abū Ḥātim al-Malzuẓī [q.v.], leader of the Ibadīs of Tripoli. The latter succeeded in capturing the town of Tūbān in 154/771, subsequently setting out in pursuit of Umar b. Hafs Hāzāmārī, who made his way towards the east. Abū Ḥātim was preceded by an advance party commanded by Dijarī b. Maṣūd al-Midyānī. The latter caught up with Umar b. Hafs at Dijīdīl (the present-day Djedjelli) in the land of the Ketāmā; in the ensuing battle, Dijarī b. Maṣūd and his partisans perished, and Abū Ḥātim al-Malzuẓī retreated to Tripoli.

Despite the defeat of Dijarī b. Maṣūd in 771/1371 and the emigration of a large proportion of the Midyānī of Morocco to Spain with the troops of Tārīk b. Ziyād in 90/270-11, numerous sections of this tribe survived in North Africa, at least until the 8th/14th century, if not later.

The following is the information provided by Arab authors of the Middle Ages regarding these sections: Morocco: Mention has been made above of the significant group of newly Islamized Midyānī who, taking part in the conquest of Spain by Tārīk b. Ziyād in 92/271-11, settled in south-eastern Spain. It is probable that the Midyānī who inhabited the Dijābal Midyānī, a mountain situated to the south of Fās, between this city and that of Sufri [q.v., present-day Sefrou], and are mentioned by al-Bakrī (5th/11th century), belonged to the same clan. Dijarī b. Maṣūd [q.v.], 8th/14th century mentions in his geographical work Dijābal Midyānī situated to the east of Fās. Could this be the same place as the Dijābal Midyānī situated between Fās and Sefrou? These Midyānī of the region of Fās are also mentioned by Ibn Khāldūn among numerous other Berber tribes of the Maghrib al-Asghār (the Bahlūla, the Fazāz, the Ghīyāḥa, etc.) as professing Judaism at the beginning of the 3rd/9th century. Later, they converted to Islam, accepting Sufi doctrines at a very early stage. In the second half of this century, during the reign of 'Alī b. Umar, the Idrīsī prince of Fās, a Khārdīl Sufi named 'Abd al-Razzāk, a native of the town of Washka [q.v., i.e. Huesca] situated in the north-east of Muslim Spain, settled among the Sufri Midyānī inhabiting the mountain of this name to the south of Fās. There he gained numerous partisans. He had counted for his cause numerous neighbouring Berber tribes, for example the Ghīyāḥa. He had also constructed on the mountain of Sāla in the territory of the Midyānī (to the south of Fās) a powerful stronghold, to which he gave the name of Washka, in memory of his native city in Spain. According to the author of the Kirtās (8th/14th century), this castle was still in existence in 726/1325-6. Subsequently, 'Abd al-Razzāk rebelled against 'Alī b. Umar. After a number of battles with this prince, he inflicted a decisive victory on him and
forced him to abandon the city of Fas and to take refuge in the territory of the Berber tribe of the Arwabra, the tribe most loyal to the Idrisids. The inhabitants of the Andalus quarter of Fas submitted to 'Abd ar-Razzāk, but this family lived for some time in the Maghrib al-Aṣṣā and governed, in all probability, the Midyūna of the region of Fas.

If Ibn Khaldūn is to be believed, the Midyūna of the region of Fas rebelled, in 614-20/1217-23, against the Marinid prince 'Abd ʿUdām Saʿīd, but they were soon defeated by the Marinids and pledged allegiance to this dynasty.

Besides this fact, nothing definite is known concerning the history of this section of the Midyūna living between Fas and Sefrou, at least as regards the 4th-8th/10th-14th centuries. The last item of information available concerning the Moroccan Midyūna dates from the time of Ibn Khaldūn, who mentions a section of this tribe, still present between Fas and Sefrou, in the vicinity of the important Berber tribe of the Maghūla [p.e.] and under its protection.

Al-ʾArabia: According to Ibn Khaldūn, the original homeland of the Midyūna was located in the central Maghrib, in the province of Tiλīmān (Tlemcen). The Midyūna occupied the portion of territory which extends from the Djabal Bāni Rashīd (currently Djebel Amour), in the south-east of the High Plateau region, the east of Geryville and north-west of Laghouat, as far as the mountain which stands to the south of Ouedja (west-south-west of Tlemcen) and which still bears the name of Djebel Midioouna. In this early period, that is before the conquest of the central Maghrib by the Banū tribes of the Banū Tuqūn and the Banū Rashīd, the Midyūna of this part of the Maghrib roamed, in nomadic fashion, "the plains of Ibn Khaldūn. It was located in the canton of Yefren (in the ancient Arab sources: Yafran) situated to the east of Djabal Naftūs in northern Tripolitanian. In fact, in his Kitāb al-Siyar, al-ʾShāmīḫkāh speaks of people belonging to the tribe of the Midyūna inhabiting this district in the Middle Ages. Among these people, al-ʾShāmīḫkāh mentions an ʾIbāḥī scholar named ʾIsā b. Hamdūn al-Midyūnī al-Hawwārī who lived, during the 5th/11th century, in the ibīdīa (desert) of this country. It seems that this section of Midyūna belonged to the major Berber tribe of Hawwārī [p.e.].

Libya: A section of the tribe of the Midyūna also lived in the canto of Tifern (in the ancient Arab sources: Yafran) situated to the east of Djabal Naftūs in northern Tripolitanian. In fact, in his Kitāb al-Siyar, al-ʾShāmīḫkāh speaks of people belonging to the tribe of the Midyūna living in this district during the Middle Ages. Among these people, al-ʾShāmīḫkāh mentions an ʾIbāḥī scholar named ʾIsā b. Hamdūn al-Midyūnī al-Hawwārī who lived, during the 5th/11th century, in the ibīdīa (desert) of this country. It seems that this section of Midyūna belonged to the major Berber tribe of Hawwārī [p.e.].

Spain: It has been noted above that a large number of the Midyūna entered Spain at the time of the first Muslim invasion of Spain led by the Berber Tārik b. Ziyād in 92/711. Becoming very powerful and very numerous, the Midyūna of Spain enjoyed considerable influence there and, in 151/768, a group from this tribe embraced the cause of the Berber pretender Shākiyā al-Mīnkāšī who claimed to be the grandson of Ḥusayn b. ʿĀlī. In fact, one of the Midyūna amīrs of Spain named Ḥilāl b. Abziya rose in rebellion at Shantamariyāt al-Shārīk (Santa Maria de la Antigua or Albarracín) against the Umayyad ʿAbd al-Rahmān al-Đâkhib. After the death of Shākiyā, whose revolt lasted nine years, Ḥilāl b. Abziya pledged submission to ʿAbd al-Rahmān al-Đâkhib and obtained from this amīr a commission appointing him chief of the Midyūna of Spain. His power extended over the Berbers established in eastern Spain and in Santa Maria or Albarracín. He was succeeded by Nabīth, one of his kinsmen.

Sicily: A section of the Midyūna settled, probably in the 3rd/9th century, on the banks of the river called Selīnu in antiquity in south-western Sicily. In fact, this river was later known as Modirīn, from the ancient tribal name Midyūna or Midyūna. The relevant group here is probably that section of the tribe of the Midyūna which was formerly resident in Idrīšiya and which took part in the conquest of Sicily undertaken in 118/826 by the kādī Asad b. Ṭurāt b. Sinān. Initially ʾIbāḥīs, these Midyūna were subsequently converted to orthodox doctrines after the death of the ʾImām Abā Ḥātim al-Malzuṭī.
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